

I. Introduction

Fitzgerald and Novels of Social Awareness

Having seen many ups and down of social conditions and circumstances of 1920s most of the works of F. S. Fitzgerald deals with hot issues of the then society. The shimmering effect of World War 1st, the rising voices of black Americans in the name of Harlem Renaissance and the obligation of young and prominent writers to leave the country after the world war attracted him heavily, which became the fertile ground for his literary career. The birth of Jazz Age and the emergence of new romantic generation and their activities never gave him to go far from the romantic circumstance and nature. So, many of Fitzgerald's works have good and mutual blend of social issues and romantic nature of individual characters.

He, a pioneer of Jazz age coined the term and offered it for the sake of flamboyant and pleasure seeking youth of 1920s America. This merged with the generations of Harlem Renaissance and became the national center of African American Culture, including the arts of theater, music and dance. Fitzgerald's first novel, *This Side of Paradise* (1920) describes the new generations of post-World War 1st, who had lost their American ideals and becoming "expatriates", moving either to London or to Paris in their quest for a richer literary and artistic milieu and freer way of life.

The tragic impact of The First World War and its impact on aesthetic sensibility to the Americans and especially among the young American writers is a remarkable one. Many of young American writers served in Europe either as Combatants or as a member of the various ambulance corps during the period of the war. It imprinted in the writing of the 1920s and had much to do with the gloomy and decadent anxiety of that haunted period.

Though Fitzgerald had already joined the army leaving his college study unfinished he, like Amory Blaine, a main character of his first novel, *This Side of Paradise* (1920) missed the war. He had left the Princeton College before graduating to accept a commission as a second lieutenant in the Regular Army during the World War 1st, but spent most of his time in the service writing and revising this novel. Amory Blaine has a direct representation of the life of Fitzgerald. But like many young generations of the time he had forced to grow up “to find all gods dead, all wars fought, and all faiths in man shaken” (Ruland and Bradbury 273).

After the publication of this novel, Fitzgerald by the age of 24 became well-known and famous novelist. The novel was such a success that magazines were eager to publish his articles, journalists were following him and he became a public figure overnight. With the publication of *This Side of Paradise* Fitzgerald achieved financial success as a novelist and as a writer of short stories, though his earnings barely kept pace with the extravagance. This novel became extremely popular because on the one hand the writing was modern and easy to read and on the other hand it had dealt with the burning social issues and had social awareness. Bringing those public and social issues in the frontline Fitzgerald’s fictions raises the social conscious and the future glimpse to the reader.

His first collection of short stories, *Flappers and Philosophers* (1920) came in the period of high fame of his first novel. Flappers “refer to the modern young ladies of that period who smoked, drank whisky, and lived dangerously free lives” (High 144) and as the title suggests it also deals with the burning issues of the time. It was the time of Jazz, film, music, flappers of romance and it deals with the same issues. As Ruland and Bradbury consider, “the 1920s was an age of Puritanism and Prohibition, but also of psychoanalysis and flappers, Jazz and film” (297).

Tales of the Jazz Age (1922), another collection of short stories describes about the pleasure-seeking youth tendency of the society. Fitzgerald himself was grateful to the Jazz Age because that bore him up, flattered him and gave him more money “than he had dreamed of, simply for telling people that he had felt as they did, that something had to be done with all the nervous energy stored up and unexpended in the war” (Charters 477). Slowly and gradually, Jazz became the synonymous of the romantic youths of the period. Originally, it was the music of and invention of black African Americans but the magic of the Jazz attracted people from all social ranks whether they were black or white; rich or poor.

In March 1922, Scribner published Fitzgerald’s second novel, *The Beautiful and the Damned*, which also grabbed the market and sold well. But his first published play *The Vegetable* (1923) opened in Atlantic City, failed, and most of the first night audiences walked out from the theatre. As Fitzgerald himself said there were many tales to tell about the spree youth of the America, and America was going on the greatest, gaudiest spree in history and there was going to be plenty to tell about it. There is still plenty to tell about it, in the light of a new age that is curious about the 1920s and persistently misjudges them. The gaudiest spree in the history was also a moral revolt and beneath the revolt were social transformations and awareness.

The 1920s was the age when Puritanism was under attack with the Protestant churches losing their dominant position. That was the age when the country ceased to be English and Scottish and when the children of later immigrants moved forward to take their place in the national life. American economy was ascending and the lifestyle became easier than before. Noisy parties and Jazz clubs were spreading every day and youngsters were found indulging there. American life style became totally different from traditional Victorian values and morals. Youngsters were

enjoying the freedom in a large scale unexpectedly than before. Love transformed into sex and human values into money. Alcohol, though it was restricted, took the position of national drink and money became easier to earn.

Fitzgerald captured this same social and economic situation of the then society in his books; and his famous novel *The Great Gatsby* (1925) came in the same periphery capturing the same social problems and the truths of the age. Though Fitzgerald was already famous and well-known novelist, he did not get critical success until the publication of this book. This book became so popular that it not only led him towards the peak of success but also solved his financial trouble. Fitzgerald was a Midwestern boy, born in St. Paul, Minnesota on September 24, 1896, to an Irish descent that had some social standing. His father was unsuccessful businessman and small fortune inherited by his mother and the financial help from a maiden aunt was not sufficient to run the family.

From the charity of his aunt he had fulfilled his dream to go to an Eastern Preparatory School and after in Princeton College. So his strong attachment towards money and firm belief in it is clearly seen in Jay Gatsby, the hero of *The Great Gatsby*.

Gatsby has a belief in the absolute power and natural goodness of money and he knows the uses of it. Though both of the main characters Nick Carraway, the narrator and Gatsby, the hero are participants of the war; through the eyes of Nick, the narrator “we see both the glamour and moral ugliness of the twentieth century” (High 144). Nick is the mouth person of Fitzgerald where as in Gatsby we can see the dreams of financial success of Fitzgerald and the vision and dream of the society. Gatsby, a true romantic character spent his whole life dreaming of his childhood sweetheart. The hidden motives of his large and expensive parties are only to win the

heart and consent of his former beloved, Daisy. Like all the other peoples of the period, he believes that money can buy everything. Jay Gatsby, like Old Braddock Washington, a main character of his one of the story *The Diamond as Big as the Ritz*, believes money can buy even the blessing of the God. Washington offering bribe to the god, convinced that even “God has His price, of course” and accept it if enough is offered.

Capturing this exact situation of the moment novel raises social consciousness in the people. Richard Roland and Malcolm Bradbury write, “*The Great Gatsby*, however, transforms its naturalist materials just as Gatsby himself magnificently transforms his own past and social reality” (248). The exact situation of 1920s seen through the prism of his fiction becomes a strange distillation of unlimited wonder and opportunity founded on human excess and waste.

Babylon Revisited (1931) is one of his best short stories describing the Lost Generation after its moral and economic collapse. Being more complicated emotionally than his earlier short stories, it embodies less regret for the past and more dignity in the face of real sorrow. This is a sad story.

The high moral, social and economic fame and reputation of Fitzgerald declined rapidly after the harsh period of 1930s. Again, the situation of all around the world and United States of America directly matched with him. Along with the great depression in America and around the whole world coincided with his own emotional and physical collapse. His wife, Zelda, judge’s daughter, with whom he had married immediately after the publication of his first novel, *This Side of Paradise*, in 1920, fell in serious mental illness. This brought a break in his career and marital life and he became disturbed because of his strong alcoholism. In his fourth novel *Tender Is the*

Night (1934), he describes his own experiences with his wife's mental illness. This novel is full of tragic characters.

This novel describes about the return back of the American expatriates of 1920s. After the hollow quest of World War 1st many young Americans moved towards France and England leaving America and calling themselves expatriates. Among them were Ezra Pound, T.S. Eliot, Gertrude Stein and others. Some of them returned back to America when the situation changed. The story of these expatriates and Exile's Return, as Malcolm Cowley called, is interwoven in the novel *Tender Is the Night*. This novel represents the mood and way of life of these two groups of American Expatriates. The extreme failure of this novel further gave him mental trouble and he became totally crack up. From the very beginning, Fitzgerald had a feeling that the twenties would end badly, both for himself and for America, and it became absolutely true:

Although *Tender Is the Night* shows the indolence and self-obsession that often accompany wealth, it is also a hymn to the lifestyle that wealth brings. The wealthy are venerated, even as they are pitied.

Servants have no more personality- or even physically attributes – than the furniture. (David Seed)

This is suffused with grief for the lost world of aristocratic stability before the Great War. Fitzgerald was obsessed with; as he wrote the novel, which warned the western civilization was on the peak of disintegration. A sense of fertility of wealth pervades his novel, with looming threat to the world order of the rich.

The last years of Fitzgerald were truly lost and he passed those days writing Hollywood screenplays and losing his dissipated talent. Despite his various attempts

and struggles to complete his last novel *The Last Tycoon* remained unfinished. In 1940, at the age of 44 he died of a heart attack, lying on the sofa.

Critics on *The Great Gatsby*

Among all his novels, *The Great Gatsby* is a remarkable one that “marked a turning-point in Fitzgerald’s career by his discovery of the use of a dramatized narrator” (Seed). Nick Carraway, narrator, thus performed a crucial role in conveying a sense of something inexplicable about all characters. Because of this mysterious role of narrator as well as the crucial theme it has dealt with, *The Great Gatsby* has been interpreted by different critics from the time of its publication. Despite its various use and application the narrator’s role made this novel mysterious and famous. In this context, Aitkenhead about the role of narrator writes:

like *The Great Gatsby*’s narrator, you leave your small hometown with your father’s advice to “reserve judgment” and the secret certainly that you will therefore know how to judge everything. And you discover the empty allegiance of the careless and beautiful, and their layers of glamorous untruth.

Therefore, Nick is not only the narrator of *The Great Gatsby* but also stands as a prototype of all who clearly judges and others ‘Other’ gaining crucial advices from others. He reserves all the judgments about time, age and characters. Nick, who represents every-things for which we have an unaffected scorn; there is something gorgeous about him, some heightened sensibility about the promise for life. He had an extraordinary gift for judgment that is not likely to find easily in other characters.

Writing of Fitzgerald is guided by the strong psychological strains. Characters of Fitzgerald speak the views of the then society and the attitude of Americans, a rapidly developing country of the time. The hidden motive of almost all the

characters of his novel is to show the superiority of Americanness and to dominate and other “Other” as Nick Carraway of *The Great Gatsby*. Despite its domination and subjugation, it is about the American dream, which has gone wrong way at that time. This, figures out the activities of those who seek to enjoy the success American society had promised. The dream and hope of Gatsby is the dream of all Americans and the failure of Gatsby is the failure of American dream.

When America could not fulfill its promises, the young generations became more obsessed and frustrated. They lost all their hopes and desires, and money only became the means to enjoy. *The Great Gatsby* transformed its naturalist material just as Gatsby himself magnificently transforms his own past and social reality. Like Gatsby’s, behinds of every Americans’ fortune there was some sort of meanness and rottenness. America at the end of twentieth century was the land of Gatsby’s. As Fitzgerald’s characters deal that a man has right to wear a glamorous crushed rag of pink suit if he wants, as Nick Carraway says, they turn out all right in the end.

The works of Fitzgerald have the symbolic force of certain senses and *The Great Gatsby* is a symbolic one. This is a symbolic novel, which combines symbolism and psychological realism. It seems, then, “to be the case that as Fitzgerald revised his work in order to increase the symbolic forces of certain scenes or reduce the informational content in others, a concern for chronological accuracy remained a low priority of for him” (Seed). All the activities of the novel have symbolic glow. The descriptions of house, the roads and places, the parties, the music and musicians, the guests and their behaviors as well as each and every setting and description have symbolic force. Even Gatsby symbolically presents “the American belief that money can buy love and happiness” (High 144) and the failure of Gatsby symbolically refers the failure of American dream. So the book becomes a symbolist

tragedy about the symbolic imagination's struggle to persist in a lowered historical time.

The failure of Gatsby makes him a tragic figure. He “tries and fails to change the world and hard American objects and hard materialistic people into the ideal world of his fantasy” (High 145). The world of Gatsby, like the world of many fellow Americans of the time, is material without being real, where poor ghosts, breathing dreams like air drifted about. Gatsby is a “dandy of desire who seeks to transform money into love, time into endless instance of contemplations and the clock into dream” (Richard Ruland 249). He floats, in his “ineffable gaudiness”, on the everlasting American dream, while beneath him a confusing, surreal record of economic and social facts unravels. His existence is supported by the moral tolerance and reticence of the narrator, Nick, who records the modern world through the shifting flash of fashions, the jumble of parties, the contrasts between the landscape of wealth and the ash heaps of the wasteland economy. *The Great Gatsby* symbolically presents every minute details of the time and describes them vividly.

Another critic Thomas A Pendleton shows the lack of accuracy in *The Great Gatsby*. He argues that the status of the novel has tended to militate against the rigorous close analysis we would expect. However, “Pendleton's purpose is not to correct an overall critical lack, but rather to home in a specific issue the chronology of *The Great Gatsby*” (Seed). The main thrust of his arguments is that about halfway through the novel's composition Fitzgerald discovered that he was running out of story and as a result lengthen the chronology. Pendleton again and again shows the examples of chronological clarity at the manuscript stage being sacrificed to vagueness when Fitzgerald revised the galleys. These problems became seriously contradictory partly because material was relocated in the narrative.

Gatsby is searching for a transfiguring vision, a world beyond the clock of historical time, life seeming meaningless unless invested with meaning. Almost all readers and critics are aware of the dominant role of Nick in the novel. In the eyes of Ken Bush, the immense wealth and fame of Gatsby became an object of attraction for Nick. For him “A man of immense wealth and charm, he becomes an object of fascination for his neighbor, Nick Carraway. As Nick unravels the mystery for us, his own life becomes entangled with Gatsby and fatally attractive to Daisy...” (Blurb)

In the novel Nick Carraway become the dominant and omnipresent narrator and he represents the voice of Fitzgerald. Most of the critics consider Nick as the only mysterious narrator of Fitzgerald’s novel. In this context Richard Ruland and Malcolm Bradbury write:

The narrator, Nick Carraway, becomes a voice of what Fitzgerald called “selective delicacy”- filtering sensations and impressions in an order appropriate to his growing understanding of Gatsby’s nature, presenting a landscapes of complex images of that Gatsby, initially just another corrupt product of his material world, is gradually distinguished from it and finally made the voices of its massive carelessness. (299)

In *The Great Gatsby* Fitzgerald’s colonialist views are expressed through the narration of Nick Carraway who remains aloof from other characters and represents them as 'Other' with in the narrative of the novel.

II. Rhetorics of Postcoloniality

Post Colonialism as a literary discourse emerges after the World War 2nd to deals with the effect of colonization on cultures and societies. It has a clearly chronological meaning, designating the post-independent period. It gained its popularity after the 1970s when many literary critics used it to discuss various cultural effects of colonialism. Post Colonialism with colonialism reveals some basic issues of ‘images’, ‘representation’ and ‘depiction’ of culture, people and geography in literature like that of cultural studies. It is not only the study of ideological and cultural impact of western colonialism emerging from 16th century onward but also its aftermath, in whichever forms it may be, i.e. neo-colonialism. Postcolonialism may offer us quite new ways of thinking about the implications of the centrality of nudity in artistic traditions in Western Europe. It may reveal the ways in which the discourse works not only to read the culture of the colonized, but also to deconstruct the hidden codes and assumption of the colonial power and their traditions.

So post colonialism on the one hand reveals the inconsistencies and dominations formed in the colonial discourse and on the other hand, counter attacks those inconsistencies and colonial discourses. As Tyson writes in *Literary Theory Today*, “For post colonial cultures includes both a merger of and antagonism between the culture of the colonized and that of the colonizers” (365). The colonialism, a western discourse, presents and represents everything non-western as inferior, and manifests westerners’ desire to rule, to dominate and to control the ‘Other’. This same notion of westerners’, which lies in the core of their heart helped to flourish this colonial purpose in an effective manner. It produces a kind of myth and stereotype of the orient in order to make it easy to have power and authority over them. Bill Aschroft, Griffiths and Tiffen write it clearly as, “The idea of colonialism itself is

grounded in a sexualized discourse of rape, penetration and impregnation, whilst the subsequent relationship of the colonizer and colonized is often presented in a discourse that is redolent of a sexual exoticism” (40-41).

Said also held the similar views that without examining Orientalism as a discourse we can't understand the enormously systematic discipline of westerners by which Europeans become able to manage the orient as an 'Other' by politically, sociologically, militarily, ideologically, scientifically, and imaginatively after the Post-Enlightenment period.

The westerners were always desirous to dominate and rule upon the non-westerners. Considering the natives colonized, as primitive and barbaric, the western white colonizers, themselves, took the so-called burden to educate and civilize them. The colonial discourse is greatly implicated in ideas of the centrality of Europe. It is a system by which dominant groups in society constitute the field of truth by imposing specific knowledge, disciplines and values upon dominated groups. As a social formation it works to constitute reality not only for the objects it appears to represent but also for the subject. For Tyson, colonialist discourse was based on the colonizers' assumption of their own superiority, which they contrasted with the alleged inferiority of native people, the original inhabitant of the lands they invaded. Westerners believed that there was a hierarchy of race and 'we' by the right of the race belonged to the superior position. 'They' neither have the right to rule nor to raise any question about 'we' and what 'we' do rather 'they' deserve to be ruled. Colonizers divide the world between 'Us', the 'civilized', and 'Them', the 'savage' and 'other'. As Tyson claims, "So the colonizers saw themselves at the center of the world; the colonized were at the margins. The colonizers saw themselves as the embodiment of what a

human being should be, the proper “Self”; native peoples were “other”, different, and therefore inferior” (366).

Because of this Eurocentric notion the Westerners always had dominated non-westerners, non-whites, non-Europeans and proved their hegemonic nature. Edward Said further clarifies this point as, “The relationship between occident and orient is a relationship of power, of domination, of varying degree of complex hegemony...” (*Orientalism* 1). Hegemony is the power of the ruling class to convince other classes that their interests are the interest of all. Because of this, ruling class becomes successful in promoting its own interest in the society. It becomes difficult to rebel against a system or a people in command over several generations. Colonized persons, who believe in British superiority and their own inferiority, cannot resist their colonial subjugations; rather they try to imitate the colonizers as far as possible. Western discourse about the non-western world as well as the belief of non-westerners as their own inferiority played a great role in serving the purpose of European expansion, but along with this there came some sort of resistance in almost everywhere in the non-European world, as manifested in different resistance movement, formation of the colonial parties whose common goal was self-determination and national independence.

Along with this tradition, decolonization became possible right after the World War 2nd, and many previous colonial countries became free and independent. Though the countries geographically and politically became sovereign but culturally they still remained colonized. Outwardly, they seemed independent but deeply embedded cultural colonization; including British education, British culture, British system of government, British moral behavior and value of life, remained their still dominating and operating.

This cultural domination of strong culture over the native culture makes the European culture as what we call the 'Cultural Empire'. Due to the effect of this cultural imperialism, which is the direct result of economic domination, consists of the "takeover" of one culture by another until the weak appear to be a kind of imitation of the former. In it every cultural manners, like food, clothing, customs, recreation and others, of the economically dominant culture replace those of economically vulnerable culture. As a result, there emerges not only the hybrid culture but also the fear of losing one's cultural norms and systems by indigenous cultural group. Even in this post-colonial period American cultural imperialism is enjoying this privilege. Tyson correctly writes this, as "American cultural imperialism has been one of the most pervasive forms of this phenomenon, as we see American fashion, movies, sports, fast food, and consumption squeeze out indigenous cultures all over the world" (372-73).

Because of this continuous domination and subjugation of European culture over indigenous culture, a sort of resistance movement emerged all over the world and critics, writers, literary entrepreneurs and others tried to reinterpret the relation between west and east or colonizer and colonized. The post colonialism broadened its scope in every field and took a broader sphere. Some writers like Edward Said and others challenged the western discourse by following the logic of Foucault's theory that no discourse is fixed for all time; it is both a cause and effect. It not only wields power but also stimulates oppositions.

The opposition of the power is just like another side of the coin. It is natural for the opposition to have 'will to power'. It can jump into the power in no time whenever it gets chance. For all this, what it needs first is the creation of parallel discourse. As Selden, with Foucault writes "these discursive practices have no

universal validity but are historically dominant ways of controlling and preserving social relation of exploitation” (*A Readers Guide* 164). This means that first of all discourse is produced and through that discourse is manipulated the power in order to maintain the sense of superiority and authority over the other. Discourse in this sense, became an instrument of power, a means of governing the other. However, the struggle held by the opposition, ‘the other’, on the other hand, is the struggle to achieve power, which in turn, is the struggle to hold the discourse. Discourse, in this sense, becomes an object that ‘the others’ are suffering the lack of.

With this concept, on the one hand, the undurability of power is exposed and on the other hand, the doctrine of oppositional criticism is emerged. Postcolonial discourse while developing from the concept of Said and Foucault observed the whole previous colonial relation from the eyes of resistance. It forcefully deconstructed the long cherished discourses that produced colonizing myths about laziness, deceit and irrationality of the non-westerners or colonizers to support the process of colonization. As Bill Ashcroft, Griffith and Helen Tiffin write:

Post-colonialism, for example, may offer us quite new ways of thinking about the implications of the centrality of nudity in artistic tradition in Western Europe. It may reveal the ways in which the discourse works not only to read the culture of the colonized, but also to deconstruct the hidden codes and assumptions of the colonial powers and their tradition. (185)

Thus it can be said that post colonialism is mainly concerned on the material effect of the historical condition of colonialism as well as on its discursive power. By redefining previous European colonialist institutions and their contemporary colonial motives from the viewpoint of colonized, post colonialism established itself as a

discourse. Post colonialism is now used in wide and diverse ways to include the study and analysis of European territorial conquests. The various institutions of European colonialism, the discursive operations of Empire, the subtleties of subject construction in colonial discourse and the resistance of those subjects, and, the differing responses to such incursions and their contemporary colonial legacies in both pre- and post-independence nations and communities. While its use has “tended to focus on the cultural production of such communities, it is becoming widely used in historical, political, sociological and economic analysis, as these disciplines continue to engage with the impact of European imperialism upon world societies” (*Key Concepts* 187).

Post colonialism, thus, primarily is concerned to examine the process and effect of, and reaction to, European colonialism. This term now is used in its various fields, to describe a remarkably heterogeneous set of subject positions, professional fields and critical enterprises. Postcolonial studies have its own internal agendas and forces that continue to interact with and modify the direct response to the colonial incursion.

The project of identifying the general discursive forces that held together the imperial enterprise that operated wherever colonization occurred is often in conflict with the need to provide detailed accounts of the material effect to those discourses as they operated in different periods and different localities. To suggest that colonialism or imperialism were not themselves multivalent forces, and operated differently according to the periods in which they occurred, or the specific “contact zones” in which they took effect, is clearly to oversimplify. But to suggest that it is impossible to determine widespread common elements within these particularities, especially at the level of ideology and discursive formation, seems equally inadequate at a basis for any but the most limited accounts.

The aspects or features of colonialism which one colonial state bears are not shared by another one, and vice versa. The discourse of colonialism is deeply affected by time and space as well as the localities. The way and form by which westerners dominate non-westerners in the very beginning of the colonial expansion, is definitely changing in the present time. Though the motives of colonizers are same, the form is rapidly changing. European Post-Renaissance colonial expansion coterminous with the development of the modern capitalist system of economic and it's notion of colonialism.

In the present, postcolonial theorists indicate many forms of colonialism, which operates differently in different fields. In every social and individual relation, it comes whether it becomes obvious or not. The idea of colonialism enlarges beyond its boundaries and it leaves impression in every aspects of human life: society, culture, economy, language and others. Colonizers had a tendency of creating an eclectic class of people from the colonized, so that they train them as their imitators and use them as the mediator between them and the laymen. The imitators tried to show their superiority over the common people through the mimicry of the colonizer. These mimic men are hybrid personalities who create a new transcultural forms within the contact zone produced by the colonizers.

Hybridity: Mimicry and Ambivalence

Because of the impact of colonization the subject class think themselves as inferior and try to imitate the language, code, dress and other activities of ruling class. But, only from the mimicry colonized can never become colonizer as Said said, rather they become hybrid cultural group. It is a cross breeding of two cultural group to form a third group in politics, linguistic, cultural, racism and other. The relation between colonizer and colonized as Homi K. Bhabha think, stresses their

independence and the mutual construction of their subjectivities. By stressing the transformative cultural, linguistic and political impacts on both the colonized and the colonizers, it has been regarded as replicating assimilationist policies by masking or whitewashing the cultural differences.

But these hybrid cultural groups are groundless and they don't bear any qualities of any particular group. It is the 'in-between' space that carries the burden of both cultures. The colonizers formed this cultural group in order to dominate the native people. As Macaulay purposed in "Minute on Indian Education" to make hybrid Indian group, who by blood and color become Indian but by mind, taste and manner become English. He purposed to make half-Indian and half-English man to dominate the Indians. As Macaulay suggested the riches of European learning should be "a class of interpreters between us and millions whom we govern- a class of persons Indian in blood and color, but English in taste, opinions, in morals and in intellect" (qtd. in Ashcroft 140).

These hybrid cultural groups neither can become so-called civilized and dominant colonizers, nor can go into the ground reality of the natives. But as Macaulay purposed, this cultural group helps the colonizers to dominate upon the colonized themselves. By imitating the cultural habits, assumptions, institutions and value of colonizers the colonized become the blurred copy of colonizers that can be quite threatening. This group plays the role of interpreter between colonized and colonizers and formulates the notion of colonizers. As written in the book *The Empire Writes Back* "it caused those from the periphery to immerse themselves in the imported culture denying their origins in an attempt to become 'more English than the English'" (4).

As understood within the domain of postcolonial criticism, hybridity is the result of the orientalist projects of the west. The term has something to do with traumatic colonial experience, since it is an ambivalent relationship of colonizer and the colonized. The colonial settlers, once they arrive in an alien land, felt the necessity of establishing a new identity since they were displaced from their own point of origin. In a colonized society, there emerged a binary relationship between the people of two cultures, races, and languages and such a relation produced a hybrid or cross-cultural society.

Thus the coping of colonizers, mimicry, has often been an overt goal of imperial policy. Colonizers had a tendency of creating an eclectic class of people from the colonized so that they train them as their imitator and use them as their mediator between them and the laymen. Those imitators can never become masters but they are indoctrinated to act superior to the subject class. So this artificial hierarchy is the social class of mimicry (mimic men), who are so badly affected that they turn out to be hybridized, odd, and suspended between two statuses: colonized and colonizer. The person who mimics or those mimickers lose their identity by forsaking their own cultural and social norms and values, and by trying to repeat others. But colonized can never become colonizer rather their double selves push them to emptiness, dislocation, inadequacy and even in confusion. This further leads towards the emotional and psychological withdrawal. At last colonized's attempts to become colonizer become futile in front of colonial power, which compelled them to be a copycat.

The mimicry does not lie in its concealment of some real identity behind its mask, but comes from its double vision, which in disclosing the ambivalence of colonial discourse also disrupts its authority. Mimicry not only helps to promote the

colonial project by copying the behaviors of colonizers but also locates the end of colonial dominance:

When colonial discourse encourages the colonized subjects to ‘mimic’ the colonizers, by adopting the colonizers’ cultural habits, assumptions, institutions and values, the result, is never a simple reproduction of those traits. Rather, the result is a ‘blurred copy’ of the colonizer that can be quite threatening. This is because mimicry is never very far from mockery, since it can appear to parody whatever it mimics. Mimicry therefore locates a crack in the certainty of colonial dominance, an uncertainty in its control of the behavior of the colonized. (Ashcroft and others 139)

Such mimicry of the colonizing culture and behavior by the colonized contains both mockery and menace. The mimicry of the postcolonial subject is therefore always potentially destabilizing the colonial discourse, and locating an area of considerable political and cultural uncertainty in the structure of dominance. Mimicry is, then, “the sign of a double articulation”, a complex strategy of reform, regulation and discipline, which “appropriates” the “other” as it visualizes power. As Bhabha says, “Mimicry is also the sign of inappropriate, however, a difference or recalcitrance, which coheres the dominant strategic function of colonial power, intensifies surveillance, and poses an immanent threat to both normalized knowledge and disciplinary power” (78).

Mimicry can be both ambivalent and multilayered. However, hegemony and mimicry come together in the process of acculturation, which suggest disparagement of the tendency to emulate the colonizer. The mimicry of the postcolonial subject is therefore, always potentially destabilizing to colonial discourse, and locates an area of considerable political and cultural uncertainty in the structure of imperial dominance.

The colonial space is therefore an agnostic space. Despite the ‘imitation’ and ‘mimicry’ with which colonized people cope with imperial presence the relationship becomes one of constant or implicit, contestation and opposition. Indeed, such mimicry becomes the very site of that conflict, a transparency which is dependent for its fixity on the underlying negativity of imperial presence which it seems to duplicate.

The colonized subject cannot oppose the colonizers completely rather complicit and resistant lies side by side. So the relationship becomes ambivalent. As taken by Bhabha “ambivalence disrupts the clear-cut authority of colonial domination because it disrupts the simple relationship between colonized and colonizers” (Ashcroft and others 13). Ambivalence, so, goes beyond the control of colonizers because it doesn’t serve the purpose of colonizers, that is to produce loyal subjects who truly reproduce its assumption, habits and value; which is not very far from the mimicry itself. Because of its ambivalent behavior, colonial relationship generates its own destruction and have controversial proposition. As taken by Bhabha colonial discourse is compelled to be ambivalent because it never really wants colonial subjects to be exact copy of the colonizers, because it would be the threat for themselves.

Discourse and Power

Though the concept ‘Discourse’ was first used to describe any kind of speaking and conversation but in Foucauldian sense, it is describes in terms of “bodies of knowledge”. His use of the concept moves it away from something to do with language and brings closer towards the concept of discipline. For Foucault, “a discourse is a strongly bounded area of social knowledge or a system of statements within which the world can be known. In any given period we can write, speak or

think about a given social object or practices only in a certain specific ways” (A *Foucault Primer* 31). Therefore, everything writing, speaking and thinking within such historical limits about everything can be discourse. Everything of discourse within that specific context has a pragmatic function. But these historically specific discourses are quite distinct from one another as well as from earlier to later forms of ‘themselves’ which may or may not have the same names. Therefore, discourses are discontinuous, temporary, and changeable and are the product of power.

The concept of non-Foucauldian discourse or primitive form of discourse can be divided into two groups; the formal approach, which considers discourse in terms of ‘text’ or formal linguistic method of analysis; and the empirical approach, which consist of sociological forms of analysis. Formalists are interested in the social function of language and its implication in the society. This type of discourse, deeply rooted in the Russian Formalist School, is therefore very close to the discipline known as social linguistics. Besides the critical and political uses of formal linguistic method, it attempts to find general underlying rules of linguistics or communicative function, behind imagined and invented texts. It is much less of a diversified social and epistemological phenomenon and more of a formal linguistic system of its own right.

But, as the empirical approach consists of sociological forms of analysis, it seems to share Foucault’s concern of discourse in terms of knowledge; though the ‘knowledge,’ this analysis mean is something different from Foucault’s. Knowledge is a matter of social condition as Alec McHoul and Wendy Grace write, “for Foucault, ‘knowledge’ is much more a matter of social, historical and political conditions under which, for example, statements come to count as true or false” (29). But knowledge, here in empirical approach, is taken as a narrow limit of commonsense that ultimately

informs conversational rules and procedures. It refers that linguists to describe any unit of speech longer than a sentence have used the discourse in technical sense.

The term 'discourse' for Foucault refers not to language and its social interaction but to relatively well-bounded areas of social knowledge. It is a historical fact and has a historical limitation. A discourse would then be constrained writing, speaking and thinking within such specific historical boundary. Raman Selden writes that, "the discursive practices have no universal validity but are historically dominant ways of controlling and presenting social relations of exploitation" (164). From the presence of discourse every things social and historical is known in the society as Ashcroft and others write:

The key feature of this is that the world is not simply 'there' to be talked about rather it is through discourse itself that the world is brought into being. It is also in such a discourse that speakers and hearers, writers and readers come to an understanding about themselves, there relationship to each other and their place in the world (the construction of subjectivity). It is the 'complex sign and practices which organizes social existence and social reproduction.' (71)

Thus, the discourse is a medium to reveal everything in the world. But these contemporary discourses are put in their historical position. They are relativized or pluralized so that they no longer seem to have unique access to the truth. Truth becomes a function of what can be said, written or thought. Discourse is not just a form of representation rather it is a material condition which enables and constrains the socially productive imagination. These conditions are therefore being referred to as 'discourses' or discursive conditions of possibility. Foucault's work gave the term 'discursive practices' and 'discursive formation' to the analysis of the kinds of

statement associated with particular institutions and their ways of establishing orders of truth, or what is accepted as 'reality' in a given society.

Along with the change of time and space the discourses are also changed so we can't say the discourse represent the reality of life and world. However, if discourses don't merely represent 'the real', and if they are the part of historical production, then which discourse is 'best' can't be decided by merely comparing it with any real object. Instead, discourses might be tested in terms of how they can actually intervene in local struggles. This mean that, in Foucault's view discourses are rooted in social institutions and that social and political power operates through it. The implication of Foucault's work is that members of society, including its intellectuals, are implicated in discourse and the discursive regimes or systems of power and regulation, which give them their livelihoods and definition. There lies no place to stand outside such systems.

'Power', for Foucault, is very different from traditional socio-political conceptions of it. Discourse is not a mere effect or end product of pre-existing power. Nor is power 'owned' by some privileged persons or group and exercised simply as an obligation or a prohibition on those who do not have it. It is not just the ruthless domination of the weaker by the stronger one as discussed by Nietzsche. In fact power is everywhere, not because it embraces everything but because it comes from everywhere. In this context, Foucault, in *History of Sexuality* writes:

... power comes below, that is there is no binary and all-encompassing opposition between ruler and ruled at the root of power relations, and serving as a general matrix- no such duality extending from the top down and reacting on more and more limited groups to the very depth of social body. One must suppose rather that the manifold relations of

force that take shape and come into play in the machinery of production in families, limited groups and institutions, are the basis for wide-ranging effects of cleavage that run through the social body as a whole. (93-4)

This radical rethinking of power by Foucault does not negate the role of language in determining the truth rather observes truth as a social product, where language can play the role of device of power not a model of power. Therefore, the linguistic system, as a whole, is one instance of power where power is considered as a set of relation of force. Because these relations are local and historically contingent, they cannot be 'predicted' by a general theory. Only particular investigation- what Foucault calls 'archeological' investigation- can specify them. The archaeological method shows that social histories of thought, knowledge and power are both unique and specific as well as having general properties. Foucauldian theory of discourse is developed in relation to power structures operating in the society. He cannot see discourse and power separately rather they are rooted in social institutions. He views that discourses are rooted in social institutions and that social power operates through discourse. Foucault, according to Alec McHoul and Wendy Grace, writes:

...there can be no possible exercise of power without a certain economy of discourses of truth which operates through and on the basis of this association. We are subjected to the production of truth through power and we can't exercise power except through the production of truth. (*A Foucault Primer* 59)

The discursive formations have enabled institutions to wield power and domination by defining and excluding 'the other'. To obtain the purpose of this certain social standards dichotomies are produced and imposed on society as definitive of human

existence and are operated in such a way that have real effects on society's institutions. Those social standards carry the burdens of that particular social institution that is to include and exclude certain social forms. Foucault argues that such discursive formations massively determine and constrain the forms of knowledge, the types of normality and the nature of subjectivity that prevail in a particular period.

These forms of knowledge, which in certain historical context, have the power to determine rational and irrational, normal and abnormal etc have also the power to silence what they labeled as abnormal or what they excludes. So the meaning of discourse depends upon who control it and who shape it. But power is not simply repressive but is productive, it brings subjects into being. Power is implicated in "generating forces, making them grow, and ordering them, rather than one dedicated to impeding, making them submit, or destroying them" (*Power/Knowledge* 136). Foucault's writings on power, for this, cannot be discussed outside his investigations of the production of truth. Foucauldian conception of discourse, according to Alec McHoul and Wendy Grace "is indispensable for an understanding of the role of 'power' in the production of knowledge – including self knowledge" (57).

Foucault understands power as associated not with repression or inhabitation of straightforward domination but as a working through institutionalized and accustomed discourses, which open up delimited forms of action, knowledge, and being. In this way the exercise of power constitutes as it, simultaneously controls individual subject and psyche. The discourse that is institutionalized has authority and legitimacy by definition, by virtue of being so institutionalized. The language of specific discourse within a given system and society will therefore play a vital part in constituting subjective and social identities as well as to determine or trace out the

knowledge. Therefore, the Foucault's concept of power has a relationship to the historical production of truth.

Because of its historical limitation, truth and knowledge cannot operate for a longtime. Along with the changes in power structures, the truth is also changes. For Foucault the concept of knowledge and truth are not firm and discrete entities but are fragmented and changing sites across which the flows of power move. Foucault establishes a "mutually constituting relationship between power and knowledge so that knowledge is indissociable from regimes of power, knowledge is formed within the practice of power and is constitutive of the development, refinement and proliferation of new techniques of power"(McHoul 58). The social group, who has the power in his control, wants to have it for a long time and wants to enjoy the privilege it gives. Where as another social group, whom does not have the power wants to have control over it and creates own truth. Therefore, there always lies a struggle between and among different social forces to gain or have control over the power. Thus for Foucault as for Nietzsche, any attempt to produce and control discourse is will to power. Those who have power have control of what is known and the way it is known, and those who have such knowledge have power over those who do not. Discourse, therefore, is important because it joins power and knowledge together.

The role of power and knowledge is very much dominant in colonialism, where the relationship between colonizers and colonized is determined or shaped by it. The relation between them is locked into a rigid hierarchy of difference deeply resistant to fair and equitable exchange, where the colonizers marginalize the subject people of different race, society and social background. Colonizer's regular presentation of colonized as inferior, is the manifestation of their desire to have

control over them and to rule them. It regularly and rotationally serves the same notion of colonizers and on their purpose in an effective manner. Colonialism depends for its strategy on this flexible positional superiority, which puts colonizers in a whole series of possible relationships with the other without ever losing them the relative upper hand. Everything they do, say and even think about colonized become truth for colonized and even for themselves. Thus, the concepts orientalism and colonialism are the product of discourses, and all of the statements and all that can be include and exclude within themselves become protected by the assertion of 'power' and 'truth'.

Colonialist Attitudes

One of the most important abilities critical theory develops in us is the ability to see connections where we didn't know they existed: for example, connections between our personal psychological conflict and the way we interpret a text, between the ideologies we have internalized and the literary works we find interesting, between a nation's political climate and what its intellectuals called great literature and so on. In the same way, no ideology is really separate from the psychology it produces. Most of the critical theories heavily depend upon the frame of references, and those frames of references or ideologies are not separate from the psychology they produce. Psychological concept by shaping those ideologies sustains them. Ideology cannot exist without the psychology appropriate to it, without the psychology that sustains it. Tyson further writes, "All the literary frameworks as feminism, Marxism, queer/ gay and lesbian theory along with postcolonial and African American criticism are guided by the psychological concept" (401).

Different critical theories or concepts deliver a message that becomes powerful and shapes the mind of common people that they cannot easily resist them.

As said by Foucault the message delivered by them becomes 'The Truth'. This truth further helps to generate their hidden purposes. All the ideologies as classicism, sexism, heterosexism and racism are not merely belief systems, they also relate to oneself and others and involve in the complex psychological modes of being.

Post-colonialism helps us to see connections among all the domains of our experiences in ways that show us just how inseparable these categories are in our lived experience of ourselves and our world. The psychological domain of colonizers shapes concept of colonialism; that is their desire to rule and to dominate. Because of their strong desire to show their superiority they further create the so-called hierarchy between them and other. That was (and is) not the social hierarchy on the ground level, rather, a so-called imaginary distinction between and among different peoples and social classes. Each and every social class, in one way or another is affected by this distinction. Therefore, along with this conception their motives, behavior and manners shaped and changed. That's why, seeing this connection between colonialism and psychology Lois Tyson writes, "perhaps nowhere is the intimate connection between ideology and psychology demonstrated more clearly than in postcolonial criticism" (402). This is, because postcolonial theory combats with the colonialist ideology by understanding the ways in which it operates the psychological identity (framework) of both the colonized and the colonizer.

Colonialism, mostly, exist within the individual psyche of people where it influences their (our) personal identity and their (our) perception towards others. It emotionally shapes the mind of culturally privileged group, who deliberately "Other" the culturally subordinate group and maintain control over them. The attempt of Europeans to prove non-Europeans as inferior and barbaric produces a kind of stereotype about them, which makes Europeans easy to have power and authority over

‘Other’. Westerners think and try to make believe that west is the source of life and knowledge. The core intention of Europeans is to make orient as "Other" and complicated place to rule and dominate them. And according to this same notion they form discourse. Thus, psychology helps to form discourse and according to this same notion colonialist psychology of the colonizers also help to form colonialist discourse. This discourse worked through the role model of Foucauldian power theory as well as the orientalism’s concept of Edward Said.

For Foucault power cannot be discussed outside its product, truth, and how this implies for the status of human subjects in contemporary societies. Foucault’s conception of “discourse is indispensable for an understanding of role model of ‘power’ in the production of knowledge – including self knowledge” (*A Foucault Primer* 57). Power shaped the mind of both colonizer and colonized, and they behave according to this readymade concept or belief. Power, for Foucault, is nothing more and nothing less than the multiplicity of force relations extant within the social body. Power’s condition of possibility actually “consists of this moving substance of force relations: the struggle, confrontations, contradictions, inequalities, transformations and integration of these force relations” (McHoul 63).

Thus, ‘we’ are ‘positioned’ within any struggle only as a consequence of the existence of struggle for the power. The discourse of power, which colonizers produces and deliver in any society, whitewashing the common peoples individual, personal psyche, shapes the mind of them, so badly that they fall within the grip of that colonial maze. Those hypertextualized, mythologized, magicalized and romanticized images create inconsistency in the psychology of common people that their personality gets splited. Slowly they start to follow the colonizer’s concept and

images because power plays dominant role there. By doing this, colonizers colonized upon the unconscious psyche of the colonized.

This psyche of colonized become the fertile ground for the colonizers to play upon. Not only the dominant motive of colonizers upon colonized and their so-called superiority over them, but also the inferior colonized psyche provides emotional support for colonizers. The position of colonizers become strong and safe day by day, and their colonial attitude become sharper; there emerges a particular psychological conception, which is hidden by the false notion of 'the universe'. But because of the presence of power those colonial attitudes are accepted by colonized without any question. Rather than resisting upon those discourses colonized ones try to copy it and a class of mimicry or mimic men is formed. The concept of mimicry itself is the psychological concept. So the colonial relation is maintained and guided by the colonial discourse, which licensed with power, dominate the individual psyche and, because of that, discourse becomes the sole force of colonialism.

On the other hand these psychological concepts of colonizers deliberately 'other' the people around. They, putting themselves on the center, place others in the margin in order to dominate and subjugate them. In this context, Tyson writes:

As might be expected, colonialist psychology consists of, among other things, those (often unconscious) attitudes and behaviors by which a culturally privileged group other a culturally subordinate group, that is, by which the culturally privileged distances themselves emotionally from populations over whom they want to gain or maintain control. There might be political and economic motives for othering, but the primary psychological motives seem to be the need to feel powerful, in

control, superior. Thus, colonialist psychology finds in the insecure individual fertile ground upon which to establish itself. (402-03)

This psychological domination of culturally privileged group is clearly seen in the concept of Said's Orientalism. Grounding upon the psychological concept or attitude the occidentals clearly other the oriental and this same concept reveals or manifests in orientalism. Orient and oriental are come to define their identities always in relation to what they are not, and therefore, what they are not must be demonized as 'others'. Occidentals deliberately produce 'the other' in order to create its identity and, then, consolidate colonial power over the 'other'. They become always conscious about their belongingness, which in turn bars them from promoting mutual bond with the 'other'. Unlike oriental, they believe 'we' are true human being; so, 'we' have the right to govern, to rule and even to possess 'them'. Their psychological attitude makes them believe that it is their human prerogative not only to manage the non-white but also to own it, to teach it and to make it civilize.

Orient was (and is) constructed in European thinking. Professional orientalists included scholars in various disciplines such as languages, history and philology was much more widespread and emetic in European thoughts. As well as a form of academic discourse, it was "(is) a style of thought bases on the ontological and epistemological distinction between the 'orient' and the 'occident'" (*Orientalism* 1). The orient is not an inert fact of nature, but a phenomenon constructed by generations of intellectuals, artists, commentators, writers, politicians, and, more importantly, constructed by the naturalizing of wide range of orientalist assumptions and stereotypes. Thus, orientalism is what oriental think, write and represent about the orient, but rather than factual data, it is an imaginary concept and construction of orientalists. It is their willful attempt to show non-westerners as an inferior and

'other'. Other is anyone who separates from oneself. The existence of others is crucial in defining what is 'normal' and in locating, one's own place in the world. The colonized subject is characterized as 'other' through discourses such as primitive and cannibalism, as a means of establishing the binary separation of the colonizer and colonized and asserting the naturalness and primacy of the colonizing culture.

Then the representation of the other occurs across a wide variety of literary and cultural texts, perhaps most commonly of all in jokes and comedy where some 'other' is necessarily exploited and stereotyped as the butt of humor. The degree to which this is tolerated or made tolerable through humor is a revealing sign of a culture's sense of boundaries between itself and perceived others. Further examples occur in crimes or gothic fictions as well as in scientific fictions where the other as murderer, monster or alien is a central agent in the narrative but has to be expelled to preserve psychic and social norms. "The merging of 'cannibal' and 'primitive' into a virtually synonymous relationship extended to the present day as the preeminent sign of power of 'othering' maintained by imperial discourse" (*Key Concepts* 30).

In the texts written by westerners, the idealized oriental civilization is depicted as the definitive primitivism of men-eating cannibals, and the demonization of the 'primitive' other in imperial discourse becomes increasingly common. The emergence of the word 'cannibal' was an especially powerful and distinctive feature of the rhetoric of empire. From the very long time cannibal became synonymous with the savage, the primitive, the 'other' of Europe, its use a signification of an abased state of being. We can see how Africa is used by the west to define and establish its own superiority as a 'civilized' culture against the 'darkness' of primitive Africans in Joseph Conrad's *The Heart of Darkness*. The native Africans are depicted as savage, barbaric and cruel when they attack the steamboat of Marlow, a representation

of white colonizer. Besides its anti colonial agenda, *The Heart of Darkness*, points out the colonized population as the standard of savagery to which Europeans are contrasted. This same notion is depicted in Rudyard Kipling's *Kim*, where Russians are shown as bad spices.

Thus, the concept of colonialism is a psychological one; and because of this colonial attitude and notion, the mind and manner of both colonized and colonizer is determined. Every walking step of both colonized and colonizer is determined by the psychological concept and know-how of colonialism.

The Empire Within

Though the long cherished and flourished British regime all over the world has been declined after the World War 2nd, the new form of imperialism has been developed and came into practice within the limited geographical boundary of England and America. Britishers' desire to create colony and to dominate and subjugate over other is manifesting in many forms and manners. Rather than the means of production, the westerners are controlling the means of representation by which they confirmed the hegemonic and imperial nature of theirs. Western Empires' "ideology of race and the civilizing mission of European cultural dominance" (*Key Concepts* 126) have been practicing after the fall of European colonialism.

Concept of race and ethnicity gave Europeans a fertile ground to quench the thirst of imperialism. These two concepts become the only means of othering and practicing colonialism within their own geographical location. White Europeans and Americans started to create myths and stereotypes about the minority groups of their own country as like to the non-westerners in colonial period. Racism does not only concerns with color and skin, rather a means to determine superiority and inferiority in the society. As for Tyson, "Racism...refers to the belief in racial superiority,

inferiority and purity based on the conviction that moral and intellectual characteristics” (391). Racism and ethnicity, in the western new imperialism refers to the unequal power relations that grow from sociopolitical domination of one race and ethnicity by another.

Ethnicity and racism are two successful forms of othering, where the peoples different than white Americans and Europeans are clearly marginalized and othered. A person’s ethnic group is such a powerful identifier because when he/ she choose to remain in it or when he/she born in it, it becomes a powerful identity that cannot be denied, rejected or taken away by others. It is a form of group identity, so whole social group is marginalized and 'Othered' as inferior, unfinished man and savage. Africans are taken as unfinished men, cannibal and barbaric in white European culture and society. The enslavement of Africans and their indoctrination in the colonialist ideology of white superiority was justified by officially defining Africans as only three-fifth human.

These ethnic groups, while representing in colonialist’s writing, are reduced just into a single physical feature that this same may seem their whole identity. These particular physical features are mentioned so frequently that the whole ethnic group’s identity reduced into that single physical feature. In addition, by doing this, they totally dehumanize them. In the recent time, Americans and Europeans take 'Muslims' as 'Terrorist' and this same is becoming their real identity in those countries. Muslims are synonymous to terrorist, which is a true stereotype of white colonizers. By saying this, they are reducing all Muslims populations and all those Muslim countries into a single identity of terrorist.

Racism, more than other thing becomes obvious to everyone and means of othering. No one can hide his/her real identity of color or race although they become

success to hide other identity. And because of this same reason color is becoming the first target of colonizers to marginalize and 'other' others. Therefore, race is particularly pertinent to the rise of colonialism, because the division of human society in this way is inextricable from the need of colonialist power to establish dominance over subject peoples and imperial enterprise. Racial thinking and colonialism are imbued with the same impetus to draw a binary distinction between 'civilized' and 'primitive' and the same necessity for the hierarchy of human type. In this connection Bill Ashcroft, Gareth Griffiths and Helen Tiffin write, "The Negro or black African category was usually relegated to the bottom, in part because of black Africans' color and allegedly 'primitive' culture, but primarily because they were best known to Europeans as slave" (199).

Those white Britishers and Americans are now concentrating to import a new empire, a new community of subject peoples of whom they think, and with whom they can deal in the same way their predecessors thought and dealt since last four centuries. After four hundred years of conquest, looting and marginalization over the minority groups in the name of race and ethnicity, those white westerners are creating a colony within their own country. As Tyson contemplates, colonialism can exist within the geopolitical boundary of a single country and this same notion is applying in these modern western white countries. The never sun setting British Empire of past is nowhere, nowadays, but the tendency of Britishers to create colony and dominate them is still in practice. Britishers and Americans are so intoxicated with the desire to create colony that they are fulfilling their desire by creating psychological colonialism in the name of race and ethnicity, which is their short-minded parochialism.

In the very heyday of European Colonialism, Europeans never considered Africans as human, rather they thought them as Salman Rushdie writes, “The fluttered folk and wild’, the ‘new-caught, sullen peoples, half-devil and half-child’” (130). Those peoples, who are somehow liberal considers Africans as inferior, so they do not match to stand along with them. They took Africans as their junior brothers as Albert Schweitzer write, “The African is indeed my brother, but my junior brother” (qtd. in Achebe 1191). This mark and leave a dark stain of inferiority of Africans, which has spread in every part of culture and daily life; and nothing, has been done to wash it out. And because of this the new form of colonialism developed and came into practice within the geopolitical boundary of a single country itself. British society, British thought and deed have never been left the contamination of imperialism. As Rushdie writes about British imperialism that, “it is still there, breeding lice and vermin, waiting for unscrupulous people to exploit it for their own ends” (131).

Britain, thus, becoming a new Empire within a limited geopolitical boundary discriminating the peoples by laws, policies and practices, they are practicing the colonial policy. In the place of white westerners of colonial period the white Britishers are there, the role of colonizing armies is carried out by the British police force itself and in the place of colonized country, the Asian immigrants and black Britishers are there; and England is becoming a true representation of colonial Empire. Under a single regime of British and American government there are “two entirely different worlds, and the one you inhabit is determined by the color of your skin” (Rushdie 134).

Racial discrimination, inside America and Britain, in this modern period, is becoming a main issue of discrimination and subjugation over the minority groups. Emerging as a powerful tool to establish a hierarchal division between Europeans and

others, 'Race' and 'Ethnicity', are becoming powerful issues of imperialism. Adjusting with the concept of marginality ethnic characters or representators are placed in the periphery and are becoming the matter of humor, misbehave and violence. As Rushdie writes, "In the streets of new empire, black women are abused, and black children are beaten upon their way home from school. In the rundown housing estates of the Empire, black families have their windows broken, they are afraid to go out after dark, and human and animal excrement arrive through their letter-boxes" (134).

White English and Americans believed that there is a hierarchy of race and 'they' by the hierarchy of race belong to the inferior position and 'we' to the superior. When inferior 'Africans' and 'Asians' misbehave or become rebellious, 'we' require to give sever punishment, not only as a punishment but also to improve their manner and behavior.

III. Colonialist Attitude in *The Great Gatsby*

Introduction

Despite its wide link in various fields of human dimension the psychological formation in *The Great Gatsby* is remarkable one. Though the title of the novel is taken from the main character Gatsby, whole story is guided and shaped by the viewpoint of narrator, Nick Carraway. Nick shapes the story, leads it forward and narrates it modifying it according to his own intention. Nick functions as the novel's moral center.

From the early age of his childhood a sort of superiority of race and belongingness was imprinted in his mind; and same sort of mentality of his was formed. During the course of his psychological development, this same notion becomes the main source of inspiration, and a basic point of development. So, throughout his life he becomes conscious about his belongingness, which in turns bars him from promoting the mutual bond with the characters representing other culture.

Nick begins the novel as well as the story of his life with the advice of his father given to him in the very young age of his life, which is guided by the very notion of superiority. His father's advice, here, is the advice of all white Europeans and Americans to their children; which begins in this way, "Whenever you feel like criticizing anyone...just remember that all the people in this world haven't had the advantages that you have had" (11). This very advice became the sole model of his life and behavior, and he never moves a single step against this. Rather Nick's inner fear whether he forget this advice is manifested clearly, when he says, "I am still a little afraid of missing something if I forget that" (11).

Nick not only mentions about his rich and well to do family of the descend of "the Duck of Bucckuch" (12), but also the background of well educated family, "I

graduated from New Haven in 1915, just a quarter of a century after my father" (12), which is contrasted with almost all the other characters' family status. He judges Gatsby, even, relating him with his poor family background. Nick's attempt to undermine Gatsby is clearly seen in the line, "His parents were shiftless and unsuccessful farm people" (94), where he places Gatsby in the inferior position. The dominant or colonialist psychology, in *The Great Gatsby* is pervasively present in the narration as a whole because that psychology is the center to the characterization of the narrator, Nick Carraway. Therefore, Nick performs a crucial role in conveying a sense of something mysterious and inexplicable about all the other characters and to show the sense of superiority over them.

From the early and premature age of his life Nick had a spicy nature and he "was privy to the secret griefs of wild and unknown men" (11) when he was student of the University of Yale. He is still following this same nature. He arranges the meeting of Gatsby and Daisy, and watches them while they two meet at his cottage during the period of Gatsby's party. He even secretly observes the conditions and activities of Tom and Daisy in the evening of Myrtle's death, and helps Gatsby to find out the actual condition of them. Nick narrates this as, "I walked back along the border of the lawn, traversed the gravel softly and tiptoed up the veranda step" (134).

Therefore, every step of Nick is guided by the colonialist psychology and in the novel colonialism exists within the individual psyche of the narrator, Nick. This same colonialist psychology of Nick shapes his concepts and influences our personal identity and perception towards other. In the presence of and the narration of Nick, there exists colonialist psychology, which shapes, negates and marginalizes other characters. Nick, here is the prototype of American and European culture as well as the mentality. The novel reveals the colonialist ideology hiding at the heart of

American culture by revealing the colonialist psychology that lurks at the core of American cultural identity.

Colonialist Representations

The way of presentation of Nick strikes many readers of the book, as indeed he wants to strike them, as a very tolerant and moderate person. His choices of words are certainly effective as colorful description but they are deeply rooted into his inner motive of domination. On the verge of his description, Nick continually makes judgments about others with no apparent consciousness of doing so. While talking about other minor characters Nick mentions about their ethnicity, physical quality and tries to reduce them into a single physical feature. Whenever Nick has cause to mention people from different culture, he emphasized their ethnicity as if they were their primary or only feature and thus foregrounds their alien quality.

A main role of power and domination over other ethnic characters is clearly seen in the depiction of Meyer Wolfshiem, a Jewish. From the very beginning of the novel and from the introductory note of Wolfshiem, Nick is giving emphasis on his nose and trying to reduce his whole introduction into a single feature. Time and again Nick mentions about his nose while he has to refer Wolfshiem. When Gatsby introduced Wolfshiem to Nick, he frequently mentions his nose as if he only saw it. He introduced him to us as “A small flat-nosed Jew” (68). We are told very little else about his appearance except his nose. Even in every manner and behavior of Wolfshiem, Nick saw the gesture of his nose. In the introductory paragraph, Nick refers that, “A small flat-nosed Jew raised his large head and regarded me with two fine growths of hair which luxuriated in either nostril. After a moment I discovered his tiny eyes in the half darkness” (68).

When Nick found Wolfshiem is interested in something, he reports it as, “His nostrils turned to me in an interested way” (69). Wolfshiem’s emotional move is described by Nick in a peculiar way, “As he shook hands and turned away his tragic nose was trembling” (71) and “The hair in his nostrils quivered slightly and as he shook his head his eyes filled with tears” (157). In Nick’s opinion, the expressiveness of Wolfshiem resides in his nose and Nick presents his nose frequently but in a bitter and ugly way. He does so because he finds Wolfshiem’s nose the most unattractive and associates this unattractive nose strongly with his ethnicity. The most bitter reference of Nick’s use of Wolfshiem’s nose is expressed in the line, “...and covered Gatsby with his expressive nose” (68). This is all because Nick has a superior mentality from the early childhood and this same superior mentality shapes and guides all of his behavior. While Nike’s choice of words is certainly effective as colorful deception, it’s relentless focus on the ethnicity of characters outside the dominant culture of Jazz-America hints at a disquieting dimension of his attitude toward “foreigners,” a dimension that becomes clear when he speaks of Meyer Wolfshiem

At other times when Nick does not mention about Wolfshiem’s nose, he mentions other physical features and qualities, in order to dehumanize him. The representations like a person having, “a bulbous finger” (157), “tiny eyes” (68) and “cuff buttons” (71) are made to other him. Wolfshime is introduced to us as a gambler and the way of conversation between Nick and Gatsby is a remarkable one, which begins as:

““who is he anyhow-an actor?”

“No”

“A dentist ?”

“Meyer Wolfshiem? No, he’s a gambler” (71).

By doing this, Nick is presenting Wolfshiem as a bad character and demonizing him. Nick foregrounds Wolfshiem’s Jewishness to such a degree that even Wolfshiem’s criminal status becomes associated with his ethnicity. Nick further uses incorrect languages and spellings to refer Wolfshiem’s speech. Indenting as a language spoken by Wolfshiem, Nick deliberately makes mistake and says Gatsby as an 'Oggsford man'. Here, Nick is trying to show the lower and half knowledge of ethnic characters like Wolfshiem.

Nick’s othering of ethnic characters is also clearly seen in the depiction of his own cook, a Finnish woman, he has hired to prepare his meal and to take care of his house. He not only negates her presence and give emphasis to her ethnicity but also shows possession over her. Saying, “I had forgotten to tell my Finn to come back...” (81), he shows his full authority over her. On the other period when he has to mention about her, he refers her geographical locality. Even her knowledge and wisdom are also no use for him and they are only suitable to murmur over the electric stove. He says, “A Finnish wisdom who made my bed and cooked breakfast and muttered Finish wisdom to her over the electric stove” (13). This is described in a way that foregrounds her ethnic differences. Nick assigns not only a low type of job to the ethnic characters but also demonizes them as he morally devalues her saying’ “demoniac Finn” (84).

The other way of othering ethnic characters, in Nick’s description is found from the viewpoint of racism. Racism, here, refers to the unequal power relations that grow from the sociopolitical domination of one race by another and that results in a systematic discriminatory practice. The systematic practices of racism can occur on a regular basis in Nick’s deception. When Nick and Gatsby were driving towards New

York City, they saw three black peoples sitting on a limousine driving by a white chauffeur. Nick narrates this incident as, "...a limousine passed us, driven by a white chauffeur, in which sat three modish Negroes" and further describes them as "two bucks and a girl" (68). Niger and bucks are the words referring to the black Africans and taken as a slang and offensive words. Bucks are animal in nature rather than the human being. He further says, "I laughed aloud as the yolks of their balls rolled us in a haughty rivalry" (68). By the description of their wide-stretched rolling eyes, he resonates strongly with racist stereotypes that portray African Americans as foolish, stupid, childish, overly dramatic and comic characters.

This is, however, an important exception of Nick's othering of ethnic characters, "the young Greek Michaelis, who ran the coffee joint" (126) next to George Wilson's garage, is a well- developed, sympathetic character who is not reduced to his ethnicity. Michaelis takes interest in Wilson's concern. He spends a whole night sitting up with George, trying to help and comfort him, after Myrtle was killed. He cooks breakfast himself, George, and "one of the watchers of the night before" (147) - who returns the next morning to help. And the text gives Michaelis a good deal of authority by making him "the principal witness at the inquest" (126) concerning Myrtle's death. This exception makes sense, however, when we recall that white Americans consider Greece the cradle of their white western civilization. It can hardly be coincidental that, in a novel filled with one-dimensional, dehumanized ethnic characters, the single character given fully human status is associated with Greece, an important and foremost source of white civilization's superior image itself.

Nick is conscious about his white belongingness and favors his ethnic colors as, "our white girlhood was passed together there, our beautiful white-" (26). This is his deliberate attempt to show white superiority. In the description of Nick, whites

are presented as having full enthusiasm and vigor whereas blacks are both physically and mentally weak and fragile. The black one who came in the place of accident after Myrtle's death is described as "A pale...Negro" (130), which contrast with his "Our beautiful white" (20).

Nick: A Colonizer

Nick not only marginalizes and negates other characters representing other cultures but also promotes his status in his description. He puts himself in the center of all the characters in the novel. Each and every character whether major or minor they may be, give him equal value and respect. He achieves information of all the characters and almost all the main characters confides in Nick. Tom describes about his relation with Myrtle, his beloved and arranges their meeting. Daisy tells him about her marital troubles with Tom and opens her heart to Nick saying "I'll tell you a family secret" (22). Gatsby tells him the truth about his past life and his former relationship with Daisy. Gatsby opens his heart in front of Nick and informs him about his whole family background and wants to improve Nick's conceptions toward him. Gatsby himself begins, "well, I am going to tell you something about my life" and further adds, "I don't want you to get a wrong idea of me from all the stories you hear" (64).

While opening her heart in front of Nick, even Myrtle tells to him her excitement while meeting Tom and having an extramarital affair for the first time. More than this, she exposes her marital problems and her regret to marry with a person of low character like Wilson. Releasing the bundle of grief in front of Nick Myrtle said, "He was not fit to lick my shoes" and further says, "The only crazy I was when I married him. I knew right away I made a mistake" (39). Nick is only a person in the novel who takes genuine personal interest in other characters' happiness and

sorrows, who function as the novel's moral center. He expresses strong ethical reservations about their obvious selfishness. He is extremely tolerant of the personal choices they make in their private lives.

As if the colonizers' concept about colonized Nick also assumes that, he knows each and every thing about other characters in the novel. While describing about Jordan Baker he writes, "I had heard some story of her too, a critical, unpleasant story" (26), but never reveals what that story was? Rather than the fact of his saying, it is all because he wanted to dominate her and for this, he is creating his own discourse.

Though Nick refers each and everything about other characters, he never reveals his inner fact and secret with others. This is his deliberate and intentional attempt to be mysterious and unknown in the eyes of others. This made him easy to create his image upon them and to prove his greatness. He and his behaviors are not easily accessible to the other characters of the novel itself. This very remark of Nick is clearly seen in the following conversation between Tom Buchanan and Nick himself:

"What you doing, Nick?"

"I am a bond man."

"who with?"

I told him.

"Never heard of them," he remarked decisively. (19)

Here Nick only mentions that he was a bondman but does not give further clue of that. Throughout the length and breadth of the novel, the same conception of Nick carouses the crucial role in the depiction of, revealing of and declaring of the story and role of other characters. Therefore, Nick never descends from the pinnacle in the novel.

Nick places himself into the warm center of the novel and every character of the novel give worth and importance to him. All the characters of the novel trust him, disclose their inner gay, and grieve in front of him. Nick introduces himself as “a path finder” (13), a person discovering or detecting roots and guiding others. The life and the future of travelers’ confines in the hand of guide, so pathfinder is their destiny, their god and their savior, who save them, secure them and lead them ahead. Nick himself grants him all these qualities and enjoys the privileges.

Western white colonizers create the discourse of colonized, dominate and exploit the natives, make them indulge in various fields and take the profit from it. The colonizers become invisible in the eyes of colonized, who not only takes the fruit of colonized labor and skill but also takes credit for those fruits as well. It should be no surprise, than that the novel gives the credit of Jazz, symbolically to whites. Though, Fitzgerald himself is a person who coined the word ‘Jazz’, but in the period of high African Jazz age, he doesn’t bring Black Africans in the context of Jazz music. The only musicians, who play Jazz in the grand party of Gatsby, are white musicians. Nick describes and narrates the grand style and immense presence of those musicians. They came there with, “whole pit full of oboes and trombones and saxophones and viols and cornets of full and piccolos and low and high drums” (43-44). The description of party is also enormous and he further writes, the bar is in full swing and floating rounds of cocktails permeate the garden outside until the air is alive with chatter and laughter. These activities and enthusiasm of American life belong to the high culture of white Americans, not blacks. Therefore, the credit of Jazz music also has been given into the hands of white Americans and Jazz has been raised into the status of high white culture.

Nick is the narrator loved by almost all the characters of the novel. Whether or not they care him, he becomes able to make us believe that there is strong sense of love and respect to him. He even presents the minor incidents of his life giving high value and worth in the text to obtain honor and admiration. He “was one of the few guests who had actually been invited” (44) in the grand party of Gatsby but he says, “I had actually been invited” (45) whereas most of the other “people weren’t invited – they (simply) went there” (44). Nick and his position in that society were different than others. Nick describes the scene of Gatsby’s party in such a way that gives glimpse of his own party. Most of the people in the party are unknown about ‘who Gatsby is?’ but they give attention of each and every behavior of Nick. No one think it is his /her duty to meet him, expresses his /her gratitude and thank for his party as well as for his invitation to him/her. Time and again Nick mentions this and said, “...no one swooned backwards on Gatsby and no French bob touched Gatsby’s shoulder and no singing quarters were formed with Gatsby’s head for one link” (53).

This is not only the attitude of Nick towards Gatsby but of all colonizers strong viewpoint towards other. Nick deliberately 'others' Gatsby because Gatsby lacks the proper bloodline, class origin, upbringing, and education for Daisy’s set. He has newly become rich and has poor family background and a past full of criminal behavior and bloodshed. There are many rumors in the market and his subtle social codes and gradation of social status are unfamiliar to him. Being a member of cultural elite, Nick is very aware of the importance of gradations in social rank. Though he has no large sum of family inheritance and property, he has family relation with enormously wealthy family of Tom and Daisy. Therefore, he is oblivious to the important social distinction between the upper-crust East Eggers and those who live at “the less fashionable” (14) West Egg, where he resides.

Mimicry and the Hybrid Identities

How much wealthy Gatsby may be, for Nick, he lacks the proper blood lineage and class origin as his and Daisy who are the members of elite family background and well educated. Although Gatsby's enormous wealth and white color put him among the cultural elite, he is far more common with the colonial subject. Nick presents Gatsby as a hybrid and mimic character of the novel. He is hybrid because his personality is dominated by an endless struggle to rid himself from his family root and his own identity as a poor boy from a family of "shiftless and unsuccessful farm people" (94) in rural Minnesota. Gatsby has lied and faked about his life with Daisy both during their former meeting as well as after their reunion.

Gatsby tried to copy language, speech, lifestyle and dress of a culturally privileged group. He invented an upper class family and fabricated a past that includes an Oxford educated background. Adopting many upper-class speech and manner as "old sport" to everyone, he has tried to manifest his superiority. He has created a new and more fashionable atmosphere around himself and purchased an enormous mansion and other expensive possessions in large number only to show others. His grand party on a regular basis, his trying to be Jay Gatsby from Jimmy Gatz and his self remarks of eliminations of or eradication of all family members as well as his own snob of a child of wealthy and well to do family background, all are his attempt to copy the code and manner of superior class; and all these attempts became futile, and he became unable to win the favor of Daisy. Mimicry is a laborious attempt to be accepted by a culture different from the one into which one was born but along with this, it is a simultaneous attempt to rid of everything one has identified as other than that culture.

Gatsby has the strong fear of unhomeliness that leads him towards the mimicry. Though he was rich and had all physical properties he has strong psychological desire to secure his place among the superior cultural elite, which he lacks. For the upper class' people like Tom his grand party only becomes a collection of animals and wealth is the product of illegal work. Tom, having the privileges of cultural elite easily blames Gatsby as "just big bootlegger(s)" (102) and the peoples who come there in the party of Gatsby are "menagerie" (102) for him. Throughout the life, Gatsby's attempt was just to secure his place in the surrounding of cultural privileged groups but this all became futile rather it became too costly and expensive for him and he became compelled to lose his life. As the understanding of Ralph Singh of V.S. Naipul's *The Mimic Men* since the colonized can never become colonizer, Gatsby also became unable to be a member of high cultural elite.

The psychological colonialism, in *The Great Gatsby*, is also manifested in the viewpoint of Tom Buchanan, a most culturally privileged character of the novel. He has all sorts of cultural advantages provided by race, ethnicity, education, socio-economic class, family status and others. Tom enthusiastically believes in white supremacy, so has an ideology which 'Others' non-whites and poor people in order to subordinate them. He links his and Nick's family with high Nordic race, who "produced all the things that go to make civilization" (21). For Tom, his so-called high Nordic Race is the product of all things that the modern society needs and consider as "Civilization". Tom strongly believes that the function of white race is to have control over others. Paraphrasing the racist book of Goddard *The Rise of the Cultural Empires*, Tom even suggests Nick that is "a fine book and everybody ought to read it" (21). His core intention is revealed immediately that if they do not look such books and practices according to them their white superior race will be utterly

submerged. Tom clearly suggests Nick that, "It's up to us who are the dominant race to watch out or these other races will have control of things" (21).

When Tom becomes aware that Gatsby was a West Eggers and not a member of his own family set, he continuously negates him and others him. At one time when Tom along with his friends came into the house of Gatsby to drink, Tom and his friends treat him disdainfully. Sloane, doesn't speak a single word with Gatsby rather "lounge back haughtily in his chair" (108-9), and when his lady friend invites Gatsby to join them for dinner, Sloane immediately bring her outside and they three departed from there. Tom remarks, "My God, I believe the man's coming" (109) to Gatsby when Gatsby was planning to go there regarding the invitation of Mr. Sloane's wife. They all parted from there leaving Gatsby standing on his own lawn.

Tom's colonialist attitude can also be seen in his selection of women for seduction. He chooses women different from his own cultural and social status. Tom develops the relationship to those women who are in lower social relations, economically, racially and ethnically than his and who can't raise voices against his brutality. Using them according to his own intention, need and desire Tom proved their powerlessness in the society. In a minor debate like whether she can utter Daisy's name or not, Tom breaks away the nose of Myrtle, his beloved or girlfriend. This shows that Tom sees working class women as "bad girls," as sexual objects and nothing more, who are in a separate category altogether from "good girls" like his wife and Jordan. All the women, with whom Tom developed his relations, are pretty but from lower cultural and social milieu than his own. His beloved Myrtle Wilson as well as the Chambermaids in the Santa Barbara Hotel all are from lower social position than his. Though Tom enjoys and pass life with them he never gave them

any chance to come into his social status and never place them in the position of Daisy.

Therefore, *The Great Gatsby* reveals the ways in which colonialist psychology, upon which colonialist ideology depends, operates in the home front to sustain the imbalances of cultural power that have characterized America since its inception. Colonialist ideology in *The Great Gatsby* strongly influences the ways Nick perceives himself and others. In this postcolonial period, when the physical and geographical colonialism is impossible, it is taking other many forms and manners are existing in the once colonizers. And modern America is enjoying this cultural and psychological colonialism as Nick Carraway and Tom Buchanan of *The Great Gatsby* by creating the hierarchy within its own geopolitical boundaries.

IV. Conclusion

While writing novel in the context of the then society and social issues Fitzgerald created a mysterious and powerful narrator in *The Great Gatsby*. The narrator, Nick Carraway functions as the moral and central character of the novel, around whom all the story and plot is circled. From the very beginning of his childhood, Nick was guided and shaped by the very concept of his own superiority and he was conscious and aware of his white belongingness. So, when he has to mention other persons and characters different than his own culture and even other than his own family surrounding he mentions and behaves them differently. The colonialist attitude in *The Great Gatsby* exists in the attitude of Nick's individual psyche.

Though almost all the ideologies are psychological one and psychology becomes the main source of its inspiration, in colonialist ideology there lays heavy domination of personal psyche. Class, race, ethnicity etc help person to define self and make them separate from others. The domination strain, however, is considerably marred by the Nick's colonial eye. Since Fitzgerald fails to curb this colonialist instinct, colonialist attitude on the reception of Nick's psychology is interspersed throughout the narrative. When people are judged according to their color, race and other issues it takes a permanent form of domination and subjugation over others. It influences the personal identity and the perception towards others. By emotionally guiding the mind of culturally privileged group and people, it helps to maintain control over culturally subordinate groups. In the course of time, this same takes the form of discourse, a continuous way to define and dominate other.

Culture along with race and class is a means of wholesale domination where it by whitewashing psyches of lower cultural group shapes the mind of them and

compels them to fall into the grip of colonial maze. In the novel *The Great Gatsby*, everywhere we can feel the role of power, domination and subjugation as well as the role of colonialist psychology. Though colonialist psychology is felt time and again throughout the narrative but in the description of Nick to the ethnic characters it becomes more obvious. Nick is conscious and well aware about his class, race and family relations, and according to these things, he himself places him and his family in a superior position. Nick is such a moral and model character of the novel that around whom all the other characters move. All of them expose their own inner psyche, happenings, past and present. He is only a character who takes genuine interest in other individuals concern and happenings.

Nick is not only loved by almost all the characters of the novel but also has a 'secret gift' to judge and observe others. Nick himself says that he was the privy of the secret griefs of wild and unknown men and this same attitude and behavior remains through out his life. This type of attitude of Nick is found when he observes the behavior of Daisy and Tom in the night of Myrtle's death. This type of behavior not only influences his psychological attitude but also makes him mysterious and inexplicable.

In the process of describing Wolfshiem, Myrtle Wilson and other black characters, Nick only focus their single physical features and reduce them into a single physical feature. By doing this, he not only dominates them but also dehumanizes them. The physical features of these ethnic characters are compared and contrasted with the body of animals. Physical feature like 'large head' 'tiny eyes', 'bulbous fingers', 'cuff buttock', and the descriptions like 'a small flat nosed Jew', 'three modish Negroes, two bucks and a girl' are some remarkable points of Nick's psychological domination over ethnic characters.

Nick carries the similar view towards other characters also. While defining main characters like Gatsby, Tom and Jordan he forwards his family relation, descendents and culture. For Nick, Gatsby is not equal with his social status. Gatsby is a son of unsuccessful and poor farmer, who neither have secure and strong past nor is well educated from famous Yale University like Nick. Nick links himself with socially established family of Daisy Buchanan. For Nick, Gatsby is a hybrid one who blends two different cultures of high social status and lowers one. That's why Gatsby can't be reach in the position of Nick. Gatsby, the hero of the novel is in the control of narrator Nick, and becomes the victim of his domination. Rather than what Gatsby does, the novel is guided by what Nick thinks and does.

On the other hand, colonialist attitude of Tom Buchanan is also a crucial one. He uses various women of inferior social status to fulfill his sexual need. On the one hand, all of these characters are from lower social rank; on the other, they never get any care and protection from him. Rather they all become the victim of his selfish and colonial desire.

The novel erases the role of Afro-African in the invention of famous Jazz music of the time. By representing white musicians to play Jazz music and describing those musicians in vivid and elaborate style while coming on the stage the novel symbolically grants the credit of the inventions of Jazz music to the white. The description of stage, musical instruments and other process is described in such a way that the blacks cannot afford that. So every manner and attitude of Nick Carraway, projects the supremacy of colonialist psychology. To sum up, I would like to repeat Lois Tyson that, Fitzgerald's famous novel about the American Jazz Age is the quintessential text about othering, a psychological operation upon which colonialist ideology depends and that is its unmistakable hallmark.

Works Cited

- Abrams, M.H. *A Glossary of Literary Terms*. Singapore: Harcourt, 2000.
- Achebe, Chinua. "Colonialist Criticism." *Critical Theory Since Plato*. Ed. Hazard Adams. New York: Harcourt, 1992. 1191-1198
- Aithkenhead, Decca. "The Great Gatsby." *New Statesman* (1996) 126.
n4363(Dec,1997): 54(2). British Council Journal Database. Thomas Gale-Nepal. 13 March 2006. Thomson Gale Document Number: A20354751.
<<http://find.galegroup.com/ips/infomark.do?&contentSe=IAC-Documents&type=retrieve&tabID=T002&prodId=IPS&docId=A18164128&source=gale&userGroupName=brinep&version=1.0>>.
- Ashcroft, Bill, Gareth Griffiths, and Helen Tiffin. *Key Concepts in Post Colonial Studies*. London and New York: Routledge, 1997
- ... *The Empire Writes Back: Theory and Practice in Post Colonial Literature*. London: Routledge, 1989.
- Bhabha, Homi K. "Of Mimicry and Men: The Ambivalence of Colonial Studies". *The Location of Culture*. London: Routledge, 1994.
- Charters, Ann. *The Stories and its Writer: An Introduction to Short Fiction*. Boston: Bedford Books, 1995.
- Fitzgerald, F. Scott. *The Great Gatsby*. Ed. Ken Bush. London: Cambridge University Press, 1995.
- Foucault, Michel. *Language, Counter-memory, Practice: Selected Essays and Interviews*. Ed. Donald F. Bouchard. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1978.
- ... *History of Sexuality*. Vol.1. New York: Vintage, 1994.
- *Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and other Writings 1972-1977*. Trans. Colin Gordon. Brighton: Harvester, 1980.

- Gandhi, Leela. *Postcolonial Theory: A critical Introduction*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1998.
- High, Peter B. *An Outline of American Literature*. London and New York: Longman, 1989.
- McHoul, Alec and Wendy Grace. *A Foucauldian Primer: Discourse, Power and the Subject*. New York: New York University Press, 1997.
- Mongia, Padmani. *Contemporary Postcolonial Theory: A Reader*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1997.
- Naipaul, V.S. *The Mimic Men*. London: Macmillan, 2002.
- Ruland, Richard and Malcolm Bradbury. *From Puritanism to the Postmodernism*. New York: Penguin, 1991.
- Rushdie, Salman. *Imaginary Homelands*. London: Granta Books, 1992.
- Said, Edward W. *Orientalism*. New York: Vintage, 1994.
- *The World, The Text and The Critic*. Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1983.
- ... "Crisis of Orientalism." *Modern Criticism and Theory: A Reader*. Ed. David Lodge. London: Longman, 1991.
- Seed, David. "The Great Gatsby." *The Review of English Studies* 47.n185 (Feb 1996):115(3). The British Council Journals Database. Thomson Gale. British Council- Nepal. 13 March 2006 Thomson Gale Document Number:A18164128.
- <<http://find.galegroup.com/ips/infomark.do?&contentSe=IAC-Documents&type=retrieve&tabID=T002&prodId=IPS&docId=A18164128&source=gale&userGroupName=brinep&version=1.0>>.

Selden, Raman and Peter Widdowson. *A Readers Guide to Contemporary Literary Theory*. New York: Harvester Wheatsheaf, 1993.

Stephen, Nancy. "Race is Everything: The Growth of Racial Determinism 1830-50". *The Idea of Race in Science: Great Britain: 1800:1960*. London: Archon Books, 1982. 20-46.

Tyson, Lois. *Critical Theory Today*. New York and London: Garland Publishing, Inc, 1999.