



MIMICRY IN GEORGE ORWELL'S *ANIMAL FARM* AND CHINUA ACHEBE'S *THINGS FALL APART*: A POSTCOLONIAL READING

2021

MASTER THESIS

Department of English Language and Literature

Abdulqader YASEEN

Supervisor

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Harith TURKI

**MIMICRY IN GEORGE ORWELL'S *ANIMAL FARM* AND CHINUA
ACHEBE'S *THINGS FALL APART*: A POSTCOLONIAL READING**



Abdulqader YASEEN

T.C

Karabuk University

Institute of Graduate Programs

Department of English Language and Literature

Prepared as

Master Thesis

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Harith TURKI

KARABUK

June 2021

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS	1
THESIS APPROVAL PAGE.....	2
DECLARATION	3
ACKNOWLEDGMENT	4
ABSTRACT.....	5
ÖZET	6
ARCHIVE RECORD INFORMATION	7
ARŞİV KAYIT BİLGİLERİ	8
ABBREVIATIONS.....	9
SUBJECT OF THE RESEARCH	10
PURPOSE AND IMPORTANCE OF THE STUDY.....	10
METHOD OF THE RESEARCH.....	10
HYPOTHESIS OF THE RESEARCH	10
SCOPE AND LIMITATIONS / DIFFICULTIES	10
CHAPTER ONE: THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK	11
POST-COLONIALISM	11
1.1. Postcolonialism.....	11
1.2 Ambivalence and Mimicry	30
CHAPTER TWO: MIMICRY IN ORWELL'S <i>ANIMAL FARM</i> :.....	34
A POSTCOLONIAL READING	34
CHAPTER THREE: <i>THINGS FALL A PART</i>	59
CONCLUSION	77
REFERENCES.....	81
RESUME	Hata! Yer işareti tanımlanmamış.

THESIS APPROVAL PAGE

I certify that, in my opinion, the thesis submitted by Abdulqader Yaseen titled “MIMICRY IN GEORGE ORWELL’S ANIMAL FARM AND CHINUA ACHEBE’S THINGS FALL APART: A POSTCOLONIAL READING ” is fully adequate in scope and in quality as a thesis for the degree of Master of Arts.

Assoc.Prof.Dr. Harith TURKI

Thesis Advisor, Department of English Language and Literature

This thesis is accepted by the examining committee with a unanimous vote in the Department of English Language and Literature as a Master’s thesis. June 18, 2021

Examining Committee Members (Institutions)

Signature

Chairman: Assoc. Prof. Dr Harith TURKI (KBU)

Member: Assoc. Prof. Dr Tavghah Ghulam SAEED (KBU)

Member : Dr. Öğr. Üyesi Derya BİDERLİ DİNÇ (IAU)

The degree of Master of Arts by the thesis submitted is approved by the Administrative Board of the Institute of Graduate Programs, Karabuk University.

Prof. Dr Hasan SOLMAZ

Director of the Institute of Graduate Programs

DECLARATION

I hereby declare that this thesis is the result of my own work, and all information included has been obtained and expounded in accordance with the academic rules and ethical policy specified by the institute. Besides, I declare that all the statements, results, materials not original to this thesis have been cited and referenced literally.

Without being bound by a particular time, I accept all moral and legal consequences of any detection contrary to the aforementioned statement.



Name Surname: Abdulqader Yaseen

Signature :

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

I would like to take this opportunity to first and foremost thank god for being my and guide in the writing of this thesis. Without him, I would not have the wisdom or the physical ability to do so.

I would like to express my sincere appreciation to my thesis supervisor Assoc.Prof.Dr. Harith Ismail Turki for his constant guidance and encouragement, without which this work would not have been possible. For his unwavering support, I am truly grateful.

I also would love to thank all the academic staff, in particular, those who taught me at the Faculty of Arts of Karabuk, especially Dr Muayad, who imbued us with the love of research. Thanks are also extended to the Head of English Department, Prof. Dr Abdul Serdar and Prof. Nazila, who taught me during the Drama course for their support and encouragement.

I thank my parents for always being supportive of my education. I also take this opportunity to acknowledge everyone in my family.

My final thanks to all my friends who encouraged and supported me.

Last but not least, I would love to thank someone who is in my heart for her constant encouragement for me.

ABSTRACT

The word "mimicry" is a metonym for "presence." Mimicry occurs as inhabitants of a colonized population emulate and adopt the colonizers' ideology. Camouflage is the effect of mimicry. It is not a matter of blending in with the context but of standing out to a mottled background. Colonial mimicry is motivated by the colonist's need for a transformed, easily recognizable Other, as a subject of a distinction that is almost identical but not exactly. Thus, imitation is indicative of a dual articulation, a technique that appropriates the Other when visualizing force.

Additionally, mimicry is a symptom of the inappropriate discrepancy or reluctance that reinforces imperial power's overriding strategic role, increases monitoring, and presents an immediate challenge to all 'normalized' intelligence and punitive powers.

The current thesis represents an attempt to highlight mimicry in Orwell's *Animal Farm* and Achebe's *Things Fall a Part*. The study is divided into three chapters; in the first chapter, the research highlights the term of mimicry within the framework of postcolonialism. Chapters two and three are dedicated to exploring how Orwell and Achebe depict mimicry in their aforementioned novels.

Keywords: Mimicry, colonial, postcolonialism, colonialist.

ÖZET

Taklitçilik kelimesi "mimicry" mevcudiyet "presence" anlamına gelmektedir. Taklit, sömürgeleştirilmiş bir nüfusun sakinleri sömürgecilerin ideolojisini taklit edip benimsedikçe ortaya çıkmaktadır. Kamufraj, taklitçiliğin etkisidir. Bu, bağlamla harmanlama meselesi değil, önemli olan benekli bir arka plana dikkat çekmektir. Sömürgeci taklitçilik, sömürgecinin dönüştürülmüş, kolayca tanınabilir bir Öteki'ye neredeyse özdeş ama tam olarak değil bir ayrımın konusu olarak motive edilir. Böylece taklitçilik, ikili eklemelenmenin göstergesidir, göçü tasvir ederken değerlere el koyan bir yöntemdir.

Üstelik taklitçilik, sömürgeci gücün öncelikli stratejik rolünü güçlendiren, izlemeyi artıran ve tüm (normalleştirilmiş) istihbarat ve cezalandırıcı güçlere acil bir meydan okuma sunan uygunsuzluk, tutarsızlık veya isteksizliğin bir belirtisidir.

Bu çalışmada Orwell' in *Animal Farm* ve Achebe' in *Things Fall Apart*'taki taklitçiliğe odaklanmıştır. Çalışma üç ana bölümden oluşmaktadır. Birini bölümde sömürgecilik sonrası çerçevesinde taklit terimi üzerinde durulmuştur. İkinci bölümde ve üçüncü bölümde ise Orwell ve Achebe'nin yukarıda yer alan romanlarında taklitçiliği nasıl tasvir ettikleri ele alınmıştır.

Anahtar Kelimeleri: Taklitçilik, Sömürge, Sömürgecilik Sonrası, Sömürgeci.

ARCHIVE RECORD INFORMATION

Title of the Thesis	Mimicry in George Orwell's <i>Animal Farm</i> and Chinua Achebe's <i>Things Fall Apart</i>: A Postcolonial Reading
Author of the Thesis	Abdulqader YASEEN
Supervisor of the Thesis	Assoc. Pro. Dr Harith TURKI
Status of the Thesis	Master's Degree
Date of the Thesis	2021
Field of the Thesis	English Literature
Place of the Thesis	KBU – LEE
Total Page Number	84
Keywords	Mimicry, colonial, postcolonialism, colonialist.

ARŞİV KAYIT BİLGİLERİ

Tezin Adı	George Orwell'in <i>Hayvan Çiftliği</i> adlı ve Chinua Achebe'nin <i>Parçalanma</i> adlı eserindeki Taklitçilik: Poskolonyal Bir İnceleme
Tezin Yazarı	Abdulqader YASEEN
Tezin Danışmanı	Doç. Dr. Harith TURKI
Tezin Derecesi	Yüksek Lisans
Tezin Tarihi	2021
Tezin Alanı	İngiliz Edebiyatı
Tezin Yeri	KBÜ – LEE
Tezin Sayfa Sayısı	84
Anahtar Kelimeler	Taklitçilik, Sömürge, Sömürgecilik Sonrası, Sömürgeci.

ABBREVIATIONS

Etc. : Ve benzeri gibi

ed. : Baskı

Ed. by : Editör

p./pp. : Sayfa/sayfalar

Vol. : Sayı

Vs. : Karşı

SUBJECT OF THE RESEARCH

This thesis aims at tracing Mimicry in Orwell's *Animal Farm*, and Chinua Achebe's *Things Fall Apart*.

PURPOSE AND IMPORTANCE OF THE STUDY

The purpose of this study is to investigate mimicry in the aforementioned novels. This thesis also reveals how mimicry affects the life of the characters in the two novels. The importance of this study is that it is the first study to combine these two novels in one research.

METHOD OF THE RESEARCH

The term Mimicry refers to those individuals in the colonized land after colonization who are influenced by the colonizer's lifestyle. This study endeavours to apply this term to Achebe's *Things Fall Apart* and Orwell's *Animal Farm*.

HYPOTHESIS OF THE RESEARCH

Orwell and Achebe's novels are very different novels that come from different cultures and different places. Also, the two novels employ different kinds of characters.

SCOPE AND LIMITATIONS / DIFFICULTIES

The limitation of the study is that it focuses only on the term of Mimicry among other terms of postcolonialism and among the different terms that Bhabha referred to.

CHAPTER ONE: THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

POST-COLONIALISM

1.1. Postcolonialism

At the beginning of the twentieth century, Great Britain covered immense parts of the world that involved parts of Australia, Canada, Ireland, Asia, Africa, and the Caribbean islands. At the turn of the twenty-first century, Britain lost most of its colonies. Nowadays, the term “British Empire” is only used in historical perspectives; it is used to signify an era that no longer exists. To put it in another way, the 20th century was the period of colonial decess, of decolonization for lots of people around the globe. These individuals were subjected to the power of Great Britain. However, at the beginning of the 21st century, Britain remained a colonial power, with several possessions in the South Atlantic and the Caribbean. Moreover, the imaginative and material legacies of both decolonization and colonialism remained fundamentally significant constitutive components in a diversity of contemporary domains, such as art, economics, anthropology, global politics, the mass media, international capitalism, and literature (McLeod, 2000, p.6).

Colonialism had taken various shapes and has engendered different impacts around the globe, but one should be as accurate as one may when delineating its connotation. This might be gauged, firstly by considering the relationship between two extra terms, “imperialism and capitalism”. Denis Judd (1996) states that “one may doubt that the craving for profitable trade, enrichment and plunder has been the primary force that led the formation of the imperial structures” (p.3). Judd maintains that colonialism is the primary part of the “commercial venture of the Western countries (although others date its origin to the European voyages of discovery in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, for instance, those of Christopher Columbus)” (p.3). The seizing of the foreign soils for settlement and government was motivated by the

need to control and create marketplaces in a foreign country for Western goods, also guaranteeing the natural labour-power and resources of different people and lands at the lowest probable price. Colonialism had been a profitable commercial process, transporting riches and wealth to Western countries through the “economic exploitation of others” (McLeod, p.8). It was chased for reward and riches, economic advantage. Hence, capitalism and colonialism disclose a mutually accommodating relationship with each other.

Sometimes, “colonialism” is used interchangeably with “imperialism”; however, the two expressions indicate dissimilar things. As Patrick Williams and Peter Childs argue, imperialism “is an ideological” notion which sustains the “legitimacy” of military and economic regulator of one country by another (McLeod, p.8). However, colonialism is “only one form of practice” that resulted from “the ideology of imperialism” and precisely involves the “settlement of one group of people in a new location” (McLeod, p.9). In this regard, British colonialism had not been all the times fruitful in attaining its goals, and come across some acts of confrontation from the outset by native residents of colonized countries, as well as peoples of the European societies who had settled abroad and no longer desired to submit authority and power to the imperial motherland.

After colonialism and decolonization, a critical theory that focuses on the analysis of history, literature, culture, and discourse of European imperial power appeared, this theory is known as Postcolonialism. McLeod maintains that “we need to look at two areas of intellectual study that have come to influence the emergence of postcolonialism: ‘Commonwealth literature’ and ‘theories of colonial discourses’” (p.10). One significant antecedent for postcolonialism was the expansion of the investigation of Commonwealth literature. The term has been used from the fifties of the previous century to define literature in English, evolving from a collection of countries with a history of colonialism. It combined the study of literary authors from the predominantly European settler communities, also authors who belong to those nations which were in the course of obtaining freedom from British canons, such as those from South Asian, Caribbean, African nations. Literary reviewers started to characterize a fast-developing body of literature written in English, which involved works by literary writers like Katherine Mansfield (New Zealand), George Lamming

(Barbados), R. K. Narayan (India) and Chinua Achebe (Nigeria). The formation of the classification of 'Commonwealth literature' as a distinctive area of study was an effort to locate and identify this energetic literary movement and to reflect through a comparative method the common attributes and concerns that these multifarious literary voices might have reflected (Young, 2001, p.154). Most importantly, neither Irish nor American literature was involved in the early formulation of the subject. "Commonwealth literature", then, was related exclusively to particular nations with a history of colonialism.

The concept "Commonwealth literature" is significant in the relations it beckons, and these relations have a historical origin. One significant result of the decline of British colonialism in the 20th century was the formation of the British "Commonwealth of Nations". At first, the notion indicated the distinct position of the territories within the Domain and their enduring adherence to Britain (Young, 2001, p.123). However, as the relationship between the dominions and Britain altered at the beginning of the twentieth century, a different meaning of 'Commonwealth' emerged. At the beginning of the century, Britain hosted recurrent 'colonial conferences' that collected the Governors of the colonies and heads of the territories. These meetings were renamed in 1907 'imperial conferences' in respect of the fact that the territories were no longer strictly belong to Britain (Young, 2001, p.124). After the Great War, the meetings turn into "Commonwealth conferences" and presented the "Heads of State" of the recently independent countries. The British sovereign was accepted as the leader of the "Commonwealth"; however, Britain helps no political authority over the Commonwealth countries, and the word 'British' was completely abandoned (McLeod, p.11). Therefore, 'Commonwealth' became redefined after the Second World War in more reasonable standings, as meaning an association of independent countries without respect to a lone authority. Nowadays, the "Commonwealth" of the countries as a body exists in name only, no legal authority or constitution is needed, and its membership—although built on the previous map of Great Britain—"is not obligatory for the independent countries" (McLeod, p.11).

This move from "colonial" to "Commonwealth" maybe recommends a specific account of history in which the position of the colonized nations alters from "subservience" to "equality". McLeod argues that "we must avoid subscribing to this

selective view, not least because the political and economic relations between the Commonwealth nations and Britain have stayed far from equal” (p.14). This study and identification of “Commonwealth literature” definitely mirrored the tenor of the specifically benign use of ‘Commonwealth’, but it also had its own problem. Generally speaking, the term suggested a valuable, shared literary inheritance between variable and disparate countries. It clearly promoted harmony in diversity—significantly, the plural concept “Commonwealth literature” was rarely used (p.14). However, the general inheritance questionably helped to strengthen the preeminence of Britain among the “Commonwealth countries”. Addressing the first conference of Commonwealth literature, Norman Jeffers (1965) maintains that “one reads (Commonwealth writers) because they bring new interpretations, new ideas of life to us” (p. xiv). Postcolonial or “Commonwealth literature” could have been formed as an attempt to gather literature from around the domain on an equal footing; however, the supposition stayed that the literary texts were referred principally to as a “Western English-speaking readership”. In ‘Commonwealth literature’, the Commonwealth was not free from the more impetuous, older implications of the notion (p. xiv).

One of the essential assumptions held by the first Western scholars of Commonwealth literature involved the relationship between the nation and literature. Cornell (1961) proposed that the beginning of “local” Commonwealth writings in the Commonwealth nations has been concurrent with the advancement of a “nationalist sentiment”: the larger among British colonies like Malta, Hong Kong, Fiji, where there are quite large English-speaking populations, have produced no literature, even in the widest sense of the term (p. 8). Several critics approved that the new interpretations and ideas of life in “Commonwealth literature” owed much to the ways which the literary authors used to forge their view of cultural and national identity.

However, the emphasis on the supposed nationalist drives of much “Commonwealth literature” played second fiddle to more theoretical interests, which took attention away from particular contexts. Many scholars devoted themselves to recognizing a shared aim among writers from various countries that went beyond more “local matters”. Just like the idea of a “Commonwealth” of countries proposed a varied community with a general group of concerns, “Commonwealth literature” was produced in the Caribbean, Australia, or India was expected to achieve national

limitations and deal with universal concerns. “Commonwealth literature” definitely dealt with cultural and national matters, but the best writing influenced the furtive force to transcend them too. Norman Jeffers maintains that:

A Commonwealth writer wants ultimately to be judged not because he gives us a picture of life in a particular place, in a particular situation, but by the lasting, universal quality of his writings, judged by neither local yet national standards. Good writing is something that transcends borders, whether national or local, whether of the spirit or of the mind (p. xviii).

Commonwealth literature, then, was really a sub-set of English colonial literature, valued in terms resultant from “conventional investigation” of English that emphasized the values of universality and timelessness. For Walsh (1973), Commonwealth literature dealt basically with the same obsessions with the human conditions as did George Eliot or Jane Austin (p.134). National diversities were certainly significant, adding to the novelty of ‘personality’, “light”, and “colour”;; but eventually, these “national specifics” were secondary to the essential general meaning of the work (p.134).

One of the most important “differences that many postcolonial critics today have from their Commonwealth predecessors is their insistence” that geographical, cultural, historical specifics are vital to both the reading and the writing of a text and cannot be so simply considered as secondary background or colouring (McLeod, p.14). But for many scholars of “Commonwealth literature”, these “texts conformed to a critical status quo” (McLeod, p.14). They were not regarded especially oppositional or radical; “nor were they seen to challenge the Western criteria of excellence used to read them”. Their experimental rudiments, their local and novelty concentration made them thrilling for reading and helped in depicting the nation with which they were related. But “their potential differences were contained by the identification within them of universal themes that they bound texts safely inside the aesthetic criteria of the West” (McLeod, p.14). Scholars in the field of postcolonialism scholars believe that the dissimilar contexts and preoccupation of texts “were to become more significant than their alleged similar abstract qualities” (McLeod, p.14).

In spite of this, it would be a kind of mockery to dismiss or condemn the work of the preceding group of critics of Commonwealth literature because it is not

proper for the current critical climate. Indeed, reviewers like Walsh and Jeffares belong to a former phase of literary criticism, which was to be fundamentally challenged at the close of the twentieth century. However, these critics and others were instrumental in securing “Commonwealth literature” as a significant group of artistic endeavours and as a practical field of academic study. In separating the liberal conventions of these scholar’s interpretation practices, it might be “too easily forgotten that the attention they gave to Commonwealth literature, and the space they cleared for it on university English courses in the West” established an essentially significant political act. These researchers helped in confirming that these writings were never a trivial part of interest but the main area that deserved serious attention on the same footings as the “classics” of English literature. Today, what might seem like a liberal humanist initiative was at the time also a significant “political investment” in this new literature as important, despite the restrictions we have regarded. The enduring, enthusiastic and detailed interpretations of “Commonwealth literature” laid the basics for the numerous postcolonial reproach that were to follow and to which much postcolonial “critical activity stays indebted” (McLeod, p.16).

Shirley Chew explains, “a paradox sits at the heart of the Commonwealth: described as a free association as a mutually and equal cooperating countries, it is nevertheless drawn together by a shared history of colonial exploitation, interchange and dependence” (p.32). If the study of the “Commonwealth literature” was followed in the charitable essence of the first side of this contradiction, the critical activity of postcolonialism was to “focus more on the other, darker side of dependence” and exploitation. In the beginning of the 1980s and the before that late 1970s, many critics endeavoured to discard the “liberal humanist bias perceived” in critics of Commonwealth literature, and to “read the literature in new ways” (p.32). In order to understand why and how this occurred one needs to look concisely at the second main precursor to postcolonialism: theories of “colonial discourse”.

Theories of colonial discourses have been enormously important in the expansion of postcolonialism. Generally speaking, they discover the ways that “modes of perceptions” and representations are used as important “weapons of colonial power to keep colonized peoples subservient to colonial authority” (McLeod, p.17). Colonialism continued by explaining to those in the colonizing nations the indication

that it is right and proper to control the lives of other peoples, by forcing colonized people to admit their lower position in the colonial categorization of things- a procedure might be called “colonizing the mind”(McLeod, p.20). It functions by convincing people to adopt its logic and speak its language; to continue the assumptions and values of the colonies regarding the ways they represent and perceive the world. Even though the notion was usually used in the singular, it is more precise to speak about “colonial discourses” rather than mere “colonial discourse” due to its multifarious operations and varieties which vary in space and time (McLeod, p.20).

Colonial discourses shape the connections where power and language meet. It is more than means of communication; it institutes our worldview, ordering and cutting up reality into meaningful units. As Ngugi (1986) maintains, language never inertly mirrors reality; it goes far towards producing an individual’s understanding of their world, and it contains the standards by which people live their lives (p.16). Colonialism was definitely reliant on the use of physical coercion and force, but it couldn’t take place without the presence of a group of convictions that are alleged to explain the continuing and possession occupation of other people’s properties. These convictions are programmed into the language which the colonizers utter and to which the colonized individuals are exposed (McLeod, p.36). This produces the distribution of a diversity of commonly held conventions regarding the relative variations of peoples of supposedly different cultures. As Alan Lawson and Chris Tiffin argue, “Colonialism (like racism) is an operation of discourse, and as an operation of discourse, it interpellates colonial subjects by integrating them in a system of representation” (1994, p. 3). The term “interpellates” that they used is actually taken from Althusser’s book on the significant function of the interpellation in the operative ideology. Interpellation “means calling; the idea is that ideology calls peoples and they turn and recognize who they are” (McLeod, p.37).

Colonized individuals (under colonialism) are made submissive to ways of considering the world which support and reflect colonialist standards. A specific “value system” is instructed as to the finest, rightest worldview. The cultural standards of the people under colonization are believed as “lacking in value, or even as being ‘uncivilized’, from that they should be saved” (McLeod, p.22). Great Britain did not govern by physical and military power alone. It continued by forcing both colonized

people and colonizers to look at themselves and their world in a specific way, internalizing the language of Empire as representing the true, natural arrangement of life. Selvon discusses how far-reaching the unenviable impact of internalizing colonial conventions about the “inferiority” of particular people might be (p.16).

If the internalization of colonial groups of standards was to a degree. Selvon referred to an efficient “way of disempowering” people; also, it was “the source of trauma” for colonized people who were instructed “to look negatively upon their people”, themselves and their culture (p.21). In the fifties of the previous century, there appeared much significant work that endeavoured “to record the psychological damage suffered by colonized peoples who internalized these colonial discourses” (p.21). The psychologist Fanon wrote passionately and widely “about the damage French colonialism had wrecked upon millions of people” (p.21). In a narrative both distressing and inspiring, Fanon observed the cost to the person who “lives in a world where because of the colour of her of his skin”, she or he is “rendered peculiar”, an “object of derision”, and an abbreviation. In his writings, Fanon narrates the way he felt when he was in France, and a white man pointed out his blackness. Fanon was called with expressions such as “Look, a Negro” or “dirty nigger” (Fanon, 1952, p.56). In his *Black Skin, White Masks*, Fanon says:

On that day, completely dislocated, unable to be abroad with the other, the white man, who unmercifully imprisoned me, I took myself far off from my own presence, far indeed, and made myself an object. What else could be for me but an amputation, an excision, a haemorrhage that spattered my whole body with black blood? But did not want this revision, this thematization. All I wanted was to be a man among other men. I wanted to come lithe and young into a world that was ours and help to build it together (Fanon, 1952, pp.112-13).

Therefore, his identity is described in undesirable expressions by those who held a higher rank of power. He is obliged to “see himself not as a human subject”, with his own needs and wants as shown in the quotation, but as “an object,” an individuality at the “mercy of a group” that labels him as an “inferior”, less than a human, place at the “mercy of their representations and definitions” (McLeod, p.25). The ferocity of this review of his identity is taken strongly in the image of subtraction. Fanon feels violated, imprisoned, abbreviated; they give him an identity depending on

his appearance. Therefore, Fanon's identity was a mere description of his outlook, and in doing that, the French commit fierceness that ruptures Fanon's very sense of self. The supremacy of naming, of description, was never to be undervalued. The connection between power and language is fundamental and far-reaching.

In his book, *Black Skin, White Masks*, Fanon clarifies the outcomes of identity construction for the "colonized subject" who is compelled into the internationalization of the self as an "other". The "Nigro" is thought to characterize anything that "the colonizing French are not". The colonizers are intelligent, civilized, and rational: the "Nigro" stays "other" to all such "qualities against which colonizing peoples derive their sense of normality and superiority" (p.24). *Black Skins, White Masks* portrays "those colonized by French imperialism" destined to "hold a traumatic belief in their own inferiority" (p.24). One reply to such traumas is to struggle to escape it through the acceptance of the "civilized" standards of the French motherland. Furthermore, although the colonized try to accept the language, values, and education of France—"to don the white mask of civilization that will cover up the uncivilized" nature indexed by their blackness—they were not accepted on equal terms. Fanon writes, "the white world, is the only honourable one, barred me from all contribution. A man was never expected to act like a man. I was likely to act like a black man" (p.114). That imaginative division that distinguishes black (man) "other" and "man" (self) is a significant, shocking part of the armoury of colonial power, one who detains the mind as secularly as handcuffs imprison the hands. Fanon maintains that the end of colonialism meant not economic and political alteration but psychological alteration as well (p.112). Colonialism is demolished just once this way of thinking about identity is successfully challenged (McLeod, p.23).

Fanon was called by others, and this makes him regard himself in terms of the racist ideology that tells how others see him. Ideology assigns him an identity and role which he was made to recognize as his own. In other words, "the ideology of racism is calling to him through the lips of the white French who tell him who he is" (Fanon, 1952, p.59). Although such examples highlight the pain of being subjected by other people; maybe, interpellation works through pleasure as well. This can be done by inviting people to consider themselves in fluttering ways. Some would maintain that it would be easier to make an individual act bestowing to someone's needs by making

the individual feel special or valuable, rather than contemptuous and bereft, as this fulfils a person's feeling of worth and makes him pleased with the identity that was given to him (McLeod, p.39). In fact, one could regard that "colonial discourses" have been successful due to the fact that they give the colonizers the feeling that they are valuable, superior, and significant to others; furthermore, gaining the participation of the colonized by allowing them to grow a new sense of "self-worth" through their contribution in the advancing the "progress" of the "civilization" (McLeod, p.39). Therefore, the key point to hold from the beginning is that philosophies of "colonial discourses" are established upon the significant mutually accommodating relationship between the "material practice of colonialism and the representations it fashions in order to work" (McLeod, p.39).

Reading literary works in the light of colonial discourses serves numerous aims. First, this reading method, called "colonial discourse analysis", rejects the humanist hypothesis, which says that literary texts be existent beyond and above their historical context. It locates writings in history by revealing the way that historical contexts impact the production of meaning within literary texts and how literary demonstrations have the power to impact their historical moments. Second, criticism of colonial discourses ventures to point out the context to which the "best of high Western culture—be it literature, opera, art, classical music—is caught up in the sordid history of colonial dispossession and exploitation" (McLeod, p.39). Third, the concern with the machinery of colonial discourses in the past may operate as a tool of resisting the persistence of the current of colonial demonstrations that endure after colonization has come to an end: a state frequently referred to as "neo-colonialism".

The time of 1978 was the year in which Edward Said published his book *Orientalism*. This book is regarded by many critics as the most influential book of the late twentieth century (McLeod, p.20). Said also paid attention to the decisive relationship between the colonized and the colonizer, but from a different perspective. Said discovered the extent to which colonial nations generated a manner of seeing the world, "an order of things that were to be proper and true,"; but Said focused more on the colonizers than the colonized. Said's book refers to the developments in "Marxist theories of power", particularly the political philosophy of Antonio Gramsci and Michel Foucault. Said inspected "how the knowledge that the Western imperial powers

shaped about their colonies frequently helped to explain their subjugation”. Western countries like Britain and France, Said argues, invested some of their power and time in producing information about the places they dominated (p.111). Looking in specific at representations of the Middle East and Egypt in a diversity of written resources, Said argued that seldom did Western travellers in these areas tried to learn much about, propagated, or form the native people they encountered. Instead, they recorded their comments “based upon commonly-held assumptions about the ‘Orient’ as a mythic place of moral laxity, exoticism, sexual degeneracy and so forth” (p.111). These comments were offered as scientific facts that, in their turn, operated to clarify the very propriety of colonial domination. Therefore, colonialism incessantly continued. Colonial authority was supported by the fabrication of knowledge about colonized cultures which boundlessly formed a deteriorate picture of the Orient for Western people, or Occident.

Said’s book of Orientalism explains how the Western colonial power of France and Britain denoted Middle Eastern and North African domains at the close of the ninetieth century and the beginning of the twentieth century, although he draws upon other historical moments too. The “Orient” is the shared noun that Said employed to signify to these areas. Orientalism then signifies the sum of the West’s representations of the Orient. In the concluding chapters of his book, Said studies the reason behind Orientalism’s survival in Western media narratives of Eastern, particularly Arab, lands, in spite of formal decolonization for many nations. This supports the point that says the machinery of colonialism does not simply disappear once the colonies become independent. In fact, Said displays how the modes of depiction common to colonialism have sustained after decolonization and stay part of the modern world (Said, p.123).

One of the many commendable possibilities of Orientalism is its readability. The style of Said’s writings is noted and accessible for its lucidity and clarity. Nonetheless, it raises many challenging issues and ideas. Essential to the view of the world stated by Said is the dualistic separation it causes between the West (Occident) and the Orient. Occident and Orient are expected to exist in opposition to one another: “the Orient is considered as being everything the West is not, its alter ego” (Said, p.5). McLeod argues that this opposition is not of an equal partner; the Orient is described regularly in a sequence of negative expressions that function to reinforce a sense of the

West's strength and superiority (p.40). If the West is supposed to be the seat of learning and knowledge, then it follows that the Orient is the place of naiveté and ignorance. Therefore, in Orientalism, the West and East are situated through the construction of unequal opposition (p.40). The West seizes a higher rank, whereas the Orient is its the "Other" in a subservient position. And this makes the nature of the relationship between the two asymmetrical.

It is significant to grasp Said's argument that Western opinions toward Orient are not established on what is observed to exist in Oriental lands but often come from the West's assumptions, imaginations, and dreams about what this was drastically contrasting, different place encloses. Orientalism is first and foremost a "fabricated" concept, a sequence of ideas that "come to stand as the Orient's reality for those in the West" (p.40). This manufactured truth in no way mirrors what could or could not really be there in the Orient itself; "it does not exist outside of the representations made about it by Westerners" (Said, p.6). It is not "an inert fact of nature" (Said, p.5). Orientalism imposes upon the Orient definitely Western opinions of its reality. Significantly, its formation from the paraphernalia of the unreal does not make it any less distant from the world. Orientalism could be essentially imaginative, but material effects consequences from its beginning. Orientalism is a far-achieving structure of representations inevitable to the construction of political dominance. Orientalist depictions work to explain the decorum of Western colonial law of Eastern lands. They are a significant side of the arsenal of Empire. They "legitimate" the supremacy of other people and "lubricate" the judicial and political structures that uphold colonial law through physical coercion.

The works of Said and Fanon motivated a new generation of literary scholars in the eighties of the twentieth century "keen to apply their ideas" to their understanding of the literary works. What critics learned from the works of Said and Fanon was the concurrently complex and candid reality that Empires colonies fancy. Fanon displays how this operates at the psychological level of the oppressed; Said, on the other hand, validates the legitimation of the colonial for the oppressor. Then, overturning colonization is not only about giving the land back to its dispossessed citizens, handing back "power to those who were once ruled by Empire" (McLeod, p.24). It is also a procedure of abolishing the prevailing conducts of perceiving the world and

representing reality in ways that do not echo colonial standards. If colonialism includes colonizing the mind, then resistance to it needs a “decolonizing the mind” (Ngugi, p.54), which means that it is the issue of language. Salman Rushdie, the Anglo-Indian novelist, comments, “the language, like so much else in the colonies, needs to be decolonized, to be remade in other images, if those of us who use it from positions outside Anglo-Saxon culture is to be more than artistic Uncle Tomas” (1982, p.8).

So, liberation from colonization originates not only from the adoption of announcements of independence and the raising and lowering of flags. There has to be a change in the minds, a challenge to the prevailing conducts of seeing. This represents an experiment for those from both colonizing and colonized countries. Individuals from various areas of the Empire need to reject the prevailing languages of power which have separated them into slave and master, the ruled and the ruler if the lasting and progressive change is to be attained. Fanon wrote, “a man who has a language consequently possesses the world expressed and implied by that language” (p.18). The capacity of reading and writing otherwise, to reconsider our identification of the organization of things, contributes to the ability of change. In fact, “in order to challenge the colonial organization of things, some of us could need re-consider our received assumptions of what we have been taught as ‘true’ or ‘natural’” (McLeod, p.20).

It would be exceptionally reductive to assume that Said is the initiator of postcolonialism, not least because this might disregard the significant anti-colonial critiques before to Ngungi, Fanon, and others. However, it is maybe reasonable to argue that, institutionally, the success of Said’s Orientalism did much to encourage new kinds of study. Sensitized by Said’s book and others to the operations of the colonial discourses, a new generation of critics became more ‘theoretical’ materials in their work (McLeod, p.22). Probably, this was the beginning of postcolonialism as one understands it today and marked a main leaving from the earlier, humanist methods which characterized “criticism of Commonwealth”. Emerging in the 1980s were new, excitingly dynamic structures of textual analysis prominent for their interdisciplinary and eclecticism, merging the insights of “feminism”, politics, “psychology”, philosophy, “anthropology”, and literary theory in energetic and provocative ways.

Three methods of textual analysis in specific turned to be common at the beginning of Orientalism. One included “re-reading English colonial literature” so as to inspect if past texts questioned or continued the hidden “assumptions of colonial discourses”. This type of textual analysis continued along two avenues. In one direction, reviewers looked at authors who tackled noticeably colonial themes and discussed the problem of whether their works were critical or supportive of colonial discourses. One instance is Joseph Conrad’s *Heart of Darkness* (1899). Scholars argued if Conrad’s work preserved the colonialist view of the supposed inadequacy of other people or if it questioned the whole colonial scheme, dissenting from colonial discourses. On the other hand, writings that are not directly connected with colonialism, for example, Jane Austin’s *Mansfield* (1814) or Bronte’s *Jane Eyre* (1874), were also “re-read” provokingly regarding colonial discourses.

Second, a number of scholars who worked with the post-structuralist thoughts of Jacques Lacan, Jacques Derrida, and Michel Foucault started to investigate the “representation of colonized subjects” in a diversity of colonial texts, not just literary ones (McLeod, p. 24). As Said claimed, if the West shaped knowledge about other people so as to verify the “truth” about their ‘inferiority’, was it likely to consider these texts “against the grain” and explore “in them moments” when colonized subjects “resisted” being presented with “recourse to colonial standards” (McLeod, p.24). This matter was regarded in various manners during the 1980s by Gayatri Spivak and Homi K. Bhabha, as well the “Subaltern Studies” critics based in India. In her significant writings “Subaltern Studies: Deconstructing Historiography” (1988) and “Can the Subaltern Speak” (1993), Spivak dealt with the “problem of whether or not it is possible to recover the voices of those who had been made subjects of colonial representations”, particularly females, and read them as potentially subversive and disruptive. Since the eighties of the last century, Bhabha, Spivak, and Said have opened a “wide variety of theoretical issues” central to postcolonialism (McLeod, p.24). The three emerged as the “Holy Trinity” of reviewers investigating or working in the domain of postcolonialism.

The third form of literary analysis provoked by the turn of theory brought together some of the insights obtained by “theories of colonial discourses with readings of the new literature from nations with a history of colonialism”. Using the works of

Said and Fanon, and late Spivak and Bhabha, it has become common to claim that these works were mainly involved with “writing back to the centre”, actively connected to the procedure of travesty and questioning colonial discourses in their texts (McLeod, p.25). The “nomenclature of Commonwealth” was dropped in favour of postcolonial in explaining these authors and their writings, “as if to signal new generation” of critic’s “repudiation of older attitudes” in preference of the newer, more interdisciplinary methods. The “imperious overtones of Commonwealth literature made this term fall increasingly out of favour from the 1980s” (McLeod, p.25). In plain difference to “liberal humanist readings” by critics of “Commonwealth literature”, the postcolonial literature were “at a stroke” considered as locally situated and “politically radical” rather than universally relevant. They were believed to present straight challenges to the colonial centre from the colonized limits, transferring new manners of seeing that both challenged the prevailing method, and gave expression and voice to colonized and once-colonized individuals. “Postcolonial literature” was vigorously involved in the act of decolonizing the mind.

This method was crystallized in a significant text that emerged at the end of the twentieth century titled “The Empire Writes Back: Theory and Practice in Postcolonial Literatures” (1989). The book was co-written by the Australians: Gareth Griffiths, Bill Ashcroft, and Helen Tiffin. The three critics were motivated by Rushdie’s claim regarding the necessity to decolonize the English language, “The Empire Writes Back orchestrated the issues we have been exploring into a coherent critical practice”. It epitomized the increasingly common observation that writings from the once—colonized nations were essentially “concerned with challenging the language of colonial power, unlearning its worldview, and producing new modes of representation” (Said, p.23). Its writers explored the fortunes of the English language in countries with a colonial past, as well as how authors were voicing their own sense of belonging by refashioning English to suit their experiences. In the post-colonial world, English was supplemented by a variety of linguistic cultures (Griffiths, Ashcroft & Tiffin, p.8). They were watching it as a means of questioning the colonial belief structure it enshrined and bearing witness to these peoples' sense of cultural change? The three commentators illustrate the assumption that postcolonial literature describes itself by snatching the vocabulary of the middle and substituting it in a discourse completely

suiting to the colonized position in a tone that is mostly more viewpoint than descriptive. (p.88)

This refashioning was effective in a variety of ways. Griffiths, Ashcroft, and Tiffin concluded that authors were inventing new “Englishes” by using a variety of techniques, including adding untranslatable phrases, glossing apparently ambiguous expressions, ignoring Standard English grammar in favour of constructs drawn from other languages, and integrating numerous creolized varieties of English into their literary works. Each of these strategies was demonstrated in a variety of postcolonial books, and in each, the writer's attempt to refashion and subvert Standard English into several new forms of ‘English,’ as a means of jettisoning the colonialist standards that Standard English housed, was given special attention (p.88).

The *Empire Writes Back* claimed that postcolonial writings were only the product of “the renunciation (i.e. discounting) of the perceived English that speaks from the middle, and the act of appropriation (i.e. seizure) that puts it under the control of a vernacular language, the multifarious of speech patterns that define the “local tongue” (p.38). The colonized place's new “English” was irreversibly distinct from the colonial centre's language, isolated by an unbridgeable distance: “this gap, or absence, is not derogatory, but in its consequence, it is regarded as optimistic.” It creates a differentiation from which an identification (whether retrieved or created) may be expressed” (p.62). Standard English could not be modified because the current “Englishes” had gone over its bounds and violated the laws. Fresh identities, traditions, and belief systems emerged as a result of this irreversible plurality, whereas old patriarchal values were vehemently opposed.

In the 1990s, it had a major influence on discussions of postcolonial literature in university classrooms. *The Empire Responds* made a major contribution to the domain's literature studies. It moved the approach to literature from formerly colonized countries away from the abstract question of a text's eternal and universal meaning and toward a more politicized approach that analyzes texts specifically within regional and historical frameworks. Postcolonial literature, according to Griffiths, Ashcroft, and Tiffin, questioned rather than verified broadly held expectations. Their “local” attentions were vital to their definitions, not simply accidental (McLeod, p.27). Griffiths, Ashcroft, and Tiffin lump together a complex and plural body of literature

from various locations, failing to consider the differences between the literature they study. *The Empire Writes Back* spawned a "grand theory of postcolonialism" that ignores cultural and historical distinctions among authors, homogenizing "specificities" into a less or more unproblematic theory of the "other" (p.278). In the end, variety and diversity are dismissed. As a result, one must be aware that postcolonial ideas cannot be too dissimilar from the generalizing and homogenizing impulses that are often cited as the area of Commonwealth literature's core flaw nowadays.

In the 1990s, postcolonial studies became trendy among academics and became steadily busy. A strange splitting of the realm between critical studies that explore postcolonial philosophy and textual critique of postcolonial literature has been in danger of happening in a literary setting. Griffiths, Ashcroft, and Tiffin's efforts, although problematically, to put analytical observations to bear on readings of postcolonial texts in *The Empire Writes Back* are an illustration of this. However, the 'Holy Trinity' of Spivak, Bhabha, and Said has recently become the topic of much discussion and commentary in postcolonial studies, not least because some facets of Bhabha and Spivak's work may seem impenetrable at first glance. Collectively, this has aided in the creation of 'postcolonial theory' as a separate discipline of its own right, often at the detriment of postcolonial literature critique.

The most significant surveys of the postcolonial theory are series of essays rather than analytical writings, not least because they go beyond the Bhabha-Spivak-Said triad. Extracts from the work of 'Holy Trinity' and many other significant voices can be found in Laura Chrisman and Patrick Williams' *Colonial Discourse and Post-Colonial Theory*, edited by Laura Chrisman and Patrick Williams in 1993. The editors of the book provide a broad and comprehensive sense of the excitement and variety of postcolonial theory by including some excellent introductory sections. *The Post-Colonial Studies Reader*, edited by Griffiths, Ashcroft, and Tiffin (1995), has a similar feel, but the editors opt for brief excerpts from little commentary and longer sections, rendering the text seem threadbare. Another collection, *Colonial Discourse/ Post-Colonial Theory*, edited by Margret Iverson, Francis Baker, and Peter Hulme, contains many articles that challenge several of the key assumptions of postcolonial theory, though the complication of the critique allows it a text to tackle after one has made his or her first foray into postcolonial theory.

After extensive critiques of Spivak, Said, and Bhabha, Bart Moore-Gilbert's *Theory and the West* (1990) and Robert Young's *White Mythologies: Writing History and the West* (1990) are the two most significant. Young provides valuable examples of the work of the 'Holy Trinity,' situating their writings within a larger investigation of poststructuralist historical approaches. Bart Moore-Gilbert, on the other hand, presents the wealthiest and most thorough work on postcolonial theory to date and situates it in relation to Commonwealth literature as well as the works of other postcolonial writers (Although Said, Bhabha, and Spivak stay its primary subject matter). Moore-Gilbert's interest in postcolonial theory is incredibly valuable and remarkable, but this suggests that his book is not intended to be an introductory document.

There are several excellent introductory guides to postcolonial theory, but they seldom seek to deal properly with postcolonial literature; this is maybe unsurprising considering that their authors' backgrounds are mainly in literary studies. *An Introduction to Postcolonial Theory* (1977) by Patrick Williams and Peter Childs is the most stimulating since it covers far more ground than Spivak, Said, or Bhabha and does so in a supportive and transparent manner; nevertheless,, the 'Holy Trinity' remains paramount.

After studying the philosophical and historical contexts of postcolonialism, one is now in a position to define it. First and foremost, we must comprehend the relation between postcolonialism and colonialism. According to theories of colonial discourses, colonization has a major impact on forms of representation. Languages hold a series of beliefs about the "proper order of things" that are taught as "facts" or "fact" (McLeod, p. 32). It is far from reasonable to say that colonization came to a rest as a colony officially archives its freedom. The raising of a newly independent colony's flag may signal a critical change in constitutional authority to those in the newly independent nation, but it's important to remember that colonial standards do not vanish on the first day of independence. In several cases, life after freedom, according to Stuart Hall, "is marked by the presence of many of these colonial forces" (Hall, 1996, pp.248). The reading patterns, beliefs, and representations of colonization are not quickly dislodged. Is it necessary to communicate about a postcolonial period if colonialism's numerous information, views, and assumptions are left unquestioned?

Postcolonialism Part of the mission entails writing back in response to patriarchal forms of knowing. However, imperial forms of understanding continue to exist and circulate today; regrettably, they have not actually vanished when the Empire has weakened. Therefore, one of Davies's reservations about postcolonialism is the impression it might give that colonial relationship no longer exist (Davies, 1994, p.82). Davies argues that people have to remember the "numerous individuals that are still existing within definite countries who have been colonized with the former/colonies (African-American, Native-American, Palestinians, South Africans, Aboriginal Australians) (p.83). This comment raises the issue of internal colonialism that persists in many ways in once-colonized nations; for such individuals, colonial oppression still far from over. This is the reason why people must be careful in using postcolonialism strictly as shaping a historical period or moment.

As a result, the word "postcolonialism " differs from "after colonialism," as though imperial values are no longer relevant. The concept does not necessarily denote a modern historical period, nor does it mean a bold new future free of the ills of the imperial past (McLeod, p. 32). In reality, postcolonialism acknowledges both transition and historical continuity. It also recognizes that, even as the political map of the world has shifted as a result of decolonization, the material forms and realities of representation typical to colonialism are also very much present today. However, it asserts the potential, hope, and continued need for reform, while still noting that substantial improvements and obstacles have already been encountered.

Thus, with this firmly in our minds, one may proceed to make some decisions about what is assembled under the umbrella notion of 'postcolonialism '. Keeping in mind the concern with the variety that the term may cover, one may identify three noticeable areas that fall within its remit. In a literary context, and very basically, postcolonialism includes either or a variation of the following: first, reading literature works from countries with a colonial history, especially those dealing with the residue and working of colonialism in the present and past. Second, reading texts on diaspora relationships and their different consequences published by migrants from countries with colonial history or descendants of migrant families. Re-reading documents from the period of colonialism, both those that specifically address the Empire's views and those that appear not to, in terms of colonial debate hypotheses. (McLeod, p. 34).

The main term in each is 'reading'. The process of readings in a postcolonial context is by no means neutral activities. The way one reads is as significant as what he/she reads. The ideas one may encounter within postcolonialism and the issues they raise need that conventional reading models and methods interpretation have to be rethought if one's reading practices are to contribute to the decolonization of discourses to which post-colonialism aspires. Re-thinking conventional modes of reading are essential to postcolonialism.

In fact, making distinctions like what has illustrated above always involving a certain degree of generalization. It would be unlikely; also a mistake to unify these three areas into single coherent postcolonialism with a common philosophy. Single-sentence clarifications are unwise and impossible. Moreover, one has to be aware that each area itself heterogeneous and diverse. For instance, colonial discourses may operate in definite ways for various peoples at different periods of time. One must not presume totality and consensus where there is instead heterogeneity. The last point to be discussed here is that postcolonialism might well aim to oppose colonial values and representations, but whether it fulfils these aims stays a hotly debated issue in the field. Postcolonialism could bring new possibilities, but it is not free from problems of its own.

1.2 Ambivalence and Mimicry

“Escape has turned to be a way of displacement and life, a perennial condition. For the evicted political, colonial independence solves no problem. A type of sequence of determinism makes it likely for them (those who experienced diaspora) to find a home. Neither the mother country nor the colony provides a matrix. Displacement and dependence are their ultimates” (Amur, p.137). Societies with colonial history have been struggling with the issues of inconsistencies once they were given by colonizers. Their poor condition of the post-independence periods made them imitates the conducts of the colonizers to thrive in the postcolonial nations. Postcolonial reviewer Homi K.Bhabha asserts that the people of a colonized country imitate the colonizers so as to escape from disorder (Bhabha, 1984, p.182). The colonized, by adopting the role of mimicry, hopes to bring order and coherence. In the colonial discourse, both the colonized and the colonizer pander to negotiation. Mimicry involves both menace and

resemblance. The kind of ambivalence that colonized witness in the postcolonial discourse is similar to that of the diasporic people living in the postcolonial nations.

In migrant societies, features like hybridity, ambivalence, and mimicry recognizable by the diasporic people. Diasporic authors handle the problem of identity in their writings. For them, identity is not fixed; identities are partial and plural. The clash of two cultures is the main issue that the migrants suffer from. Their situation is too confusing that they are motivated to construct imaginary homelands. They reimagine their native countries, and their identities remain inconsistent. By imitating Western people, colonial subjects are still included in cultural negotiation; this process is called 'mimicry', also known as 'double consciousness' (Bhabha, 1984, p.182). The diasporic people who lost their identities in the previous colonies of the Empires struggle to regain their past.

Bhabha, like Said, asserts that colonization is based on a set of myths intended to justify its perspective on other cultures and territories. "The aim of colonial discourse is to construe the colonized as a community of degenerate kinds on the grounds of racial heritage, in order to justify the invasion and maintain colonial authority," writes Bhabha. System of instruction and administration (Bhabha, 1994, p.70). The appearance of colonial stereotypes characterizes colonized people in different pejorative ways. Moreover, Bhabha maintains that this significant goal "is never fully met". This is because the "discourse of colonialism does not function according to plan because it is always pulling in two contrary directions at one time" (Bhabha, 1984, p.70).

The discourse of colonialism, on the one hand, would have it that the Oriental (or in Bhabha's parlance, the "colonized subject") is a curious creature whose bizarre eccentric appearance is a source of both fear and fascination. The colonized are seen as the "other" of Westerners (or the colonizing subject), who are essentially outside of Western society and cultures (McLeod, p.53). Colonialism's rhetoric, on the other hand, aims to domesticate colonized objects and eliminate their militant "otherness," introducing them into Western awareness through the Orientalist project of information construction regarding them. As a consequence, the construction of "otherness" is "broken" by the colonized's inconsistent location outside and within Western awareness. "Colonial discourses create the colonized as a social phenomenon that is at

once the “other” and yet fully recognizable and knowable,” according to Bhabha. (pp.70-1)

Therefore, Stereotypes seek to justify the strangeness of others by suggesting that they are incomprehensible: the Chinese are often perplexing, the Irish are invariably ignorant, and the Arabs are fundamentally violent. If the colonized are taken beyond the limitations of Western knowledge, the distance between them and the colonizer is narrowing. Colonial stereotypes, on the other hand, operate in the other direction to preserve this illusion of distinction. Colonizers could never admit that other citizens are not truly different from themselves since this will undermine colonialism's legitimacy.

Probing Said's claim, which says/ that Western illustrations of the East are mainly based on wishes, imaginings, and fantasies, Bhabha maintains that “the fantasies of the colonial stereotypes often appear as horrors”. “The discourse of colonialism is frequently populated with “terrifying stereotypes of cannibalism, lust, anarchy, and savagery” (p.72). Bhabha argues that:

Any attempt to subdue the radical otherness of the colonized is perpetually offset by the alarming fantasies that are projected into them. This specifies how, in the discourse of colonialism, colonized subjects are split between contradictory positions. They are knowable, harmless, domesticated, but also at the same time harmful, mysterious, and wild. Bhabha maintains that as a consequence, in colonialist representations, the colonized subject is always in motion, sliding ambivalently between the polarities between difference and similarity; she or he simply will not stand still. Because of this slippery motion, stereotypes are deployed as a means to arrest the ambivalence of the colonial subject by describing her or him in static terms (McLeod, p.53).

However, this securing of the colonizer's subject role is still ineffective. As a result, myths must be echoed regularly in an incomplete, anxious effort to protect the colonized topic in the colonial debate. The same old tales of the Negro's animality, the Coolie's stupidity, or the Irish inscrutability have to be related anew and again, according to Bhabha and are different frightening and gratifying each time (Bhabha, p.77). The imperial stereotypes are replicated in an effort to hold the colonized in a set place, but it is often an acceptance that this will never be accomplished.

Therefore, to sum up, Bhabha's discourse of colonialism' is characterized by both anxious repetitions and ambivalence. In trying to do two things at once—constructing the colonized as both similar to and the other of colonizers—it ends up in doing neither properly. As a replacement, it is condemned to be at war with itself, placing radical otherness between individuals while instantaneously attempting to lessen the degree of otherness. Although “the aim is to fix knowledge about other people once and for all, this objective is always deferred”. The best it “may do is set in motion the anxious repetition of the colonized subject's stereotypical attributes that endeavour to fix it in a stable position” (Bhabha, p.77). But the reality that stereotypes must be endlessly repeated reveals that this fixity is never attained.

In his article “Of Mimicry and Man”, Bhabha constructs these notions and finds how the ambivalence of the colonized persons turns to be a complete threat to the authority of the colonizers throughout the impact of mimicry. Bhabha argues that as “one of the most effective and elusive strategies of colonial knowledge and power” (p.85). Bhabha concentrates on the idea that in colonial countries like India, the British colonizers needed native people “to work on their behalf and thus had to teach them the English language”. An example of that Macaulay's infamous “Minute”. Macaulay argues that the British in India needed to create a class of Indians able to talk in English, speaking about intellect, morals, and opinions (Macaulay, 1995, p.76). These figures comparable to “Fanon's French colonials depicted in *Black Skin, White Masks*, are described as a “mimic man” who is taught to act English but do not look English at all, nor are accepted as such. Bhabha argues to be Anglicized emphatically not to be English” (p.87).

These mimic men are not the slavish, disempowered individuals required by the British in India. Bhabha maintains, “they are invested with power to menace the colonizers because they threaten to disclose the ambivalence of the discourse of colonialism, which the use of stereotype anxiously efforts to conceal” (p.87).

CHAPTER TWO: MIMICRY IN ORWELL'S *ANIMAL FARM*:

A POSTCOLONIAL READING

In general, the success of a literary work shows its value, and one explanation for Orwell's *Animal Farm*'s universal appeal is the classic simplicity of its style and language—an English that is equally accessible to adults and teenagers. *Animal Farm*'s ability to thrive as a work of fiction, to engage the feelings and creativity of potential audiences, could well be contingent on a greater understanding of the work as an intrinsic part of a much broader cultural structure, with interwoven threads stretching back to the ancient past. *Animal Farm*'s many threads—allegory, animal plot, comedy, fairy tale, ballad, morals, lamentation, among others—can be traced back to English-language classics by Swift, Gay, Bunyan, Shakespeare, Dickens, Chaucer, and Spencer. Any broadening of a reader's viewpoint assists in unveiling Orwell's *Animal Farm* as a cell adding to the continuing existence of a civilizing literary tradition, rather than an isolated literary event applicable only to a single moment in history.

Orwell reveals himself to be a writer very much of the era as he says in "Why I am Writing" that he has been attempting to express political concepts in an artistically pleasing way since the mid-thirties of the previous century. Owing to the fact that not only was literature politicized during this period, but also academics, leaders, and authors were judged and categorized based on their ideological views. The harsh reception awaited in the manuscript of *Animal Farm*—from the slings of the intellectual left to the bows of the militaristic right—has a hint of the allegorically symbolic.

Since its publication, many reviews have appeared discussing *Animal Farm*; in fact, up till today, the novel still receives many critical views. Among these critics who discussed Orwell's novel is Donald Morse, who argues that *Animal Farm* is a novel with the fantastic convention of data from pig to human and reversible from human to pig (Morse, 1995, p.89). Orwell's novel has a fable as its surface due to the fact that it

tells its readers about animals that have human qualities, and the most prominent quality is its ability to speak. Moreover, *Animal Farm* is considered an allegorical novel because its characters mirror or correspond to some figures that are taken from the real world. Perhaps the most human quality that the animals show appears at the end of the novel when pigs start to walk on two legs and wear human attire so that other animals on the farm will not be able to differentiate them from human beings.

Besides the allegorical significance that the novel depicts, also Orwell's novel puts forward the issue of exploitation and colonialism. There have been some trials to show that in *Animal Farm*, colonialism had taken place in Russia, and this colonialism is internal with the Russian government plays the role of colonizer through its tyrannical policies. Similarly, *Animal Farm* depicts the idea that colonization caused by pigs, and these pigs represent the Soviet Union which worked to colonize the Russian people. Within the scope of this colonialism, one may also refer to the concept of mimicry in the novel. Kirschner (2007) argues that mimicry might be seen in any process of colonization, and perhaps the most common process is the interaction that takes place between the colonized and the colonizer (p. 31). In this respect, the social order that one can see in *Animal Farm* mimics or resembles "European Socialism" (p.31). As an allegory to the Russian revolution, *Animal Farm*, especially in the beginning, presents the image of animals that are colonized by men; this shows how the colonized (in this case, the animals) are exploited for the benefit of the colonizers (men). The concept of internal colonization appeared in postcolonial studies. Beatriz (1979) defines internal colonization as the stage that follows the colonization and domination of the foreigners over the natives; in this stage, the role of colonizers is taken by the natives themselves (p.85). In this sense, the colonizers might not always be foreigners, they the colonizer and the colonized might be from the same country but with different ideology or views (p.85).

The internal colonization, Calvert (2001) argues, could include the physical conquest not across and within the limitations of the political region. So, depending on Calvert's view, internal colonization occurs in one place and even in one group, and it is caused by economic, racial or political conflict (p.63). S. W. Williams argues that internal colonization always occurs within a single country, and the term itself was mostly used in literary works; perhaps the most significant work that depicts this

notion is Orwell's *Animal Farm* (p.125). At the beginning of the novel the animals on the farm are dominated by men, and then the pigs took the role of men and started to colonize and dominate other animals on the farm.

In his speech to other animals, Old Major explains how the animals are exploited and oppressed by men; men, in this case, take the role of the colonizer and animals, thus, colonized by humans. When reading the novel, not only the physical exploitation of animals such as using horses for transportation or plowing the soil by cows that one may observe, but also the productions of these animals such as wool, eggs, and milk are taken by humans. The distribution of wealth and labor from the colony—Animal Farm- into the civilization or center—Mrs. Jones's properties—symbolizes colonial relationships (Yang, 2006, p.287). These subjects are made quite clear by Old Major:

“Now Comrades, our lives are short, laborious and miserable. We were given just so much food as will keep the breath in our bodies, and most of us are forced to work till the last atom of our strength” (Orwell, 1945, p.2).

Old Major continues: “in England, animals know nothing about leisure or happiness, and when our usefulness comes to an end we are slaughtered with hideous cruelty, the life of animals is slavery and misery, and no animal is free” (Orwell, 1945, p.2). Old Major's speech indicates that the owner of the farm, Mr Jones, has been treating the animals very badly. Colonial discourse, Said argues, may always display the relationship between the colonizer and the colonized, also the oppressing and the oppressed (Said, 1972, p.34). So from the beginning of the novel, Orwell shows the inequality between animals and humans, and after Old Major's speech, it became clear that animals see the owner of the farm as a colonizer. The Old Major acts as the representative for the other animals on the farm. The aim behind his speech is to motivate other animals on the farm to make a revolution on the farm against the authority of Mr Jones. Perhaps, through Old Major's speech at the beginning of the story, Orwell wants to deliver the idea that only through revolution colonization might be defeated.

Old Major is the first animal among others on the farm to announce and declare that animals on the farm are being oppressed by the human owner. The aged boar gives the motivation that fuels the revolution. The boar is an allegorical combination of the

Russian communist leader Vladimir Lenin and Karl Marx; he draws up the values of the revolution. His skull being put on honoured public display recalls Lenin, whose conserved body was put on exhibition. Because of the cruelty of Mr Jones, Old Major urges other animals on the farm to revolt against the owner of the farm. This cruelty, as explained by Mr Jones, lies in the fact that he gives the animals the amount of food that prevents them from starving, while the rest of the products goes to the owner of the farm and his family. The animals which are unable to produce any kind of product will face a crueller fate either by losing their lives, or they are sold to another owner, who in his turn slaughter them.

The animals on the farm start to be aware of their position in a colonial relationship. Their late awareness, as argued by Robert (1990), is due to the fact that these animals lack education and Old Major was the tutor who enlightened or told their animals about their rights. From this point, the animals decide to arrange a rebellion against Mr Jones. It is important to mention that the word “Rebellion” in the novel was used with capital ‘R’, in doing so, Orwell wants to highlight the idea that “Rebellion” became the grand goal for all animals in the novel. Robert argues that the reason behind using the capital ‘R’ in the word rebellion is to indicate that this word is considered sacred by all animals on the farm because it represents their goal of equality. Furthermore, Old Major himself stated, “the word Rebellion should start with capital ‘R’”. For him, the word has become a symbol of revolution, a symbol of communism “all animals are comrades. All men are enemies” (Orwell, p.2).

The allegorical figure of Old Major always reminds animals of the hierarchy system in Mr Jones’s farm in which animals are inferior to men and that animals always feel that humans are above them. Also, it is important to note that Orwell always capitalizes the word “Man” to give the impression that “Man” is an animal’s supreme enemy: “always remember your duty of enmity towards Man and all his ways. Whatever moves upon two legs is our enemy. Whatever has wings or moves on four legs is our friend. And always remember that we must not resemble Man when fighting against him” (p.4). This quotation illustrates animals’ feelings of hatred toward “Man”, but for some critics, Old Major has always been uncertain about the success of this “Rebellion” because, as Robert argues, he thinks Rebellion is still an

unattainable dream for animals due to their capacity and strength compared to Mr Jones's power.

The awareness that "Man" is superior to animals leads "to the formulation of mimicry" as an essential idea in the story (Darmawan, 2018, p.39). The animals on the farm start to understand the fact that every human's attitude, action, and appearance is important to determine him as a superior creature in this world. They start to realize that humans' behaviours are what make them in a higher rank than animals. According to Darmawan, what really encouraged Old Major to act against humans is his feeling of inferiority when he compares himself with Mr Jones (p.40). Even when they heard Old Major's speech, not all animals were convinced with his idea of "Rebellion". An example of those who declined Old Major's view is Mollie, who is convinced that Mr Jones is his master, and it is his property. However, those animals which are convinced in Old Major's speech think it is better to behave just like humans, imitate human's attitude, but there are some human behaviours that are difficult to imitate by animals such as: sleep in bed, living in houses, wearing clothes, smoking, or even drinking alcohol. Moreover, there are some other human habits that are forbidden for animals, as asserted by Old Major "Humans are evil so as their habits" (Orwell, p.5). Among these habits is a dictatorship because it is a humanistic feature. Therefore, unexpectedly, Old Major asks other animals not to mimic humans, as Darmawan argues, "Mimicry was the line that animals must never across" (p.39).

In spite of Old Major's instruction to other animals not to mimic any human behaviour, the animals begin to generate a hierarchy system in the body of their community. The dominant race (humans) was replaced by a dominant species of animals, the pigs:

It was early March at the time. There was a lot of covert action during the next three months. Major's speech had offered the farm's more intellectual animals a whole different perspective on existence. They had little idea when Major's expected Rebellion would occur, and they had no reason to believe it would happen in their lifetime, but they recognized that it was their responsibility to plan for it. The task of educating and organizing the others inevitably fell to the pigs, who were widely regarded as the most intelligent of the species. (p.6)

This illustrates Orwell's view that the actual power lies in one's ability to adapt, and education remains the most prevalent factor in determining a dominant position in a particular group. In *Manor Farm*, all species of animals consider pigs as the cleverest animals on the farm. For that, the animals trust pigs to teach them and organize their life.

In the novel, the pigs on the farm always steal some books from the owner's library and secretly read these books. So, although Old Major forbids animals to mimic humans, pigs were the first species of animals to imitate humans. Yet, the pigs' act of mimicry seems necessary to overcome the authority of the colonial system. In the later events of the novel, one of the pigs called Napoleon used mimicry to justify his oppression and domination of other animals.

Indeed, as introduced by Orwell, pigs have qualities that enable them to mimic humans, as compared to other animals on the farm. Another reason for using pigs as the animals that act like "Man", as discussed by some critics, is that pigs were found to be among the most intelligent animals in the world, they are able to use mirrors for their own advantages and perform some tricks like stand and bow, jump hoops, open and close cages, roll over rugs, even playing videogames (Darmawan, p.51). Definitely, it was very appropriate for Orwell to use pigs; normally, pigs are used to represent uncleanness, they eat any slop, and they wallow in the mud. Pigs also might signify moral depravity, so in using pigs as representatives of Stalin's regime, Orwell indicates the idea that the leaders of the Soviet members are filthy and smart at the same time. The most important figures among these pigs are Snowball, Napoleon, and Squealer, and all of these characters symbolize famous leaders from the Soviet Regime. Napoleon is a big, fierce—fierce-looking boar; it is a representation of Joseph Stalin. Napoleon is a symbol of the new revolution that resents the old political system and aims to change it. Snowball is an allegorical character; it signifies Trotsky. Leon Trotsky was a Marxist politician and theorist; he was one of the pioneers of the October revolution. He is best known for being one of the leaders of the Red Army. For many historians, he was the vital reason that enabled the Red Army to win the Russian Civil War. When Joseph Stalin took rule of the country, Trotsky was forced to leave Russia, and he spent the rest of his life in exile. His ideas advanced the foundation of Trotskyism, a major school of Marxist consideration that opposes the

philosophies of Stalinism. When the animals on the farm decide to act against the authority of Mr Jones, Snowball helps Napoleon in his plans to roll over humans, but later the two friends oppose each other as their perspectives and views towards ruling the group change. Another pig that participated in the distribution of the 'Rebellion' is Squealer. Squealer is the second in command after Napoleon. He is the minister of propaganda. Orwell describes him in the novel as a fat porker and a very convincing orator; he is very convincing that he could "turn into white" (Orwell, p.173). He occupies a central role in delivering announcements. Some critics like Robert argue that Squealer is a representation of Pravada; Pravada was the official newspaper of the Communist Party in Russia when Stalin ruled the country (p.17). Both Squealer in the novel and Pravada spread Stalin and Napoleon propaganda. Squealer succeeded in convincing every animal of the Manor Farm in Napoleon's policies. According to Darmawan (2018), Squealer is the best example of mimicry in *Animal Farm* (p.41). In this way, Orwell reflects the main events in Russia after the revolution; he reflects these events as an unwelcome path, and that the democratic socialism the Orwell believed turned to be a vicious dictatorship constructed around a cult of personality and imposed by lies and terror: "individuals who are morally sound have known since about 1931 that the Russian régime stinks" Orwell wrote (p.41). As the main propagandist of the Russian regime, Squealer is prominent in the novel, and the author describes the path down that minor lies lead to larger lies. Orwell considered propaganda as a characteristic of most modern régimes but particularly prominent in dictatorial governments, which depend and regard it as an essential part of it.

Mimicry in *Animal Farm* is used as a means of "Rebellion", as an instrument of resistance against the colonial regime of Mr Jones. The "Rebellion", Darmawan argues, begins when Snowball starts to steal art books from Mr Jones's library and then tries to apply what he reads in his real life, but despite his animalistic appearance, Snowball thinks like a human, act like a grown, educated man (p.40). He always aims to strengthen Old Major's dream of having an independent animal kingdom. Snowball dreams of a world without humans, and for that, he must stir a rebellion not just in Mr Jones's farm but in all other farms in England. Although Snowball intends to remain loyal to Napoleon, the latter always disagrees with Snowball's suggestion because he fears that Snowball may have a bigger influence on the group and thus gain more popularity among animals. Just like when humans write their constitutions, Snowball

decides to write the Seven Commandments. These rules determine the action of pigs, however later in the story, the seven rules are changed by Squealer, under to supervision of Napoleon. Snowball thinks like humans; he uses his knowledge from books when fighting enemies. When the moment comes to fight with Mr Jones, Snowball uses human strategies in fighting to overcome Mr Jones.

In his commentary about Bhabha's notion of mimicry, Lacan argues that the impact of mimicry is camouflage, like human techniques used in warfare (Bhabha, p.85). Snowball camouflages himself with Mr Jones's knowledge to beat him. So in doing mimicry (for example, reading and writing like humans), Snowball acts not as a colonized but as a colonizer. He uses every opportunity possible for him to learn about humans using human books and industries so as to use them later against them.

The animals have not taken any step against the humans yet. After the death of Old Major, the animals start to put a plan for their "Rebellion", but they never decide when it occurs. The "Rebellion" starts when the owner of the farm, Mr Jones, gets drunk, and his workers abandon the farm without feeding the animals, leaving the animals starving. The animals have to break into the store—shed searching for food. When the owner arrives with his men, they try to take the animals out of the store, but the animals fight back. Soon Mr Jones and his men find themselves being chased off the farm. After that, the triumphant beasts start to eat heartily, destroy all traces of Jones, and celebrate their recent freedom. After discovering what's inside Mr Jones' house, the animals agree to leave the house as it is as a museum. Snowball changes the sign from "Manor Farm" to "Animal Farm" and paints the "Seven Commandments of Animalism" on the wall of the barn.

The success that the "Rebellion" achieved to change the colonial system resulted in a vacuum of powers. Led by the pigs, the animals start to determine their own destinies. However, this did not last long as the pigs start to take the role that was occupied by humans before the Rebellion. The pigs also confess to other animals that they start to learn reading and writing before planning to make a revolution. The animals take the feeling of pride from humans; moreover, instead of using their own language, animals and especially pigs, continue to use human language. Pigs decide to use the colonizer's language (Mr Jones and his men) instead of using the colonized own language. For pigs, the language of "Man" is the language of knowledge and

civilization. Huddart (2006) states that mimicry can become a source of mockery (p.39). In *Animal Farm*, mimicry becomes a mockery when pigs, as ex-colonized mock humans as their ex-colonizers by imitating their habits, language and the way they wear clothes (Darmawan, p.43).

Perhaps the most obvious example of mimicry depicted in the animals' decision to dedicate their own constitution under the name "Seven Commandment of Animalism", but these rules present an irony since these Commandments are written in human language and human's way of writing:

It was written quite well, and except for the 'mate' and one was written wrongly, the orthographic was right all the way around. For the good of everyone, Snowball read it aloud. In absolute agreement, all the animals nodded, and the cleverer started studying Commandments with their heart. (Orwell, p.9)

Byrne (2009) argues that mimicry occurs as a response to stereotyping (p.88). Stereotyping 'Man' is the main reason behind the imitating process that the pigs of the farm do. For animals, particularly pigs, humans' habits are very tempting to be imitated. Wearing Mr Jones's clothes and moving on two legs illustrate what Edward Said calls "mesmerizing power" held by the culture of the colonizer (Darmawan, p.54). By announcing their own rules and writing their own constitution, the animals on the farm are actually stereotyping humans (Darmawan, p.54). Actually, the process of stereotyping humans begins before the rebellion; it begins with Old Major, who does his speech just like a political man whose aim is to persuade his listeners or supporters with his convincing methods of speech.

At this stage of the novel, the conduct of the animals could be considered as the first stage of mimicry because they are unable to copy human's writings in a perfect way. They misspell the word "friend"; they also failed to write the letter "S". This slippage, Darmawan argues, is the earliest example of mimicry in *Animal Farm* (p.55). This case was discussed by Bhabha and his notion of mimicry, who argues that the practice of mimicry is not always perfect, not always complete (p.86). However, this simple, incomplete form of mimicry becomes a successful strategy that enabled them to overcome Mr Jones and his men. Furthermore, this act of mimicry has proved pigs to be the cleverest animals on the farm.

The demonstration of mimicry in the story continues after the employment of several policies. Whereas the new leaders of the farm, Squealer, Snowball, and Napoleon, disturbed the motto that says “do not copy human”, some animals on the farm find it fun to wear some humans’ accessories. The white mare, Mollie which its’ previous job was pulling Mr Jones’s cart, is the only animal that refused the rebellion. The white horse is depicted as a shallow materialist, which cares for nothing but its own self. The white horse’s main concern is his love for ribbons and sugar, and because of that, she was against the rebellion because she was afraid not to get more sugar. After the success of the revolution, Snowball decides to take every ribbon on the farm and burn them. For Snowball, ribbons are symbols of slavery. Snowball suggests that animals must stay naked because wearing clothes is what differentiates humans from animals. For animals like Mollie, Snowball’s decision was not fair because the white mare loves to wear human attire. This conflict between those who oppose mimicries like Snowball and those animals who like to imitate humans and enjoy human resources continues to the end of the story.

As it is obvious in the story, the reception of human knowledge or the ability to mimic “Man” is different from one animal to another. There are certain animals that benefit from human’s achievements and use them in their lives, such as Snowball. Other animals, such as Napoleon, refuse anything that is invented by or even related to humans. Because of that, two opposite parties appeared on the farm, one led by Snowball and the other led by Napoleon. The first side of the conflict held the belief that some human’s attitudes should be imitated or mimicked. The second side of the conflict refuses any attachment with the colonizer, with humans. Both Snowball and Napoleon think that they are depicting Old Major’s views, but in fact, each of the two pigs is depicting its own views. That’s why the two pigs become the head of two opposed parties on the farm. Darmawan states that this conflict between Snowball and Napoleon reflects the early influence of mimicry, which separates the animals into two teams (p.57).

After the success of the rebellion, most of the animals on the farm start to change. This change is mainly in the attitudes. After using human strategies and skills to win their freedom, the animals in this stage of the story are convinced that all human’s attitudes and habits are good and that from now on, they must act like

humans. That's why some animals like Napoleon have noted that humans' supremacy has not ended with the departure of Mr Jones and his men, and debates started to appear on the farm about the necessity of mimicry. Snowball is the smartest animal on the farm. He is a forward thinker; he also has foresight. He "is able to see the big picture and plan for it" (p.57). His main aim after the success of the rebellion is to build a windmill. Snowball teaches the idea that when animals use humans' technology, their lives will be easier. He starts to present lectures about the importance of electricity. On the other hand, Napoleon is devious. He knows the importance of technology, but he never admits it. He plans to drive Snowball away from the farm and claim that the idea of the windmill is his in the first place. The conflict between the two main pigs on the farm resulted from their different understanding concerning the degree of mimicry. Each pig starts to gather some animals around him and declare their plans in their efforts to win the battle against each other. After the campaign, the process of mimicking humans became wider; especially pigs with their campaigns became very obsessed with the attitudes of the old colonizers.

After the human's regime ended, Manor farm starts to witness great changes. In the middle of this far-ranging upheaval, the concept of equality starts to appear in the story. The pigs start to convince other animals to do their works; they only direct and supervise others:

It was normal for them to take on leadership with their superior expertise. Boxer and Clover will use the horse rake or the cutter. And tramp across the field slowly, a pig walking behind, crying out, 'Help, comrade, or 'help me back, comrade!' as it might be. (There were no parts or reins needed in these days,) And every animal worked to make the hay into the most modest. (Orwell, p.11)

The pigs start to act like their former master, Mr Jones. Instead of working, they start to command others to do their work; they act like if they are the masters and other animals are slaves. In spite of that, other animals are willing to do whatever the pigs want; they actually start to work for the pigs. This state contradicts what Old Major's predicted when he spoke about equality that would come to Manor Farm when they defeat humans. Therefore, animals find themselves working all day again, but this time, they work for another master, for pigs.

Although these animals are still colonized by a different colonizer, they never feel that they are colonized. This feeling resulted from the pigs' aim to convince animals with Animalism belief, what they produce is what they consume. It is true and that what makes the animals happy and satisfied, the number of productions that the animals start to have more than what they used to have under the rule of Mr. Jones. So now they have more food to eat and more free time.

Due to their position as the new ruler of the farm, the pigs begin to implement their policies. Most of these policies are an act of mimicry about the humans' habits and rules. These policies were the reason behind the conflict between Napoleon and Snowball, who has a contrasting policy regarding how far mimicry should be conducted:

The pigs had named the harness room as their centre of operations. They learned blacksmithing, carpentry, and other required arts from books they had taken out of the farmhouse in the evenings. Snowball was still busy organizing the other animals into Animal Committees, as he named them. He was unstoppable in his efforts. He founded the Egg Production Committee for hens, the Clean Tails League for cows, the Wild Comrades' Re-Education Committee (to tame rats and rabbits), the Whiter Wool Movement for sheep, and other organizations (Orwell, p.11).

Pigs make themselves busy with reading humans' books while other animals do their jobs. The hierarchal system that the pigs wanted to get rid of has returned now because pigs see themselves as superiors, and any other animal on the farm is inferior to them. Pigs have now actually replaced humans as the superior race. With their growing obsession with human knowledge, pigs make their own committees as an implementation of human governance. Mimicry as well starts to be implemented to all other animals on the Farm through human cultures, such as funerals. When Mr Jones tries to take the farm back from the animals, the animals fight back and force Mr Jones and his men to retreat, but they lose many lives. When the battle ends, the animals conduct some kinds of human rituals during the funeral of their fellow comrades who sacrificed their lives for the sake of the rest. Other humans' habits are mimicked after the end of the battle, like having a celebration, raising a flag, and sing victory songs. At the end of the funeral, Squealer does a speech in which he encourages animals so they

will defend and die for the sake of the farm if they are attacked in the future. This kind of speech, Darmawan (2018) argues, has been done by the Soviet comrades when one of their fellow soldiers die. Not only honouring the fallen comrades, but also they do other ceremonies like set the gun up at the foot of flagstaff and fire them twice a year.

Perhaps, the most vivid act of mimicry that animals do after the rebellion is creating their own system of education. The pigs decide to make a school; they aim to teach literature to all animals on the farm. By the end of the autumn, all animals on the farm were able to read and write (Orwell, p.13). In Bhabha's views about education in colonization, he argues that education in colonized nations is usually used for the benefit of the colonizer (p.14). Macaulay also argues that "mimic man raised through our English schools" (p.11). It indicates that the colonizers, through schools, aim to propagate their culture. In *Animal Farm*, Napoleon builds a school to teach other animals what the pigs have learned from humans. In spite of its seemingly noble purposes, there is another important aim for the pigs besides teach other animals writing and reading. The pigs' hidden aim is to keep other animals under their control. It became easier to keep the animals under the pigs' sight.

In this respect, the pigs are playing the role of colonizers, and other animals are the colonized who are forced to learn the colonizers' culture. Therefore, pigs are forcing other animals to mimic humans. Unconsciously, animals still inferior to "Man" because animals still see humans as superior to them, and humans' way of life is the best way of living. Pigs became aware that without humans' science, the farm will never progress, and they will never have enough food. The ability of learning varies from one animal to another. The pigs can easily learn reading and writing, as for other animals like goats and dogs, they study hard and can easily follow the pigs. On the contrary to these animals, horses like Clover and Boxer are slow; they are physically strong but mentally weak. Napoleon decides to make use of these animals by giving them hard works.

George Orwell uses the term "Stupider animal" in order to refer to the animals that cannot learn reading and writing. Orwell depicts animals that can read as superior. In other words, animals that can mimic humans the most (in this case, the pigs) are in higher rank than animals that cannot mimic "Man". From the context, Snowball seems to be the cleverest animal on the farm. He starts to show the animals pictures from

books; these pictures are mainly machines that help humans in the harvest works. His aim is to build such machines to enhance the productions of the farm. Snowball starts to encourage other animals to think like humans by using human machines.

Meanwhile, Napoleon is unhappy with the progress of the farm, not because he does not like technology but because technology is being presented by Snowball, this makes the latter adored by other animals, and this makes Napoleon jealous. Napoleon starts to disagree with whatever decision Snowball makes. Napoleon begins to claim that animals must return to old traditions and give up humans' technology. As a replacement, Napoleon promises animals more food. Napoleon uses food as his slogan in his campaign against Snowball: "Vote for Napoleon and the full manger" (p.20). On the other hand, Snowball is thinking to liberate other farms from the rule of humans. Snowball's idea is to hire pigeons to stir up rebellion in other farms neighbouring Manor Farm. Every day, those pigeons fly to the neighbouring farms and spread out the motto of "Animalism". Snowball promises the animals that when the neighbouring farms become free from humans' rule, the animals will share the products with other farms, and in this case, the animals will work only three days a week. Snowball's slogan is "Vote for Snowball and the Three-day week" (p.20).

The competition between Snowball and Napoleon is, without any doubt, an imitation of humans' features. Although Napoleon, as he claims, claims to be against mimicking humans' habits, he makes humans' habits when propagating himself and his policies to animals. When Snowball starts to give his passionate speech about technology, Napoleon responds pathetically with a brief and an affecting resort. Other animals seem interested in what Snowball says, and just before the animals start to give their votes, Napoleon orders nine dogs to attack Snowball and force him to leave the farm. Now the other animals are forced to take with "the dogs growling menacingly" at Napoleon's foot; Napoleon declares, "from now on, meetings will be conducted strictly for symbolic purposes." He claims that "all major decisions would be made solely by the pigs." (p.37)

Later, many of the animals feel disturbed and confused. Squealer explains to the animals that in taking the leadership, Napoleon is making a huge sacrifice, and he is putting a lot of responsibilities upon himself and that, "as the cleverest animal", he serves "the best interest of all by making the decisions" (p.38). Such declarations

soothe the animals, although they are still shocked by the exclusion of Snowball. Squealer tells the animals that Snowball is a criminal and traitor. Finally, the animals are forced to admit this version of incidents, and some animals like Boxer adds greatly to Napoleon's prestige by implementing the proverbs "I will work harder" and "Napoleon is always right." These two proverbs rapidly strengthen each other when, one month after the expulsion of Snowball, Squealer tells the animals that Napoleon agrees about the windmill project. He clarifies that Napoleon never really opposed Snowball's idea; the leader simply uses his apparent disagreement as a manoeuvre to overthrow the mischievous Snowball. He claims that these tactics attended to "advance the collective best interest". These words of Squealer prove so tempting, and the barks of his three-dog back-up so intimidating, that the rest of the animals agree to his justification without question.

In this part of the story, George Orwell illuminates Napoleon's "corrupt and power-hungry motivations". Although against mimicry, Napoleon unabashedly and openly takes hold of power for himself. Just like human politicians, he throws out his opponents with no justification and manifests a bald-faced inclination to modify history so as to delay his own ends. In the same way, when Lenin died, Stalin expelled Trotsky from Russia and strengthen his domination of the country. Orwell's experience in a "persecuted Trotskyist political group in the late 1930s during the Spanish Civil War may have contributed to his comparatively positive portrayal of Snowball" (Nawaz, 2015, p.21). Eventually, Trotsky was assassinated in Mexico, but "Stalin continued to evoke him as a phantom threat, the symbol of all enemy forces when he began his bloody purges of the 1930s. These purges appear in allegorized form in the next chapters of Animal Farm" (Nawaz, 2015, p.21).

Darmawan argues that the victory of Napoleon did not end the process of mimicry. On the contrary, Napoleon used mimicry more radically than Snowball ever had (p.65). It means that colonization does not end with Napoleon's victory; only the colonizer has changed, colonization becomes an ongoing and continuing process. In this case, mimicry caused a new kind of colonization that is "internal colonization". S. W. Williams (2001) argues that "internal colonization is a physical conquest within and not across the boundaries of the political region" (p.125). In this case, pigs are doing this internal colonization within Manor Farm. This colonization is highlighted by

the degree of mimicry that the pigs adapted after the departure of the old colonizers, humans. The “internal colonial model is developed to illustrate the fact the colonialism is not necessarily an external phenomenon; it occurs within one country” (p.125).

The animals worked very hard for what they left of the year. Their main job is to build the windmill. Just like what Mr Jones used to do when he was on the farm, Napoleon decides that animals will never receive food without working on Sunday afternoons. However, because now they work for their own and for their animal leader, they are willing to accept extra labour. Boxer, for instance, pledges himself to Animal Farm, “doing the work of three horses but never complaining. Even though the farm possesses all of the necessary materials to build the windmill, the project presents a number of difficulties” (Darmawan, p.66). The only difference now is that animals now use their brains and the knowledge they gained from school in completing their works. For example, they fight over how to break down a stone into controllable sizes for construction without crowbars and picks, which they cannot use anymore. Eventually, they realize that the problem cannot be solved without using their brains, just like humans. They learn to “raise and then drop big stones into the quarry, smashing them into usable chunks”.

Although they are working very hard, the animals do not suffer any more like they were under the rule of humans. Now animals have enough food to eat and can sustain the farmlands without difficulty now that Mr Jones and his men do not come to “cart off and sell the fruits of their labour”. However, Manor Farm lacks a number of substances that cannot be produced on the farm, such as paraffin oil, nails, and iron. As the current materials of these substances start to run low, the new leader declares that he has employed a human attorney called Mr Whymper to help them in “conducting trade on behalf of Animal Farm” (Orwell, p.43). Whymper starts to visit the farm every Monday morning, and Napoleon now is more connected with humans than ever. Napoleon starts to give orders. Meanwhile, pigs seem to have more freedom more than other animals. Napoleon establishes the policy of voice; all animals must keep their voices low except dogs and pigs. Darmawan argues that all decisions and responses in this stage are decided by a single voice that is the pigs’ voice:

Any concerns about the farm's operation will be resolved in the future by a special committee of pigs presided over by him. Both groups will meet in

private and then inform the rest about the group of their decisions. On Sunday mornings, the animals will always meet to salute the banner, sing *Beast of England*, and collect their weekly instructions, but there would be no further arguments. (Orwell, p.21)

This committee that Napoleon decides to make represents a shift in Old Major's values of equality. Now there is a dominant race that is pigs; before that, animals used to hold meetings and discuss farm issues. Now every important decision is the committee's work.

What is worth mentioning here is that while at first, he refused humans' culture, which was embraced by Snowball, Napoleon reaches to the idea that by mimicking humans' rules and laws, he might have the chance to gain full authority over all animals? Bhabha argues that at first, mimicry appears as a process of disavowal; those who mimic the colonizers feel that they are superior to others (Bhabha, p.86). By making his own committee, hiring his own attorney, and ordering animals to build the windmill, Napoleon begins to discard his own culture and adopt the old colonizer's culture. The growing oppression is related to Napoleon's continual adoption of humans' habits. In this respect, the further he conducts mimicry, the more dictator he becomes. Now "the animals watched his coming and going with a kind of dread, and avoided him as much as possible" (Orwell, p.26). On the other hand, for the pigs, seeing Napoleon giving orders for Mr Whymper, "who stood on two legs", roused their pride, and they start to realize that their relationship with humans is not similar to what it had before.

The pigs start to walk on two legs, sleep in the bed, and threaten other animals with food. They start to forget their hatred towards humans, the old colonizers and begin to show their admiration for the old colonizers' habits, at the same time oppressing other animals who were convinced of pigs' supremacy. For example, when the time comes to build the windmill, the pigs ordered other animals to work day and night, or they never get food. The pigs not only compel other

Orwell also remarks on the recurring nature of oppression. As Napoleon and other pigs gain enough power, they converted more and more corrupt. Rapidly they personify "the very iniquity that Animal Farm was created to overturn" (Orwell, p.26). Throughout Animal Farm, the pigs progressively bear a resemblance to humans,

ultimately flouting altogether “Old Major’s strictures against adopting human characteristics” (Darmawan, p.70). With the pigs’ moving sleeping in the beds, Orwell comments upon “the way that supreme power corrupts all who possess it”, converting all tyrants into power-hungry, self-serving and ruthless objects that can exist only by dominating others. When animals see pigs sleep in beds and walk on two legs, they become disturbed (Orwell, p. 27). Such acts reveal that there is a shift in power on the farm. While they sleep in beds and eat in the kitchen, the pigs forbid other animals to act like them. This does not only show the imbalance in pigs’ way of life but also indicates the appearance of a new dictatorship on the farm. Other animals start to realize that pigs are using them for their own benefit.

The winter comes, and animals decide to rebuild the windmill, and Napoleon continues in oppressing animals by a special committee of pigs. The sole job of those members is to give instructions to others. The committee members force animals to work day and night but without any benefit. Then the pigs decide to ask humans for help. The humans tell the animals that the wall is not thick enough to bear a windmill, so the animals decide to build two walls instead of one. To do that humans’ machines and humans’ materials. This act of mimicry enables animals to work twice as before, but as the work gets harder, food starts to run off. Meanwhile, and in spite of the lack of food and sources, Napoleon contracts with some humans to sell them two hundred eggs per week. The animals react with shock because one of the main forbidden acts that made Old Major act against humans is selling animals’ products and eggs in particular. Napoleon’s cruel act makes some animals rebel against him. The hens react violently, but Napoleon “responds by cutting their rations entirely. Nine hens die before the others give in to Napoleon’s demands”. Stealing the sources of the colonized nation is one of the main purposes behind colonization.

The limitation of birth control that Napoleon decides is another form of colonization on the farm:

Somehow, without richening the livestock themselves except for dogs and pigs, the farm seems to have become wealthier. This may have been partly because too many pigs and dogs were around. It was not because, according to their style, these beings could not perform. There was constant work under control, as Squealer was never tired of illustrating. (Orwell, p.50).

With birth limitation control, Napoleon wants to ensure that animals will never rebel against him. Also, dogs and pigs start to sabotage animals' works. Such acts make animals angry with Napoleon, they start to question the real intentions of Napoleon, but Napoleon puts the blame on Snowball. To their life-threatening dismay, the animals hear that Snowball has been sneaking to the farm when animals are sleep and sabotaging the efforts of the animals. Napoleon confirms that he is able to sense Snowball's existence everywhere, and every time something that seems bad occurs, Snowball is the one to blame. Squealer declares that Snowball now is sealing himself to Mr Frederick, another owner of a farm, and secretly, Snowball has been aiding Mr Jones in his fight against the animals.

With his special forces of dogs, and his followers of pigs, Napoleon seems to be more powerful than ever, and pigs are living in prosperity comparing to others. As for other animals, "As far as they understood, their life was still as it was. They were starving, sleeping on paws, they drank from the swimming pool and worked on the fields; the wind hit them in winter and the flights in season." (p.50). Orwell continues to confirm the idea that animals' state has not been changed, it became worse: "Older ones often struck their dim memory, trying to decide if things were better or worse in the early days of the Rebellion when Jones' expulsion was already new" (p.50).

With the increasing of Napoleon and the pigs' tyranny, mimicry increases. Pigs act more and more like humans while they hide in the false information that Squealer spreads. After the bloody executions that they have made, the pigs start to drink wine that they take from Mr Jones's basement and celebrate like humans. As the leader of the animals, during the celebration, Napoleon wears a bowler hat which was the property of Mr Jones. He recalls what the previous owner of the farm has been doing and tries to copy his habits. Squealer drinks alcohol as well, and while he is drunk, he gathers all animals on the farm and announces that Napoleon is dying. Of course, this announcement is not true at all, but Squealer is under the influence of alcohol. While he is under alcohol, Napoleon makes a new policy which says that any animal drinks alcohol will be punished by death. Of course, his new rule is not applied to the pigs; actually, the main purpose behind Napoleon's new law is to keep alcohol for the pigs

only. This shows that pigs see themselves as superior to other animals; now, they are the new humans, the new colonizers.

After the bloody acts that Napoleon takes against those who disagree with his decisions, the animals discover that the pigs have changed one of the commandments, which was reading: “No animal shall kill any other animal” to “No animal shall kill any other animal without a cause”. In addition to that, Napoleon now has changed his title from “Leader” to various other titles. He also has his own poet now; the main job of the poet is to praise Napoleon in his poems. Minimus, the poet, makes a poem in which he glorifies the life under Napoleon; Napoleon is described as “Fountain of happiness!” but also “Lord of the swill-bucket!” Napoleon has become a human dictator; he is changing all the rules and laws for his own benefit. For instance, when he became addicted to alcohol, Napoleon orders Squealer to change the commandment, which reads “No animal shall drink alcohol” to “No animal shall drink alcohol to excess”.

The process of mimicry does not end with Napoleon coping with Mr Jones’s habit of drinking alcohol, using humans’ sources more common among the animals in Manor Farm. After the wine incident, the pigs begin to wear green ribbons on Sundays; these ribbons mark pigs as having a higher position on the farm. The Commandments of Animalism that was first made by Old Major forbid animals to wear humans’ attire, but pigs’ do not commit themselves to these Commandments anymore. Ironically, pigs scold Molly she wears a ribbon; this irony indicates the way in which the pigs seeing themselves above the law. According to Bhabha, what differentiates normal colonized and colonized who do mimicry is “the part-objects of the colonizer” (Bhabha, p.92). This “part-object” represents the colonizer, and in Animal Farm, human clothes and humans’ accessories become the part-object.

After a year of Napoleon’s rule, animals start to realize that they are working like slaves, but instead of protesting against the pigs, they work harder and harder because they think that they are free because the rules is an animal. This is what Darmawan (2018) calls internal colonization, which is not seen by the colonized because it is done by the same race or class; the animals do not realize they are colonized by the pigs (p.73). Moreover, the pigs’ way of using propaganda and the sense of togetherness make the animals believe that they have a common enemy, and

without Napoleon's cleverness, they would be slaved by humans. So whatever the pigs do, they do it under the term of "Animalism".

Weakly and wearily, the animals begin to rebuild the windmill. Although Boxer stays extremely injured, the horse does not show any sign of being tormented and rejects the idea of leaving his labour for even a day. Boxer's friend, Clover, bandages him; eventually, Boxer improves, but his "coat doesn't seem as shiny as before, and his great strength seems slightly diminished". Of course, Clover learns how to treat patients from Mr Jones's books. Boxer says his sole aim to finish building the windmill before he retires. However, animals do not retire on Manor Farm. After the rebellion, all animals have agreed that all horses may retire at the age of twelve. Animals now can retire and die in peace, just like humans.

"Food is becoming scarcer", and all livestock receive decreased rations, but dogs and pigs also have much food. Squealer provides several figures to show that "the rations outweigh that which they got under Mr Jones" for this "readjustment." Squealer says that the whole farm would prosper if the dogs and the pigs get more food. When the piglets of Napoleon, thirty-one in total, are born in four sows, Napoleon commands that a schoolhouse should be constructed to train them, as the funds are diminishing. This act shows that Napoleon learned from humans that schooling is an integral part of societal development. Napoleon begins to gather gatherings called Spontaneous Demonstrations, in which animals have to march around the farm's walls, "listen to speeches and joy in the glory of animal farming." When the sheep start to grumble, other animals throw them out with "Four healthy legs, two poor legs!"

Boxer becomes very ill, and his strength fails him. The pigs tell other horses that they will take Boxer to the hospital. When the vehicle arrives, one of the horses reads the inscription on the "cart's sideboards" and declares that the pigs are sending Boxer to a "glue maker" to be slaughtered. The animals freak out and start shouting to Boxer to escape from the cart. The old horse begins kicking, trying to find a way out, but he fails. Soon after that, Squealer declares that they have lost Boxer: when he arrived at the hospital, doctors could not help him. Squealer says that Boxer was "He was by the great horse's side when he passed, and he describes it as "the most stirring sight he has ever seen"—"Boxer died celebrating the glory of Animal Farm," he notes. Boxer was not "taken to a glue plant," according to Squealer, who says that "the doctor

actually purchased the cart from a glue manufacturer and had forgotten to paint over the lettering". The animals feel relief when hearing this news. The animals feel completely soothed when Napoleon praises Boxer in his speech. Just after Napoleon's speech, the farm gets a delivery from the grocer, and noises of carousing explode from within. The animals start to ask questions about the source of money when they see pigs buy a crate of whisky while they did not have any money at first.

In this part of the novel, the animals, especially pigs, seem to have become more like humans with animalistic appearance. The process of mimicry increases more and more. Now the animals exchange goods with humans, also instead of the primitive treatment that has been used when one of the animals gets sick now they go to the hospital. Moreover, Snowball uses the word "doctors" instead of a vet when he describes Boxer's death. Bhabha says "almost the same but not white" the "visibility of mimicry is always produced at the site of interdiction" (p.130). In this case, animals are almost the same as humans but not humans. Napoleon acts exactly like Mr Jones; in addition to drinking alcohol and becoming addicted to it, he is slaving animals, stealing their products, controlling their food, executing the weak ones, and selling meat to butchers as did with Boxer.

After many years, many animals aged and died, and few remember the times before the revolution. Now the new windmill is ready to use, but it isn't used for generating electricity for crushing corn, "a far more profitable endeavour". The pigs and dogs seem to live a comfortable life even more than before. Squealer clarifies that the dogs and pigs are doing very significant work—they fill out forms and do paper works. Most of the others accept this explanation, and their way of living never changes. "They never lose their sense of pride in Animal Farm or their feeling that they have differentiated themselves from animals on other farms" (Darmawan, p.78). The residents of Manor Farm still ardently believe in the aims of the Revolution—"a world free from humans, with equality for all animals". Of course, the concept of quality that Old Major used in his speech has been ignored by the pigs from the first day after the Rebellion.

Squealer takes off the lambs to a distant place to give them instructions about the new chant. Soon after that, Clover shouts out to other animals, and they quickly come to the yard. The "Squealer, marching toward them on his hind legs, attracts the

attention of the creatures. Napoleon arrives shortly after, walking upright and wielding a whip". Just before others react to this astonishing change, the sheep start to sing, all together: "Four legs good, two legs better!" Clover asks Benjamin to read the inscription written on the wall where the "Seven Commandments" were first written. All commandments have been omitted only the last one has been changed from: "all animals are equal" to "all animals are equal, but some animals are more equal than others." In the following days, Napoleon "openly smokes a joint, and the other pigs continue to subscribe to human publications, listen to the radio, and begin to install a telephone, all while dressing in human clothes retrieved from Mr Jones' closet." (Orwell, p.121) In his descriptions of the mimic man, Macaulay argues that gradually the colonized becomes a new version of the colonizer (p.49). Gradually, after reading books, constructing a school, windmill, pigs now seem to be a new version of the old colonizers, very similar to humans. The whip that Napoleon carries seems to an instrument of torture, persecution, and dominance. Before that, Mr Jones and his assistances used the whip to punish, control and torture the animals that do not work enough.

Orwell uses this instrument as a symbol of man's exploitation and abuse and, as such, "is a much-reviled object". The whip was the first thing that animals destroyed after the "Rebellion": "The reins, halters, blinkers, and degrading nosebags were tossed into the garbage fire that was raging in the yard. The whips were as well. When they saw the whips engulfed in fire, all of the animals squealed in delight." (Orwell, p.22) They were delighted because they believed that they had liberated themselves from the pain imposed on them by this dreadful tool. They believed now ensue an era of mutual respect and equality among animals. They will be forever free. Their fear of torture is now something of the past.

In their minds, animals realized that the "pigs are their new masters". From now on, without any question, animals accept whatever the pigs say or do, even when it includes purchasing tools and luxuries reserved for human use and consumption or adopting human traits. Animals' life has gone "full circle", and, in the final sections, no one can distinguish between real humans and the pigs on the farm. Their previous dictators or oppressors have been substituted by a new power in the form of the pigs, which, "ironically", leaves them "worse off than they have ever been. The revolution

has, for all intents and purposes, been a failure for the animals but a massive success for the pigs” (Darmawan, p.83).

Many years pass, the pigs start to connect with humans more than before; they even become friends. Now, they invite over the neighbouring human farmers to take a look at Animal Farm. The humans admire the pigs and express, in “diplomatic language”, their remorse for past “misunderstandings.” Clover and other animals watch through the hole-in-the-wall as Napoleon and Mr Pilkington toast each other; both agree that they share the same problem: “If you have the lower livestock to compete with, we have our lower classes!” says Mr Pilkington. The pigs "have discovered strategies to make Animal Farm's animals function better and with less food than any other community of farm animals in the county," Human observes admiringly. (Orwell, p.146) Mr Pilkington says that he is aiming to introduce these developments on his farm. Napoleon and Squealer respond by comforting their guests that they “never wanted anything other than to conduct business peacefully with their human neighbours and those they have taken steps to further that goal”:

He claims that Animal Farm's animals can no longer treat each other as Comrade or pay tribute to Old Major, nor will they salute a flag with a horn and hoof on it. He tells the men that both of these customs have recently been modified by order. Napoleon also claims the Animal Farm will be called Manor Farm, which he assumes is the right and initial name. (p.145).

The final chapter in the novel shows the complete transformation of the pigs into humans. The process of mimicry has reached its climate. In the final event of the novel, the farmers and the pigs return to their friendly card game while other animals sneak out from a hole. After that, the noises of a quarrel gathered all animals on the farm to listen.

The final chapter of Animal Farm brings the novel to its unavoidable, logical conclusion. The pigs entirely merge totalitarianism and power. Napoleon and other pigs have turned to be identical to men. The meaning of Napoleon’s name has become completely obvious: the real French Napoleon, who ruled his country at the beginning of the nineteenth century and occupied considerable parts of Europe before being beaten at the “Battle of Waterloo” in 1814, initially seemed to be a mighty liberator, conquering Europe’s monarchs and kings and carrying liberty to its people. Then, he in

the end crowned himself “emperor of France”, crushing the visions of European liberalism. Instead of abolishing the aristocracy, he just re-created it around himself. Similarly, the pig Napoleon figures as the champion of Animalism early on. Now, however, he protests to the humans that he wants nothing more than to be one of them—that is, an oppressor.

All over the novel, Orwell’s story is being told from the animals’ perspective. In the chapter, in the case of mimicry, the reader recognizes the dramatic power that was accomplished by this narrative strategy. Pigs and animals became identical so that the reader is reading poems written by pigs, seeing the pigs playing cards or punishing other animals, and finally having their own hierarchy system. Strangely, all other animals remained naïvely hopeful that the colonization and slavery of humans would end with their “Rebellion”. Although “they realize that the republic foretold by Old Major has yet to come to fruition, they stalwartly insist that it will come someday.” These proclamations control the concluding events of the novel with a strong irony. For although the writer employs subtle hints and foreshadowing to make his readers more doubtful than the animals of the “pigs’ motives”, these statements, Aziz (2013) argues, are “of ingenuous faith in Animal Farm on the part of the common animals occur just before the final scene” (p. 5). The gap between the cruel reality of the pigs’ authoritarian rule and the animals’ optimism generates a sense of dramatic difference.

The final picture of the farmers and pigs, identical to each other, playing games together indicates the degree of mimicry to which the pigs have reached. Orwell, however, enables the readers to view the last scene from the animals’ point of view—sneaking at the meeting. By framing the end of the novel like this, the writer points to the animals’ ultimate loss of entitlement and power: “Animal Farm has not created a society of equals but has simply established a new class of oppressors to dominate the same class of oppressed—a division embodied, as at the opening of the novella, by the farmhouse wall” (p.13). Mimicry gave the pigs the power they needed to dominate other animals. Before the Rebellion, it would have seemed logically impossible pigs would be as powerful as humans, but by increasing the process of mimicry, pigs have become equal and sometimes more powerful than humans.

CHAPTER THREE: *THINGS FALL APART*

Things Fall Apart is a novel written by the Nigerian author Chinua Achebe in 1958. It plays a fundamental role in introducing African literature and culture to the readers. In fact, Achebe's work is meant to be as a representation of African history and the history of the European colonization as well, but it has been submitted from an African point of view in a way that he changed the focus of the narrative to the colonized perspective instead of the colonizer's one. The title of the novel has been borrowed from the poem of W. B. Yeats "The Second Coming" in 1919.

Things Fall Apart is seen as an example of a Postcolonial novel that attempts to present the effects of British colonialism on the Igbo people of Nigeria. It demonstrates the richness of African cultural traditions, which is contributed to the correction of the unfair literary and historical views towards African culture and society; it is also characterized by its intelligent and realistic way of treating the tribal beliefs simultaneously with their psychological collapse and social dissociation.

The novel sheds light on the pre-colonial life and the coming of the white man during the late nineteenth century in Nigeria. It deals deeply with the effects of colonialism on the native people of Africa, in addition to discussing the traditional culture of the Nigerian villagers in the novel. Chinua Achebe, in his novel, treats the life of an Igbo leader man, Okonkwo, from his leading period until he accidentally killed a clansman, which led to his banishment from his community for seven years. The story starts by introducing Okonkwo, the protagonist, as a celebrated wrestling champion, a very strong man who never shows weakness.

He decided not to follow his father's shameful life that did not have the qualities of masculinity that a man should have in his village. In fact, Okonkwo wanted to build an entirely self-dependent wealth, as his father Unoka's death was shameful and that he left many unpaid debts. This encouraged him to be a powerful and wealthy leader among his neighbours and to get a respected position in his community.

One day, the elders of Umuofia have assigned Okonkwo to be the guardian of a boy, 'Ikemefuna', whose father has killed an Umuofian woman as reconciliation between the two villages. Okonkwo brought him to live with his family, they were

attached to each other, and although Okonkwo was like a second father, he did not show his love to Ikemefuna in order not to appear weak. When the oracle of Umuofia declares that Ikemefuna must be killed, Okonkwo has been warned by the Ezeudu, the oldest man in the village, to avoid killing Ikemefuna since he is considered as one of his children, but Okonkwo's fear of being feminine and weak among his society did not prevent him from killing Ikemefuna.

After Ikemefuna's death, things changed and began to be wrong for Okonkwo; he took several days to get rid of his feeling of being guilty. Furthermore, his daughter Ezinma falls seriously ill, and they worried she might die. At Ezeudu's funeral, while they are making a gun salute, Okonkwo's gun mistakenly exploded and killed the son of Ezeudu. To appease the offended gods, Okonkwo and his family have been abandoned for seven years in exile. By the coming of the white man to Umuofia, Okonkwo was still away in Mbanta but, he knew that the missionaries brought a new religion, Christianity and that the number of converted people is rising whereas, the new government is constantly growing. At that time, the Umuofians were divided into converters and resisters. When he returned from exile, Okonkwo saw noticeable changes in his village and its people, so he and other village leaders have burned the new church, and this is what led to jail and humiliation by the missionaries.

When Okonkwo killed a colonial messenger, he did not find who stands behind him because of his divided villagers, which led to his suicide. This act violated the Igbo traditions of death, which prevented Okonkwo from getting a proper burial.

The novel is served as an alternative image to the stereotypical European representations of Africa, through which Achebe depicts vividly the sociocultural realities of the Igbo people, and thus Achebe attempts to obtain correct historical records by recounting the history of Africa from an African perspective. In fact, the novel is considered a realistic representation of the hybrid identity of Achebe and his society in the postcolonial era; it reflects the ambivalence of Achebe's identity and the consequences of colonial encounters. He lived in a multilingual community in which he has been influenced by the English language. Accordingly, he used the English language in his novel because it is considered a second language for him and that he has studied it in his childhood, the same thing his country Nigeria has experienced at that time.

Chinua Achebe's *Things Fall Apart* is the first Postcolonial African literary work that reflects the social and political conditions in Africa. In this sense, Achebe, in his novel, adopts the central themes and concepts of postcolonial literature such as mimicry and hybridity in culture, identity, ideology, and language. Thus, the novel *Things Fall Apart* is considered the best example to clarify the proper identifications of the mimicry concept. Additionally, the African novelist Achebe formulates his first novel under the name of the anti-colonial discourse in an objective way by which he exposes both the cultural and linguistic mimicry. Hence, the author illustrates that the cultural and linguistic differences are the major causes behind the creation of hybridity in Africa and which particularly appears during and after the arrival of colonial dominance. So, from this perspective, Chinua Achebe (1958) states:

What did the white man say before they killed him?" asked Uchendu. "He said nothing," answered one of Obierika's companions. "He said something, only they did not understand him, " said Obierika. "He seemed to speak through his nose." "One of the men told me, " said Obierika's other companion, "that he repeated over and over again a word that resembled Mbaino. Perhaps he had been going to Mbaino and had lost his way. (Achebe, p.45)

The flexible nature of the Igbo community manifests itself in several ways in the novel. It is reflected in Uchendu's assertion that the old and new generations do not have much in common concerning the willingness to keep relationships secure. Uchendu represents the past generation who understands the meaning of social integrity. The unity that Achebe portrays among the younger seems to be less strong than the one Uchendu had once experienced in his life. Though, it is quite obvious that in every community, no two generations are the same. The writer intensely shows that the Igbo community gradually faces an ill-fated change with the arrival of colonialism. However, for Thiong'o (1993), —Cultures that change to reflect the ever-changing dynamics of internal relations and which maintain a balanced give and take with external relations are the ones that are healthy (p.16).

Through reading TFA, one might undoubtedly witness that as soon as the colonizers enter Nigeria, the whole population partake in a perplexing web of change. Even though there is a distinct contrast in the people's will against colonial rule,

Achebe creates characters like Okonkwo, Uchendu, Obierika, and others that emblemize the true nature of his society. These characters are true representatives of their culture regarding preserving traditional values. They are entirely opposed to any hegemonic power that aims at the distortion of their culture, whereas others easily give in to the influence of an alien society. Therefore, through the coming of white people, TFA presents the conscious and unconscious types of characters. The former are those who enthusiastically struggle to protect their country from an outsider, and they label the latter as worthless beings. Central to this view is the instance when Obierika visits Okonkwo in Mbaino; he informs him that Abame is no longer the same because the white people have destroyed the majority of the clan.

What distresses Uchendu and Okonkwo is the fact that Abame villagers were not able to defend themselves. It is fascinating to elaborate Uchendu's perspective on such people by clarifying the story he tells to Obierika to emphasise the real reason behind their destruction by the British colonizers. As a knowledgeable elder, his purpose of bringing the story of Mother and Daughter Kite is to relate Abame's downfall to the failure of its people to equip themselves with their weapon against the enemy despite the warning they received from the Oracle. Since they were not able to defend themselves, they deserved to face such a fate. Obierika states that the Abame clan "have paid for their foolishness" (TFA, p.140).

Deep down in their hearts, these characters are so sad for Abame, and what distresses them more is the inability of the people to react to the coloniser's attack. However, nearly two years after such an incident, the colonisers widely penetrate the Igbo community and introduce their religion, education, and system of administration. Umuofia, once feared by all the neighbours, now faces a situation that tremendously disappoints all the leaders or title holders. As soon as the colonisers arrive, they begin to have converts among the men, who are usually called Efulufu, which means insignificant or worthless beings. For the narrator, Chielo calls them "the excrements of the clan" (p.143). Even if the converts are not of prestigious types, their conversion into the coloniser's culture would definitely disturb the collective power that a successful culture might have as a means of opposition.

As Retd and Maut (2014, p.8) notice, colonialism profoundly alters the unity of pre-colonial Igbo. While Okonkwo is the emblem of cultural conservation, Nwoye is

one of the converts who wholeheartedly accept the culture of the colonisers. However, his excuse is justifiable because he continually thinks about the absurdity of some cultural customs and rules like killing Ikemefuna and twins. Nwoye is the only character who is profoundly influenced by the demerits of his culture. Additionally, the missionaries, through religious songs, attracted the interest of the young, especially, Nwoye about the excellence of their religion. The narrator states: "It was the poetry of the new religion, something felt in the marrow" (TFA, p.147). Each time, the question of killing such innocent beings comes into his mind; Nwoye finds relief by listening to the white men's hymn because as Olsson (2010, p.14) remarks, for Nwoye, Christianity seemed to be more sympathetic towards twins.

Even though Nwoye is an African man who considers himself one of the missionaries, that is, he accepted the Western beliefs and thoughts in addition to his African background; this makes him a mimic character. Then after, concerning the novel, the white man depends on the translation as a mediator in order to interact with the colonized and to avoid the misunderstanding, which is created by the distinct linguistic consciousness; the narrator here says:

When they had all gathered, the white man began to speak to them. He spoke through an interpreter who was an Ibo man, through his dialect was different and harsh to the ears of Mbanta. Many people laughed at his dialect and the way he used words strangely. Instead of saying "myself," he always said "my buttocks. "But he was a man of commanding presence, and the clansmen listened to him. (Achebe, p.14)

In this regard, the author casts light on the multiplicity of the voices and the double-voicedness created by the colonization within the Postcolonial context. In this manner, the distinction of the languages and voices generates an empty space that prevents the interaction and contact with the other. Thus, this confusion requires the hybridity or "Third space", the concept of Bhabha that reflects the process of negotiation by the use of translation. According to Hoogvelt (1997) "hybridity," is "celebrated and privileged as a kind of superior cultural intelligence owing to the advantage of the in-betweenness, the straddling of two cultures and the consequent ability to negotiate the difference" (p.158). Therefore, the space of difference and

negotiation asserts the existence of cultural hybridity. In *Things Fall Apart*, Achebe tries to depict the diversity, difference and contradiction of customs and identities between East and West; he says:

... He said he was one of them; they could see him from his colour and his language. The other four black men were also their brothers, although one of them did not speak Ibo. The white man was also their brother because they were all sons of God. And he told them about this new God, the creator of all the world and all the men and women. He told them that they worshipped false gods, gods of wood and stone. (Achebe, p.158)

In addition to their poetry, the missionaries, through Igbo interpreters, persistently endeavour to spread Christianity among the people. They begin to undermine their traditional religion and label their gods as worthless objects. Under such a condition, the reader will perceive a competitive struggle in which both the coloniser and the colonised disrespect each other's beliefs. When the white man's interpreter attempts to convince the people that there is one God who is the only benevolent creator of the world and the father of a son —whose name was Jesu Kristin (TFA, p.146), Okonkwo interprets the white man's thoughts as the raving of a mad man's mind that needs a reasonable solution.

The attempts of the missionaries result in success in most cases. Since the Igbo have no kings, the missionaries aim at gathering the Umuofia titleholders together. However, they fail to realise that these men cannot be assembled easily. Unlike Umuofia, Mbanta elders accept their offer to have some land so that they can build their churches. They decide to —give them a portion of the Evil Forest (p.149) because this forest is thought to be an ominous place due to the great number of unwanted corpses or evil spirits. The Mbanta people believe that by providing them with some land of Evil Forest, they would disable their power over their cultural tradition. But, such attempts of decolonising their culture will turn out to be against the wishes of Mbanta elders because the missionaries are as safe as living in their houses, whereas Mbanta people —expected them all to be dead within four days. The first day passed, and the second and third, and fourth, and none of them died (p.149). Thus, the coloniser's power and hegemony gradually become much stronger as soon as people

witness that the bad results the Igbo conceive of living in the Evil Forest are nothing but superstitious beliefs. Therefore, they begin to brainwash the young converts to defy all the gods and burn their shrines as well.

Despite the coloniser's reasonable attempts in defending twins and falsifying gods, initially, their work is met with constant reactions by men who truly resist their power, but day by day, the decolonising struggle of the Igbo loses its strength. After the white people prove the rationality of their religious methods, they begin to stimulate the villagers to come to their churches and worship God. For instance, Mr Kiaga, who is the interpreter and the teacher, continuously works on inspiring children, the young, and those women who intensely suffered from severe cultural traditions.

What crucially works to the advantage of the missionaries is the abandonment of cultural values and family relations to the commitment of Christianity. Nneka is one of those women who remarkably reminds the reader of her culture's unreasonable custom of killing twins. After witnessing the murder of several of her twins, she heartbrokenly gives in to the coloniser's culture. This female character, like Nwoye, is forced to forsake her family relations. Similar to Nneka, Nwoye denies any attachment to his father because Okonkwo severely beats him for attending Christian churches. Afterwards, he decides to go to school in Umuofia, where the white men have set up their headquarters and schools to teach the people. Mr Kiaga is overjoyed by seeing Nwoye's complete allegiance to their power because one of the coloniser's aims is to cut off all the intimate relations and family ties that contribute to the homogeneity of the Igbo community. "Mr Kiaga's joy is very great. Blessed is he who forsakes his father and his mother for my sake", he intoned" (Achebe, p.152).

What intensely hurts Okonkwo's feelings is the reality of not being able to control his own son against the hegemony of the colonising power in spite of his persistent refusal of Nwoye's personality. The novel explains that initially, Okonkwo decides to take his machete and destroy the whole group of unlawful outsiders, but soon he realises that Nwoye never deserves to fight for. Unfortunately, a man who is the epitome of bravery and cultural heritage is the father of such a child. The narrator states that Okonkwo is deeply injured in his heart and asks himself why "should he...of all people, be cursed with such a son?" (p.152). the colonizers have successfully swayed the converts to commit crimes that were never heard in the

lifetime of the community because for Okonkwo, leaving the gods and ancestors with the purpose of adhering to an alien culture is “the depth of abomination” (Achebe, p.153).

In addition to religion, the white people endeavour to introduce their system of administration. They establish “a place of judgement in Umuofia to protect their followers” (p.155) and sentence those who disrespect their power. For Basu (2014, p. 51), colonial rule deforms “the psyche of the oppressed”. Unlike the Igbo, the Christians could verify their religious practices depending on The Holy Bible. Mr Kiaga persistently works on brainwashing the converts so that they would never doubt their religious beliefs. He usually tells them that the heathens say: “nothing but falsehood” (TFA, p.157). As for the Igbo, Christianity is the sort of religion that welcomes abominations like accepting twins and denouncing the idea of killing them. Therefore, Mr Kiaga reminds the villagers that nothing happened to them by saving twins or building their church in the Evil Forest.

Besides twins, Mr Kiaga aims at freeing the outcasts or Osu from the fear of degrading the power of gods or ancestors, which is instilled in them by their clans. The outcasts of Mbanta are people who “could neither marry nor shave their hair” (p.156). The Osu live in a part of the village separated from the clan, and they are deprived of all their village assemblies and titles. More than this, they are made to believe that when they die, they will be buried in the Evil Forest. Accordingly, the church seems to signify the only shelter for them, especially after witnessing the acceptance of twins by the missionaries. As soon as the church welcomes the osu, some of the converts express their disagreement. They explain to Mr Kiaga the disapproval of associating with such outcasts, but Mr Kiaga asserts that an osu “needs Christ more than you and I” (p.156). Accepting the outcasts is certainly for the benefit of colonisers because the more they receive people, the more they could impose their power and hegemony over the Igbo.

The British hegemony is also apparent in distorting the traditions the Igbo revered, like respecting the python and conceiving it as a sacred animal. When the outcasts joined their service, they become zealous protectors of the colonising power. Thus, the missionaries instruct them to shave their hair as a means of removing the sign of disgrace. They are encouraged to challenge everything related to the Igbo

culture. For instance, Okoli, one of the outcasts, is accused of “killing the sacred python, the emanation of the god of water”, which is the most favourite animal in the whole Mbanta, besides, “It was addressed as Our Father” (p.157). Whenever a python is killed unintentionally, there must be sacrifices and the arrangement of an expensive burial by the accidental killer. The python’s burial must be as big as a great man’s burial, but Okoli’s case is different as he is not the accidental killer but one for whom the clan decides to arrange a severe punishment.

While Okonkwo suggests that a violent reaction must be done towards Okoli, the elders of Mbanta choose peace instead. Thus, for Okonkwo, these men are merely performing a practice that is usually done by women. In the presence of personal affairs, none of the Mbanta men would like to intervene. They avoid problems that are related to a man and his personal god. One of the Mbanta men says: “When a man blasphemes.... We put our fingers into our ears to stop us a hearing. That is a wise action. For Okonkwo, such an action signifies a coward’s personality. Therefore, he labels Mbanta as “a womanly clan”, and his mind immediately goes to his fatherland where men are warlike and brave (Achebe, pp.158-159).

Umuofia represents manliness and a place where a man could play his real role. The people of Umuofia rarely fear coming across problems; they are zealous protectors of every unwelcome situation. They never show signs of cowardice, “Such a thing could never happen in his fatherland”. Okonkwo regularly encourages Mbanta people to resist the coloniser’s hegemony because they accept every type of abomination. One of the Mbanta men acknowledges that Okonkwo’s view is rational, and he suggests that his people should prevent the outsiders from distorting their cultural values. Then, they start to exclude all the practitioners of their religion from the “privileges of the clan” (Achebe, pp.158-159).

However, the Igbo people’s struggle of decolonizing their culture is met with constant failures because the Christians have formed a community of converts consisting of men, women, as well as children. “Mr Brown, the white missionary” states: “it is only eighteen months since the Seed was first sown among you, I marvel at what the Lord hath wrought”. The decolonising power of Mbanta people affects those women who begin to make some Easter arrangements. They have been ordered by Mr Kiaga “to bring red earth and white chalk and water to scrub the church for

Easter” (Achebe, p.158-159), but they return having being whipped severely by the clan, and they acknowledge that their community has outlawed them. By doing such an action towards women, the Mbanta men think that they are dismantling the coloniser’s power, but in reality, they are merely showing signs of their weakness. More than this, whenever they hear news of Okoli’s death, they think that their gods are still influential because Okoli has received his punishment straightly from the gods for killing the sacred python. So, the people come to believe that there is no point in fighting.

Consequently, due mostly to the irrationality of their view about the world, the collective endeavour of Mbanta people is entirely unable to rule out the coloniser’s hegemony. Thus, Okonkwo eagerly waits to see the ending moments of his exile. He believes that the real ambition of dismantling such an unlawful intrusion will find its dead in his fatherland. However, he expresses his extreme gratitude to his mother’s kinsmen by preparing a large feast through which a reader can observe the unaffected nature of some certain traditional customs by the colonizers. The gathering of kinsmen, performing sacrifices, and expecting elders like Uchendu to break kola nut and pray to their ancestors to provide them with health and children as the symbol of wealth and power are vivid examples of the traditional customs that resisted the coloniser’s hegemony. This case can be linked to the argument of Bhabha, who argues that the definition is significant because it describes the dysfunctional world in which colonized people are compelled to conform or try very hard to reject. The imperial influence is substantial, and the likelihood of joining a hybrid society is almost imminent. The emphasis here would be on the characters' reactions to the fusion between two societies and their ability to adjust to this hybrid world (Bhabha, p.219).

Relatives mean a lot for the Igbo, but unfortunately, the arrival of colonialism aims at cutting off all the intimate relations among the people. The elders presented in this novel are deeply worried about the drastic changes in their cultural aspects and the negative consequences of colonialism on their culture. Therefore, by expressing his gratitude to Okonkwo, an elder member of the Umunna expresses his anxiety about the future of the young people. He tells them: “I fear for you; I fear for the clan” (Bhabha, p.167) because leaving relatives and family members with the purpose of integrating into the new system of society have found a footstep, especially among the young who

could be brainwashed more efficiently by the coloniser's system of beliefs and administration.

The old man's speech foreshadows the partition of the Igbo community, loss of identity, and the cultural assimilation Okonkwo witnesses as soon as he returns to his fatherland because he begins to lose the fame and position that he had formed seven years ago. As Loon and Sardar (1999, p.123) believe, "identity is regarded as the product of an assemblage of customs, practices and meanings, an enduring heritage and a set of shared traits and experiences". In fact, Ashcroft, Griffiths, and Tiffin (1995) go more than this, and they argue that "The post-colonial desire is the desire of decolonised communities". Therefore, Okonkwo does not want an identity "thrown into mimicry and ambivalence" (p.125), but the intrusion of European power has deprived him of the opportunity of attaining the highest title in the clan. Thus, he comes across a situation that weakens his will, as the narrator states: he "lost his place among the nine masked spirits who administered justice in the clan" (TFA, p.171). Now he understands that his fatherland also has gone under the shadow of colonial power. Such a reality shatters most of his future hopes when he has already planned to rebuild two more huts for two new wives and prepare himself to be the lord of the clan. Unfortunately, the colonial hegemony has much more power in destroying his desires and putting obstacles in the way of his lifetime ambitions. The tragedy that most highlights Okonkwo's incapability is when he cannot cease his son from mimicking the coloniser's culture.

It is worth noting that, in Umuofia, the Christians are quite able of brainwashing not only the outcasts and lower classes of people but also title holders. The white people established "a court where the District Commissioner judged cases in ignorancel, and received men for the trail from court messengers. The court messengers come from Umuru, where the majority of colonisers first settled and built their church and government. For this reason, the court messengers, who are called Kotma, are intensely disliked by the Umuofia people because they are "foreigners and also arrogant and high-handed" (p.174). They guard the prison, which is filled with men who stood against colonial rule. The prisoners are forced to work every day, and each time they begin to work, they sing a song that is worth quoting:

"Kotma of the ash buttocks,

He is fit to be a slave.

The white man has no sense,

He is fit to be a slave” (Achebe, p.175).

The Kotma are called Ashy-Buttocks —because of their ashcoloured shorts (p.174). However, they hate to be called by such a name; therefore, they beat the prisoners so severely.

Okonkwo’s individual power still encourages him to react against cultural hegemony when he hears the reality of the loss of Igbo identity and culture. The only thing that intensely puzzles him is how the Umuofia people, who were the epitome of bravery and cultural preservation, have become powerless. Zizek (2003, p. 313) argues that “if the individuals were uneven in terms of power, the order could be guaranteed through sheer domination”. Okonkwo is the only character who never stops preserving his culture because the colonial power, like a contagious disease, has affected the whole Igbo community, and Okonkwo tries to become the community’s healer from such a disease. He tells Obierika that they should do something to clear their land from the outsiders, but Obierika reminds him that individual efforts could not be as powerful as collective ones. Thus, their attempt will be met with failures, as Obierika says: “Our own men and our sons have joined the ranks of the stranger” (TFA, p.176). Even if they could drive out the colonisers in Umuofia, they could not fight their own people because they are given power. Obierika further states:

The white man is very clever. He came quietly and peacefully with his religion. We were amused at his foolishness and allowed him to stay. Now he has won our brothers, and our clan can no longer act like one. He has put a knife on the things that held us together, and we have fallen apart (TFA, p.176). Postcolonial literature examines the structural transformation that occurred in postcolonial cultures and resulted in the multicultural state in literature and culture. The postcolonial African novel is characterized by its ethnic and linguistic hybridity, which is used to combat colonialism and preserve African socio-cultural traditions. As a defining feature of culture and identity, language is critical in postcolonial studies and critique since it is the medium by

which the colonizer's history, thought, and politics are articulated and by which he thinks the first move toward changing the nation's culture is taken. Indeed, this demonstrates the colonizers' wisdom in presenting his language as a means of education in order to impose their ideas and thereby transform the African people (Obierika, p.54).

No man in Umuofia is as concerned as Okonkwo about the white people's intrusion because they come to be highly respected by the clan. The colonisers employ various methods to accomplish their mission of brainwashing the Igbo about their culture through religion, education, medicine, etc. Mr Brown persistently tries to relegate their gods as false and merely wooden statues. The narrator explains, on Mr Brown's visits to other villages of Umuofia, "he had been presented with a carved elephant tusk, which was a sign of dignity" (p.179), and he gains lots of information about the traditional religion of the Igbo specifically from Akunna, one of the great men of the neighbouring village. Mr Brown attempts to convince him that their gods or religious practices are false and there is only one Supreme God. Akunna enthusiastically explains to him that in spite of the Supreme God or what they call Chukwu, they also believe in other gods and view them as God's messengers. Akunna's endeavour to convince the white man of the validity of their religion can be seen as an attempt at decolonisation because religion has recorded essential roles both in the process of colonisation and decolonisation.

Due mostly to the fact that the worthy men in the Igbo community were firm believers in their traditional beliefs or religion, Mr Brown concluded: "that a frontal attack on it would not succeed" (p. 181). Thus, the white people influence them not only through the church but also school and hospital, and they beg families to send their children to school because religion and education are two essential elements in the coloniser's strategy. For Khatar and Zarrinjooee (2016), Fanon often emphasises that "colonial education" causes an "inferiority complex" because it "invites the black man to follow white man's values and forget his own culture" (p.224). In addition, Gikandi (2000) asserts: "school is a vehicle of colonial rule and conquest" (p.65). As a means of encouragement, the colonisers provided students of different ages with various presents. In this way, the coloniser's power begins to have more effect on the Igbo. For this reason, Okonkwo is deeply grieved when he witnesses these drastic

changes. He grieves for the entire Umuofia, which he sees “breaking up and falling apart”, and he even grieves more for those brave men who have “unaccountably become soft like women” (TFA, p.183).

The Igbo society separated, and the kinship bonds between Igbo people become weakened because of this multiculturalism, which generated an ambivalent identity to the new generation that grows in an Igbo society but learning English language and culture. Furthermore, it leads to cultural assimilation and mimicry; by inserting African forms, Achebe is participating in the process of mimicry and showing how and to what extent the Igbo have assimilated to British culture. The Igbo people started to assimilate the colonizers whose ideologies are imposed through language and education. This passage is taken from the novel, and the oldest man's speech to Okonkwo shows how much colonialism affected the new generation:

An abominable religion has settled among you. A man can now leave his father and his brothers. He can curse the gods of his fathers and his ancestors, like a hunter's dog that suddenly goes mad and turns on his master. I fear for you, I fear for the clan. (TFA, p.183)

However, there is disunity among the colonisers themselves because when Reverend James Smith takes the position of Mr Brown as the head of the church, he detests the way Mr Brown managed the church. For him, the important thing is not to have numerous inappropriate converts who do not deserve Christian values. For the most part, Mr Smith intends to attract the attention of great men of the clan to their culture. As soon as he leads the church, he begins to express his intense aversion to several Umuofian customs, like mutilating dead Ogbanje children. Labelling such a practice as devilish works, Mr Smith condemns the practitioners as devil worshippers. Thus, the novel portrays Mr Smith as the most rigid white missionary who “saw things as black and white. And black was evil (p.184). As Fanon (2008, p.139) states: whiteness symbolises “Justice, Truth, Virginity”, whereas blackness stands for all bad references.

The writer depicts most effectively the coloniser's aim to break up the Igbo culture into pieces and distort every custom they hold in high esteem. For instance, every year, the Igbo form a ceremony to honour the earth goddess with the presence of

the ancestors as Egwugwu. And according to the Igbo tradition, to unmask an Egwugwu publicly means to kill the ancestral spirit, whereas Enoch, who is a zealous convert, dares to perform such a practice which is “One of the greatest crimes a man could commit (TFA, p. 186). For these people, ancestral spirits talk to them through their masks, and during their communication, there is no human being under the mask but a spirit. Consequently, Enoch’s action falsifies such beliefs, and this is another vital sign of partition because the clan might doubt the sanctity of their beliefs in the Egwugwu.

This means that "the hybrid personality" does not represent a unified, cohesive, singular, and coherent body, but rather a fragmented, unstable, numerous, and hybrid one. As a result, hybridity primarily refers to the process of merging, integrating, and combining in order to reflect impurity and variety, and it opposes the uniqueness and fixity of community and personality. That is, in the hybrid community created by the colonial phase, new multicultural types arose within the contact zone as a result of the relationship between colonizer and colonized.

The impact of Enoch’s crime on the clan and the band of Egwugwu profoundly manifests itself in surrounding Enoch’s compound with “machete and fire” as a means of destruction (p. 188). However, Enoch seeks refuge in the church, but the band heads for the church as well. For them, the church stands for all the distortion that has devastated their community. Without paying attention to Mr Smith’s idea of solving the matter, they begin to destroy the church collectively. Achebe's novel depicts the life of African people who live under colonial rule and subtly narrated Achebe's colonial history by his protagonists. Indeed, the African postcolonial novel shows microphones as a way of rebellion. This novel acts as a subversive hybrid style for English; Achebe chooses the vocabulary and literary method of the colonizer himself but does not use the pure one.

It is after the destruction of the church that Okonkwo feels happy once for all these years. He encourages the clan to take more violent action by killing the white men and driving them out of their memory. The clansmen respect his decision as they did before his exile, but they do not kill anyone. When the District Commissioner asks the village leaders to meet each other, Okonkwo reminds them to be well-armed to avoid any situation similar to what Abame people had faced. However, when they meet

the District Commissioner, they put down their machetes and begin to explain the crime Enoch has done towards their entire culture. Unfortunately, the colonisers imprison the leaders and encourage them to mimic their methods regarding religion, education, etc.

Due mostly to the fact that the British people view their culture as superior to all other cultures, they try to prove such an erroneous way of thinking by forcing the Igbo to follow their rules. This is because the colonisers usually impose their power and hegemony over the natives through the use of one of the two contrasting strategies: negotiation and force. Thus, what one might observe in the District Commissioner's attempt can be related to the former as he tells the leaders: "We shall not do you any harm...if only you agree to cooperate with us". To release the imprisoned leaders, the District Commissioner asks for "two hundred bags of cowries" (p.194). The guardians mistreat the leaders so severely, and for Okonkwo, this would not have happened if the clan had accepted his advice of killing the white men. However, out of love and respect for their leaders, the people of Umuofia attempt to collect money to rescue them soon.

Even after their release, the District Commissioner insists on reassuring the superiority of his culture and the power of his queen as "the most powerful ruler in the world" (p.194). Thus, the colonisers justify their cruel treatment by labelling the Igbo as irrational and uncivilised people who need to be disciplined and educated by the British. Their illegal settlement in his community deeply touches Okonkwo. In no way, his mind stops thinking about the severe treatment he received in prison. Therefore, he hopes that the clansmen reach a final decision and act like real warriors to drive out these illegal occupiers, and if they do not cooperate with him, he will resist alone. For him, "worthy men are no more" (p.200). At last, the villagers gather and meet in the marketplace. Okika, one of the leaders whom the white man arrested, speaks to the crowd and encourages them to fight and do whatever contributes to the expulsion of the colonisers from their country, including the clansmen who have followed them. What happens here is that Colonization is the deliberate mechanism of "shifting influences" that form the colonized character, that is to say, forced shifts on the indigenous identity while concurrently correcting the identity and community of the colonizer; this simultaneous process seeks to reshape colonized culture and values in such a way that they are easily managed and admitted by the colonizers.

Unfortunately, the meeting is interrupted by the arrival of some court messengers, and their head announces that the white people have ordered to put an end to the meeting. Okonkwo, whose anger is indescribable, approaches the man and fearlessly beheads him with his machete. Okonkwo is the only one who practices his power without any hesitation because he knows that Umuofia is no longer the place for warlike men. Such an assumption confirms itself when Okonkwo sees people allowing the other court messengers to escape instead of taking action. He hears people saying: "Why did he do it?" (p. 205). Okonkwo finally realises that his power cannot preserve his culture no matter how effortlessly he struggles. Thus, he commits suicide rather than surrender to the authority of the white men because his extreme obsession with masculine strength causes him a sense of estrangement. He realises that no one is as ardent as himself about preserving cultural values and preventing the influence of external forces. Ironically, the District Commissioner plans to write his experiences of civilising the Nigerian and about the story of a "man who had killed a messenger and hanged himself in his future book "The Pacification of the Primitive Tribes of the Lower Niger" (pp. 208-209).

It is reasonable to mention that TFA portrays a kind of people who are caught between two conflicting cultures. Achebe's hero intensely struggles to stimulate the Umuofia people into the preservation of their traditional ways of life and opposition to the colonial power. However, Okonkwo realises that he is all alone in maintaining cultural integrity, and his downfall brought about such self-consciousness. He witnesses the tension between his longing to remain inflexible and society's desire for assimilation.

Alam (2014) argues that "Okonkwo symbolises the essence of Umuofia" and his suicide which is the result of the colonial power "symbolises the suicide of Umuofia's essence" (p.104). However, similar to what Njeng (2008) writes, his "suicide is one of the greatest acts of valour" (p.5). Okonkwo's suicide symbolises the triumph of the coloniser's hegemony and the collapse of the Igbo people's resistance during the occupation.

The novel puts forward two different interpretations of Okonkwo's suicide. On the one hand, one could relate his death to the drastic psychological and social pressure of colonialism on him. On the other hand, his death, which is not anybody's death but

the death of someone who was once the epitome of his culture, symbolises the attempts of the Igbo to decolonise their occupied culture and not to be assimilated by the alien values and the oppressive hegemonic power. Thus, Okonkwo's suicide implies the community's ongoing struggle for decolonisation as they want to sacrifice themselves for rejecting the colonizers' culture. Racial blending reinforces and promotes cultural unity between diverse peoples, while colonial experiences demonstrate how colonial philosophies are built on distinction and bring disparate individuals together in a communication region. The newly emerging ideologies influenced the postcolonial discussion about the acceptance of new identities and the rejection of indigenous ones. These Postcolonial books, the majority of which are novels, are defined by the polyphonic existence of their characters.



CONCLUSION

African literature represents the oral traditions of African people. In the pre-colonial era, Africans proved their culture and existence through oral genres such as proverbs, folktales, and songs. By the arrival of colonization, African aspects of life changed, and many African writers have used the European language as a means of fighting for their independence. These colonial effects are still continuing in the African communities after independence, which led to the emergence of what is called postcolonial African literature; a considerable number of African writers, such as Chinua Achebe, established a new way of writing which is written in both the language of the colonizer in addition to the local language.

In *Things Fall Apart* and Orwell's *Animal Farm*, Chinua Achebe and Orwell depict two of the prominent issues during the twentieth century, Ambivalence and Mimicry. Postcolonial reviewer Homi K. Bhabha asserts that the people of a colonized country imitate the colonizers so as to escape from disorder (Bhabha, 1984, p. 182). In migrant societies, features like hybridity, ambivalence, and mimicry can be seen as recognizable to diasporic people. Diasporic authors handle the problem of identity in their writings. For them, identity is not fixed; identities are partial and plural. The clash of two cultures is the main issue that the migrants suffer from. Their situation is too confusing that they are motivated to construct imaginary homelands.

Therefore, to sum up, Bhabha's discourse of colonialism' is characterized by both anxious repetitions and ambivalence. In trying to do two things at once—constructing the colonized as both similar to and the other of colonizers—it ends up in doing neither properly. As a replacement, it is condemned to be at war with itself, placing radical otherness between peoples while simultaneously attempting to lessen the degree of otherness. Although the aim is to fix knowledge about other people once and for all, this objective is always deferred. In his essay "Of Mimicry and Man", Bhabha constructs these ideas and explores how the ambivalence of the colonized subject turn to be a direct threat to the authority of the colonizers through the impact of mimicry. Bhabha argues that as "one of the most effective and elusive strategies of colonial knowledge and power" (p.85). Bhabha focuses on the fact that in colonial

countries such as India, the British authorities required native people to work on their behalf and thus had to teach them the English language.

African literature has obviously foregrounded during the postcolonial period, and that refers to the struggle issues adopted by Africans against the colonial existence. In this matter, Postcolonial theory is found to deal with the same issues between colonized and colonizer advocated by certain postcolonial writers, such as Frantz Fanon, Homi Bhabha, Edward Said, and Gayatri Spivak. Furthermore, Postcolonialism draws a clear line to study the African narratives and their characteristics as postcolonial literature. In this sense, it focuses on the culture of resistance and negotiation presented by African writers towards the imperial power in order to maintain their own identity and culture.

In *Things Fall Apart* (1958), Chinua Achebe depicts one of the prominent issues during the nineteenth century in Africa, mimicry. Mimicry refers to the emergence of new culture and identity under the colonial conflict between the colonizer and the colonized. Thus, Chinua Achebe adopted the mimicry narrative in the African Igbo portrayal as a reflection of their real life. Moreover, he shows the changes that the colonizers have brought into the Igbo's community. In this matter, through his mimic forms, Chinua Achebe is changing the negative European views on African people as being primitive and savage.

The current study also has the way in which the colonizing power of the British has changed the culture of Igbo society. It emphasised the pre-colonial Igbo identity and portrayed Okonkwo as the symbol of cultural preservation whose identity was formed through wealth, status, titles, and strength. In addition, this study examined the impacts of colonialism on the colonised people and how they responded to the occupier's culture by accepting it and mimic it. In other words, it depicted the hegemony of the coloniser and the native people's resistance to decolonise their own culture. Through Okonkwo, who was the epitome of his community, the work showed that the Igbo kept on resisting the hegemonic power because he was ready to sacrifice his life instead of surrendering to colonial rule. Finally, the study pointed out the negative effects of colonialism, and it conveys a message to resist collectively the hegemony of the colonizers that work for the devastation of the native culture and the erasure of national identity.

In postcolonial African literature, mimicry is very important in the construction of literary works because it is considered as a form of poetics; by using the mimic forms, the writer is engaging in a high level of creativity, where he can add different languages and cultures into the same literary work. The mimic narrative also shows great respect to the diversity of ideologies since it permits the expression of multiple voices, and the most important is that mimicry opens the doors to the former African colonized writers to reflect their current African societies and to resist the colonial domination.

Concerning *Animal Farm*, Orwell does not only pinpoint the policies which were applied by Stalin but also criticizes the belief that the country applied. Communism, the main belief that Stalin promoted to the country at that time, was actually successful in overthrowing the previous leader, Tsar Nicholas II. Stalin proposed Communism because it has equality as the advertisement sign. There is not any class segregation inside this belief. Everyone is equal with no limits. But, in the end, what makes Orwell's anxiety becomes a reality. The equality was only a thin skin. Stalin was applying stricter policies than Tsar Nicholas. Those policies make the people more suffering than before. Orwell satirizes the twentieth-century belief of totalitarianism that was applied to every Stalin's choices of policies. What he proposed is utopia was impossible to gain. At that time, Russia is both colonizers and colonized at the same time. They are colonized by their own people. Thus, they become suffer on their own.

It is hard to draw the different line of mimicry, which is done by the animal and the true act of an animal that is pictured as a human as it is one characteristic of fable. Furthermore, as Letemendia says, George Orwell cleverly writes *Animal Farm* to play the two-sided game with his reader. In some parts, he is clearly emphasizing the qualities of humans in the real world that is owned by beast characters on the farm. For instance, they hold a meeting like humans in a barn in which Old Major injects all animals there with his belief. The way Old Major speech can also show the quality of humans. On the other hand, Orwell also provides pathos and humour to show the differences that separate humans from the beasts. By doing so, Orwell forces the reader to draw a distinction between conduct and personalities that makes humans and beast different. This way to draw a distinction between subtle differences in the similarities

between human and beast is described as finding the interdictory space. Thus, by knowing the place of interdictory space, we can know when the animal is doing mimicry and when they are just doing animal personalities that are humanized.

Mimicry as the response of colonization actually starts to manifest right after the Old Major finishes his event of encouragement. Snowball, who is the smartest pig, breaks into Mr Jones library. In that place, he finds many books that show human's knowledge of the way they make war on the system of life, such as farming, gardening, and so on. From the inferiority complex that is planted to him, Snowball studies more and more in the library, so he gains much knowledge from the library that no animal ever has.

The mimicry that is done by the pigs in *Animal Farm* is an embodiment of how Bhabha's concept of mimicry can have two different purposes. At first, led by Snowball, mimicry can be the mean of resistance. Snowball uses his ability to mimic humans to learn from Mr Jones's library. He learns about the art of war and war strategies. The second, by Napoleon, mimicry is used as a tool of power. He uses mimicry to gain complete authority over the farm.

Bhabha's theory of mimicry is covering the research question enough to correlate with the implementation of mimicry and internal colonization in *Animal Farm*. As a process, mimicry also has a peak. This peak of mimicry appears in the novel as the blurring limit between the colonizer and colonized party. In the last chapter of *Animal Farm*, George Orwell mentions meetings that appear both in the *Animal Farm* and also neighbouring farms owned by a human. Those meetings indicate that human thinks the pigs have similar status with them and vice versa because they have similar interest and power in the economic issues. Those events also indicate that the colonial theory, which is contextualized by the word colonizer and colonized, disappears from the novel at that moment. So, the peak of mimicry is signed by the line between colonized and colonizer that was omitted so the third side, in this case, another animal than a pig on the farm, does not spot any difference between human as their ex-colonizer and pig as their current colonizer.

REFERENCES

- Alam, M. (2014) _Reading Chinua Achebe's Things Fall Apart from the Postcolonial Perspective', *Research on Humanities and Social Sciences*, [online] 4(12), 104. Available: <http://www.iiste.org/Journals/index.php/RHSS/article/download/13617/14216> [accessed 7 Aug. 2018].
- Basu, A. (2014) _Postcolonial Adaptation and Appropriation in Chinua Achebe', *International Journal of English and Literature*, [online] 6(3), 51-52. Available: <http://academicjournals.org/journal/IJEL/article-full-textpdf/3EA5A015099> [accessed 7 Aug. 2018].
- Bhabha, H. (1984). Of Mimicry and Man: The Ambivalence of Colonial Discourse. *October*, 28, 125. <https://doi.org/10.2307/778467>
- Bose, B., Ashcroft, B., Griffiths, G., & Tiffin, H. (1996). The Post-Colonial Studies Reader. *World Literature Today*, 70(2), 483. <https://doi.org/10.2307/40152289>
- Bronte, C. (1983). *Jane Eyre (Bantam Classics)*. Bantam Classics.
- Calvert, P. (2001). Internal Colonisation, Development and Environment. *Third World Quarterly*, 22(1), 51-63. Retrieved May 7, 2021, from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3993345>
- Chaloult, N., & Chaloult, Y. (1979). THE INTERNAL COLONIALISM CONCEPT: METHODOLOGICAL CONSIDERATIONS. *Social and Economic Studies*, 28(4), 85-99. Retrieved May 7, 2021, from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/27861779>
- Chartrand, T. L., & Lakin, J. L. (2013). The Antecedents and Consequences of Human Behavioral Mimicry. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 64(1), 285-308. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-psych-113011-143754>
- Childs, P., & Williams, P. (1997). *An Introduction To Post-Colonial Theory* (1st ed.). Routledge.
- Conrad, J. (2019). *Heart of Darkness*. Independently published.

- Darmawan, R. I. (2020). Revisiting Bhabha's Mimicry in George Orwell's Animal Farm. *PIONEER: Journal of Language and Literature*, 12(2), 141. <https://doi.org/10.36841/pioneer.v12i2.731>
- Fanon, F., & Philcox, R. (2008). *Black Skin, White Masks* (Revised ed.). Grove Press.
- Fiddian-Qasmiyeh, E., & Daley, P. (2020). *Routledge Handbook of South-South Relations* (1st ed.). Routledge.
- Gikandi, S. (2000) Ngugi Wa Thiong'o, New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Hall, S. (1996). *[Questions of Cultural Identity] [Author: Stuart Hall] [May, 1996]*. Sage Publications Ltd.
- Hoogvelt, Ankie Maria Margaretha. Globalization and the Postcolonial World: the New Political Economy of Development. The John Hopkins University Press, 1997.
- Huddart, D. (2006). *Homi K. Bhabha (Routledge Critical Thinkers)* (1st ed.). Routledge.
- Jeffers, F., & Soules, J. A. (1965). Elementary Study of Impulsive Forces. *American Journal of Physics*, 33(12), 1079–1081. <https://doi.org/10.1119/1.1971160>
- Judd, D. (1997). *Empire: The British Imperial Experience From 1765 To The Present* (1st Edition). Basic Books.
- Khatar, S. and Zarrinjooee, B. (2016) 'Hybridity in Culture and Identity: Chinua Achebe's No Longer at Ease', *Journal of Novel Applied Sciences*, [online] 5(6), 224. Available: <http://jnasci.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/07/JNASCII-2016-224-232.pdf> [accessed 7 Aug. 2018].
- McLeod, J. (2000). *Beginning Postcolonialism (Beginnings) by John McLeod (2000–05-04)*. Manchester University Press.
- Morse, R. (1995). *INTO THE STORM (Loveswept)* (0 ed.). Loveswept.
- Njeng, E. (2008) 'Achebe, Conrad, and the Postcolonial Strain', *Comparative Literature and Culture*, [online] 10(1), 5. Available: <https://docs.lib.purdue.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1328&context=clweb> [accessed 7 Aug. 2018].

- Olsson, M. (2010) . Colonial Legacies: Ambivalence, Mimicry and Hybridity in Chinua Achebe's *Things Fall Apart* and Louise Erdrich's *Tracks*, Special Project, Mid Sweden University. Available: <http://www.divaportal.org/smash/get/diva2:302445/fulltext01.pdf> [accessed 7 Aug. 2018].
- Orwell, G., & Steadman, R. (1996). *Animal Farm: A Fairy Story* (50th Anniversary ed.). Houghton Mifflin Harcourt.
- Postcolonialism: An Historical Introduction. (2003). *Nations and Nationalism*, 9(4), 627–628. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1469-8219.00134>
- Rao, R. (2004). The Empire Writes Back (to Michael Ignatieff). *Millennium: Journal of International Studies*, 33(1), 145–166. <https://doi.org/10.1177/03058298040330010601>
- Retd, P. and Maut, D. (2014) _The Impact of Colonizer on the Colonized: A Postcolonial Study of Nigerian Igbo Culture and History in Chinua Achebe's *Things Fall Apart*, *Journal of Humanities and Social Science*, [online] 19(11), 257-260. Available: <http://www.iosrjournals.org/iosr-jhss/papers/Vol19-issue11/Version-2/A0191120108.pdf> [accessed 7 Aug. 2018].
- Said, E. W. (1979b). *Orientalism* (1st Vintage Books ed). Vintage.
- Sardar, Z. (1999). *Orientalism*. McGraw-Hill Education (UK).
- Sharrad, P., Ashcroft, B., Griffiths, G., & Tiffin, H. (1990). The Empire Writes Back: Theory and Practice in Post-Colonial Literatures. *World Literature Today*, 64(3), 537. <https://doi.org/10.2307/40146848>
- Thiong'o, N. (1993) *Moving the Centre: The Struggle for Cultural Freedoms*, London: James Currey Ltd.
- Thiong'O, W. N., Achebe, C., & Serpell, N. (2017). *Devil on the Cross (Penguin African Writers Series)*. Penguin Classics.
- Zizek, S., ed. (2003) *Jacques Lacan: Critical Evaluations in Cultural Theory*, London: Routledge.