



The Fall of British Imperialism in James Gordon Farrell's Works: Silent Native Characters in James G. Farrell's *Troubles* and *The Siege of Krishnapur*



Received: 26/02/2024; Accepted: 27/04/2024

Fakia Chehboub^{1*}, Ramdan Mehiri²

¹Department of Letters and English, University of Constantine 1, Algeria, meriem.chehboub.25@gmail.com

²Department of Letters and English, University of Biskra, Algeria, ramdanmehiri@hotmail.fr

Abstract

James Gordon Farrell is often thought of as one of the key writers of British colonial literature. This article shows how and why native characters are depicted in *Troubles* and *The Siege of Krishnapur*; voiceless, nameless, animal-like figures and infantile. By examining master/subaltern relationship through the use of silent native characters in the two novels, the article aims to reflect on the various elements of postcolonial writings involved in this novel. It briefly sums up some theoretical framework of colonial and postcolonial discourses, and argues how postcolonial points of view are opposed when British characters are living in a colony, and debates the question of how such colony is perceived and represented throughout the silence of the characters as well as their language when speaking. The article also scrutinizes the colonizer's practice of blaming the colonized for their shortcomings and revealing an unjust otherness to bolster the claims that the colonized have to be civilized in order to be accepted in the colonial environment.

Keywords

Farrell;
British Colonial Literature;
Postcolonial Literature;
Voiceless;
Master/Subaltern.

الكلمات المفتاحية

فاريل ؛
الأدب الاستعماري
البريطاني ؛
أدب ما بعد الاستعمار ؛
الصمت ؛
السيد/ التابع.

سقوط الإمبريالية البريطانية في أعمال جيمس جوردون فاريل: الشخصيات المحلية الصامتة في روايتي " الاضطرابات " و " حصار كريشناپور "

ملخص

غالبا ما يُنظر إلى جيمس جوردون فاريل على أنه أحد الكتاب الرئيسيين في الأدب الاستعماري البريطاني. تُظهر هذه المقالة كيف ولماذا تُصوّر الشخصيات الأصلية في روايتيه " الاضطرابات " و " حصار كريشناپور " صامتة ، بلا اسم ، شبيهة بالحيوان ، وطفولية . ومن خلال دراسة العلاقة بين " السيد " و " التابع " عن طريق توظيف الشخصيات الصامتة في الروايتين، تهدف المقالة إلى التفكير في مختلف عناصر الكتابات البوستكولونيالية (أدب ما بعد الاستعمار) التي تنطوي عليها الروايتان. يلخص المقال بإيجاز بعض الأطر النظرية للخطابات الاستعمارية و البوستكولونيالية ، ويجادل كيف تُعارض وجهات نظر هذه الأخيرة عندما تعيش الشخصيات البريطانية في مستعمرة ، وكيف ان صورة هذه المستعمرة وتمثيلها يعتمد على صمت الشخصيات و حتى لغتها ادا تكلمت. كما يسلط المقال الضوء أيضا على ممارسة المستعمر المتمثلة في إلقاء اللوم على المستعمر بسبب نقائصه ، وكذا تصنيفه الغير عادل ك " آخر " لدعم الادعاءات بأن هذا الأخير يجب أن يكون على قدر من التحضر لكي يقبل في البيئة الاستعمارية

* Corresponding author. E-mail: meriem.chehboub.25@gmail.com

Doi:

I- Introduction:

James Gordon Farrell is considered to be one of the most widely admired and intensively studied writers of the twentieth century. He won acclaim for his *Empire trilogy*, a series of historical novels that explore British Imperialism and its decline; *Troubles* received the 1971 Geoffrey Faber Memorial Prize, and in 2010 it was awarded the Lost Man Booker Prize. *The Siege of Krishnapur* received the 1973 Booker Prize. Farrell's last completed work, *The Singapore Grip*, and *The Siege of Krishnapur* both deal with the collapse of British colonial power. The Trilogy's works depict a group of British characters living in a colony, where they are frequently caught up in their helplessness and ignorance of the circumstances. As a result, they find themselves under assault in various ways, and by choosing to ignore what is going on around them, their community is destroyed. The article, therefore, attempts to uncover the master/subaltern relationship under the colonial system through the use of voiceless characters. It helps trace out the hostile relationship between master /subaltern in both novels, and thus, paves the way for reflecting on the various elements of postcolonial writings involved.

I.1. Farrell's Colonial Writings:

The colonial novels written by Farrell feature other elements; the reader is informed about the colony and the British community by an omniscient narrator. Besides, the community's leader, a middle-aged male, the British visitor, who comes to the neighbourhood, yet finds himself struggling to fit in. In the end, escalating events "fully overtake" the communities and destroy them (Morey, 112). Another element is that the native characters of the community, in each of the two historical books, hardly ever talk; the locals are not given in-depth descriptions. This explains the debate provoked by the depiction of Irish characters in *Troubles* and Indian characters in *The Siege of Krishnapur*.

I. 2. Colonial Discourse and the Silent Other:

The idea of colonial discourse is developed by Michel Foucault and Edward Said. Foucault maintains that discourses influence how we view the world, how they organize all of our knowledge in accordance with their fundamental criteria, and how they create and uphold power relations. Discourses restrict our perspective by emphasizing preferred elements and ignoring others; they "organize and construct our world [...] by differentiation and discrimination" (Chang 182). Despite being dominant in the moment, any discourse may be threatened by interdiscursive relations to other discourses that try to subvert it and gain control (Childs 83), while, at the same time, it embodies the power which everybody is struggling to obtain and maintain (Foucault 11).

Many locations and social groups around the world are seen and represented from a Western or European point of view, and their representations are constructed using Western discourse. The perception of life in the colonies both during and after the age of imperialism was formed by mechanisms of colonial discourse that, although evoking orientalist one, constitute a separate discourse. They can be regarded as relying on two opposing viewpoints; the first- that of the colonizer, "through which the colonized become 'othered' " (Reckwitz 122), asserts that it represents the truth and ascribes inferiority through a "set of codes, stereotypes, and vocabulary employed whenever the relationship between a colonial power and its colonies is written or spoken about." The process of "othering" frequently combines diverse features of the "other" into a single homogenous "other," which can be dealt with more readily from a Western perspective, because the discourse is founded on distinct and easily discernible categories (Ezzaher 5).

These aspects need to be taken into account as it becomes increasingly clear that Western discourses and ways of seeing the world are "not monolithic but rather polyphonic and contradictory" (Corzo-Duchardt 404). Homi Bhabha accomplishes this by turning the rigid framework of oppositions into a process of differentiation and negotiation that continuously challenge the positions held within the discourse (118). There is no static identity that is isolated from any context, just as there is no such thing as a stance within a discourse that does not depend on its other components, and there is no inherently basic defence of colonial presence (Corzo-Duchardt 404).

Colonial presence, according to Bhabha, is contradictory because it seeks to appear "original and authoritative" and naturally yet having only taken on this position after the advent of colonial difference, therefore not being an original state. In order to consistently reinforce this viewpoint as real, colonial presence, superiority and dominance must be asserted as original states. The claim of superiority can only exist and be understood in terms of how it differs from this counterpart implying that there is an "other" or counterpart of both claim and truth. In colonial discourse, positions and identities of both colonizers and colonized are formed through constant division. Samira Sasani claims that "The colonizer tries to make the colonized aware of its difference from the colonized." Thus, "...both the colonizer and the colonized

understand themselves with the help of 'Otherness'" (325). Therefore, the colonial presence can be seen of as a construct built on repetition and differentiation from its other, sustaining the difference to support its claims.

The dogmatic validity of binarism and the clear separation of the elements making up the binary opposition are two fundamental tenets on which colonial discourse is based. The most important dichotomy in (post-)colonial geography and spatial studies is that between centre and margin, where imperial Europe is the physical and metaphysical centre inspired by the colonial mission "to bring the margin into the sphere of influence of the enlightened center"(Ashcroft et al 37).

Since the indigenous cultures' ways of speaking and being silent are both connected to processes of identities, Bhabha's perspective of mimicry allows for various readings of how these behaviours are represented. Lahcen Ezzaher interprets Frantz Fanon's opinion on how by speaking the language of the colonizers, the native population is promoting an oppressive civilization (10); their silence is interpreted by Chris Ferns as an even more explicit manifestation of oppression (Chris 119) . Their voices are absent from the discourse, which might be taken as a denial of their existence, which throws into doubt the legitimacy of the prevailing discourse and questions "the authority of the dominant discourse" (Ibid), since the presence of one position necessitates the presence of the other. Furthermore, Gayatri Spivak emphasizes how colonial discourse silences the voices of the colonized and makes them invisible. According to her, subalterns who are absent from Western discourse may be created by colonial discourse (Spivak 292). Her research looks at the ways in which colonial rulers muffled and silenced the voices of those who were colonized.

I.3. Speech vs. Silence: Shifting the Balance of Power:

In Farrell's *Troubles*, the servants are primarily responsible for running the hotel, yet they are rarely heard speaking; instead, their speech is reported, which serves to subordinate and control their words (Ferns 213). Furthermore, the characters' physical presence emphasizes this control as denying them the ability to speak, which "...becomes in Farrell's hands another tool" for questioning the position of authority (Ibid, 119). This can also be seen as considering them as less important inhabitants whose opinion never matters; they are "like children" (*Troubles* 22) and they can exert no power. The Major's senses are completely dulled by his fellow guests' "overpoweringly sedative" comments, he can barely understand the unsettling ironies of the situation: that they are ill and dying, while "nervously [discuss] the abomination of Sinn Fein" (Ibid 23).

The Major's obsession with finding his mysterious fiancée begins on his first day at the Majestic, and it is made more difficult by Edward's cryptic hints concerning her location. The Major seeks assistance from the hotel cook out of despair. But once more, his aim is foiled by another obstacle: the Irish accent. The Major can only grasp a few of the cook's quick words. She is definitely speaking an alien language where linguistic and religious otherness cross, as evidenced by the oddly recognizable phrases like "gone to the angels" and "Jesus, Mary, and Joseph." The Irish woman's speech is so completely foreign to him that he becomes sure that she is either "speaking Irish" or has "a faulty palate" made worse by "the absence of teeth" (Ibid 367). One can interpret the maid's non-standard English as a confirmation of her inferiority, as "The sub- altern as female cannot be heard or read"(Spivak 61), but on the other hand, the fact that she is speaking at all indicates a change in the balance of power.

In her essay on the use of language in modern Irish politics, Clair Wills makes the connection between the Major's response to the cook's speech and the function of language as a marker of cultural and "racial" difference (21). She explains that "horrificed revulsion [for] the degenerate Irish accent" has contributed to the development of discourses about the "wild Irish," in addition to other lifestyles and habits (Ibid). Wills' claim that Irish people "are marked by their voices, their (mis)use of the English language" (Ibid), clarifies the Major's shocked response to the cook's "gabbled" English, a term that implies the inferiority of cultural and linguistic impurity (Ibid 366) . The cook's speech unmistakably distinguishes her as different and labelled her as "other." Thus, colonization is not the only transfer of cultural authority, English in the Irish woman's speech becomes a hybridized and broken language to which neither she nor the Major can lay claim to exclusive rights.

As the situation in Ireland worsens during the War of Independence, the servants start to speak up, whereas before, their direct communication was reserved for responding to or repeating commands. This indicates that the position of authority shifts. As they echo the events occurring outside the hotel and also demonstrate the Anglo-Irish characters' loss of control, their speech may be seen as a challenge to the power structure.

The ball is intended to serve as a reminder of the good old days for everyone, being a recreation of the illustrious past of supposedly trouble-free colonial rule. Charity, Edward's adolescent daughter, falls on the dance floor after drinking too much. At the sight of Charity losing control of her body, everyone breaks into sudden silence. The maid who claims that Charity is drunk opens the floor to Gaelic phrases that echo in the silence, implying that the balance of power once again changes: "'The poor thing is *stōshus*!' cried one of the maids in the sudden silence"(*Troubles* 349). Murphy also

switches from English to Gaelic once the colonial hotel's linguistic dominance of English is broken. His final English word before singing a song he learned as a young man in Wicklow Town is "[d]ead," and when the Anglo-Irish have permanently left, he prepares to burn down the hotel (Ibid 439). An explicit allusion to the end of Anglo-Irish presence in Kilnalough can be made from Murphy's final English word. Murphy, this Irish servant who has lived with the Spencers his entire life, is the only one who is familiar with the Majestic: "(Nobody, not even the twins, not even Edward himself, knew the geography of that immense rambling building better than Murphy who had spent his life in it)" (194). Murphy will also strike the last match and set the building on fire, wiping off the final trace of British rule in Kilnalough.

Due to the departure of the Anglo-Irish, Gaelic replaces English as the dominant tongue. They plainly want to assert their dominance and cause a disturbance among the locals in order to reassert colonial superiority over them. A reference to the ambivalence of the claim of colonial presence and anxiety about it, which must be maintained by repetition, people at the Majestic party still feel fearful of carrying out this action although assuming the right to do so. The Irish customers in the pub pause in conversation as the group walk in and watch them take a seat. The group from the Majestic assumes the right to dominate the locals' voices when they are silent and expects them to "start talking again, in respectful undertones, of course" (Ibid 87), but, unexpectedly, they start laughing. In an effort to recover control after being intimidated, the Anglo-Irish characters switch to singing the national hymn, another potent emblem of the Empire.

There are two ways to interpret the singing of the national anthem. On the one hand, it serves as a sign of allegiance to the Empire: the Anglo-Irish not only show their allegiance, but also give the Irish the chance to reciprocate by joining in and accepting colonial rule as legitimate- a strategy that the imperial forces actually used to frighten the Irish (Markey, 92). If the Irish refuse to sing along, the hymn also serves as a symbol of rejection of British colonial superiority. As, according to Claude Lévi-Strauss "singing is the acoustic equivalent of wearing a mask: people can convey a message without bearing full responsibility" (94). Gerald Porter too explains that "The connotations of this were well-understood by Ireland's national broadcasting organisation RTE, which, at the height of the Northern Ireland "Troubles" in 1972, banned all Irish folk music from the airwaves" (261). As a result, it might be interpreted as reflecting both the imperial claim's repeated nature and its ambivalent nature, which must be upheld and reinforced by repetition when in question.

Helpless as he is, Edward Spenser stands to begin once more into the National Anthem, singing the same verse as before, and the Irish characters join in. The Irish characters gladly welcome the singing with "a vast rolling storm of applause, laughter, of clapping and crying and shouting" (Troubles 88). The repeated use of the same verse can be read as a continued effort to enhance and legitimize colonial rule. When one of them pretends to be a conductor, the Irish respond by completely reversing control of the circumstance. Finally, deceived by the failure of their mission, the Anglo-Irish group leave the pub feeling that. They believe they are humiliated and wonder if the Irish are making fun of them. According to them, they are exposed to two strategies of resistance: the silence broken by laughter and the exhibition of colonial supremacy that is reduced to mockery by the overly enthusiastic mimicry of their singing.

1.3. Hari, the hybrid character:

The Siege of Krishnapur, a 1973 novel by J.G. Farrell, winner of the Booker Prize for Fiction in 2008, was written after *Troubles* but before *The Singapore Grip*. It charts the decline of the British Empire in India and ironically revisits the 1857 Indian Mutiny. Farrell creates a satirical mimicry of the classic Mutiny novel using some of the conventions and motifs from the Mutiny genre. In addition to his characters, he also criticizes the natives in the context of his story.

In *The Siege of Krishnapur*, the English characters act as they do in *Troubles*; distant from both reality and the native population, and persuaded of their civilizing mission and inherent superiority over other races. On the other hand, the Indians in this novel don't really do much of anything other than appear in large groups. Hari, the Maharajah's son, is the only exception; He attempts to be more English than the English by speaking decent yet imperfect English. Hari is the only Indian character in *The Siege of Krishnapur* who is given a name but within certain bounds. Contrary to the other unnamed Indian characters, he is ironically portrayed as an English mimic from an upper caste. Hari is a character that appears practically as a stock figure in British fiction about India. Poorly tailored English clothing, he is more interested in Western technology, like European literature, photography, and lifestyle; for him "a boiled egg and Blackwood's is the best way to begin the day" (*The Siege of Krishnapur* 45). Hari is a mockery of Western society in many ways; he continues to be a stereotypical comedy babu. What makes Hari funny is not the fact that he is Indian, but rather his fondness for trendy European novelties and clothes; the scene in which he shows admiration to Fleury's coat clearly illustrates this: "This English coat, sir, is it very costly? ... English craftsmen are so skilled I am quite lost in admiration for, you see, here our poor productions are in no wise to be compared with them" (Ibid 46).

East and West combine in an unsteady way in Hari. He is pleased with himself because he owns all the items we often find in an Englishman's home to appear sophisticated and civilized in front of his English guests. However, as an Indian,

he finds little comfort on a chair and instead prefers to squat on the ground out of concern that his English visitors will think less of him (Ibid 44). At this stage, Indian civilisation is heavily influenced by Western materialism. The following is a common example of how Indian culture and civilization have fallen into decay:

Hari frowned and spoke sharply to one of the servants, evidently to tell him to steer the animals in another direction, but already it was clattering towards them. "This is most backward," muttered Hari. "I am sorry you have witnessed such a thing, Mr. Fleury. My father should not be permitting it. Always in India cow here, cow there, cow everywhere!" The cow, alarmed the servants, hastened forward and was only diverted at the last moment from charging the sleeping Maharajah. An elderly servant hurried after it with a large silver bowl (Ibid 49).

By focusing on Hari, criticism leveled about Farrell that he gives his Indian characters little to no importance is refuted. Farrell's comic vision of India and the Indians includes a detailed critique of Hari's hybridity. A key concept in Homi Bhabha's analysis of the ambivalence of colonial speech is mimicry. According to him, mimicry is the method used to replicate the colonized subject as being "almost the same, but not quite" (Bhabha 86). For him "Mimicry is at once resemblance and menace" (Ibid), because it involves both mocking and a certain "menace" when the colonized duplicate the colonizer's culture, behavior, manners, and ideals. The authority of colonial speech is limited, as demonstrated by mimicry; it's almost as if colonial authority carries the seeds of its own demise.

I.3. Farrell and the Authorized Otherness:

In the Third Space, where the discourse viewpoints are met with contradictions and knowledge that one side either denies or excludes from the discourse, Bhabha uses this endless process of mutual othering to develop and negotiate views. The discourse creates a picture of an "other" controlled by the colonizer, i.e. an "authorized other" (Ibid88), in order to maintain the gap between colonial power and the indigenous people. This is accomplished by considering the natives as mimicking the colonizer and striving to attain the same status by adopting the attitude and habits of the superior rank. However, the discourse prevents them from becoming like the colonizers because doing so would eliminate the distinction between the two perspectives and, hence, the foundation for the superiority claims. As a result, Samira Sasani argues that "since becoming quite the same means that the colonizer's authentic identity is paradoxically imitable" (324). Thus, the colonizer is troubled by the "other," the colonized or the colonizer's double. Furthermore, imitation or mimicry provides the colonized other with two forms of resistance, as the position of power may either be imitated perfectly and thus all difference blurred - which cannot be allowed to happen - or the colonizer may be imitated too perfectly in an exaggerating way which again exposes the power position to ridicule (Ibid 327). The portrayal of the native population's proficiency in the dominant language as lacking can be interpreted as a signal of inferiority and exposure to mockery. However, according to Bhabha, this type of unique use of the language not only disrupts the discourse but also represents "authorized otherness," because it attempts to mimic the language of the colonizers (Ezzaher 16). The indigenous people's use of the colonizer's language must also be imperfect in order for it to differ enough from him to support colonial dominance and to justify colonial superiority.

In *The Siege of Krishnapur* Farrell completely ignores India and Indian people; he even never depicts the local Sepoys as humans, only as comedic and war objects. Native Indians and Sepoys are comical, rejected, dehumanized and even naïve and backwards; to deal with the river's constant flooding, Tom Willoughby, the Magistrate, effectively the Collector's civilian deputy proposes building embankments. But the Indian landowners do not have any of it. The simple remedy is to sacrifice a black goat, which will cause the river to recede, as is indeed the case (*The Siege of Krishnapur* 86). Another prime example of the British Empire's disgraceful role in the East is Rayne, an opium trader who sells to the Chinese. To the amusement of Fleury, Rayne gives the names of his native servants; "Ram," "Monkey," and "Ant", after the animals they are said to resemble. "We call this lad "Ram." That's not his real name. His real name is Akbar or Mohammed or something like that. We call him Ram because he looks like one. And this is Monkey" (Ibid 33). Rayne disregards the names and characteristics of his servants, which Farrell does not criticize as being demeaning or typical of Colonialism. The servants' humanity is diminished which can be interpreted as a form of violent, abusive, insulting humour.

Besides, the dehumanization of Indian Sepoys is demonstrated in another context by Fleury's encounter with an individual native Sepoy who is never referred to by name. Farrell goes into great depth about this incident and portrays the Sepoy as a monster. A huge Sepoy with a beard approaches Fleury and prepares to sever him in half lengthwise with a single sword blow, but Fleury clumsily punches the beard. The Sepoy then gets bigger and redder but when he touches his own stomach with the sabre, he turns into a Sepoy again (Ibid 96-97).

Edward Said clarifies the western idea on the Orient when he describes it as a "... collection of dreams, images and vocabularies available to anyone who has tried to talk about what lies east of the dividing line" (Said 73). He stresses the dichotomy of binary oppositions that the Western discourse's conception of the Orient is based on. With this binary opposition, each characteristic can be assigned only to one side of the binary system's points of view with its adversary being automatically allocated to the opposing point of view. By emphasizing Western qualities and accomplishments, Western discourse claims the authority of identifying, excluding and locating "arbitrary attributes of western-ness" when discussing the Orient (Corzo-Duchardt 407). This perspective, which is based on separation and discrimination, emphasizes what the Orient lacks and, by using these "othering" methods, automatically attributes the antithesis of all Western norms and all undesirable characteristics to the Orient. The discourse's tactics portray the Orient as inferior, "static and regressive" (Turner 173). By repeatedly using lexical terms, images, and symbols that attribute these characteristics to the Orient, the discourse upholds power relations.

James Gordon Farrell, "a difficult novelist to place" (Goodman 757), perfectly shows how colonization is justified and motivated by the desire to civilize the colonized, which is achieved by portraying them as inferior, barbarian, frail, and feminine. Furthermore, in the first two novels of his trilogy, he highlights language as a tool used by colonizers to maintain their control over colonized knowledge. Master and colonized are very well acquainted; the colonizer has total control over the colonized and is aware of every detail about him. The colonized have to integrate into the colonizer's culture in order to accept their hegemony after being overrun by the colonizer's forces. Yet, how can the study of the third world be done without collaborating with the colonial project, wonders Spivak? She draws attention to the idea that research is fundamentally colonial. In characterizing the "other," the "over there" subject is defined as the subject of inquiry, from which knowledge has to be drawn and applied "here." The reason for this restriction is that critical analysis of the "other" often uses the hegemonic terminology to explain how it relates to the other. Spivak concludes that "the subaltern cannot speak" when they are spoken for by those in positions of power, "if, in the contest of colonial production, the subaltern has no history and cannot speak." (Spivak 41)

II – Methods and Materials:

This article seeks to examine master (British) and subaltern (Indian) relationship through the use of humour in the novels *Troubles* and *The Siege of Krishnapur*. The aim is to reflect on the various elements of postcolonial writings involved in these novels. Therefore, it attempts to uncover the master/subaltern relationship and the silence of the native characters under colonial system through the use of humour. Humour helps trace out the hostile relationship between master and subaltern in the novel. The primary theoretical foundation is humour theory in the context of postcolonial research. Humour is the ability to make a situation satirical in order to make people laugh. The characters' speech, appearance, and behaviour all contribute to this comical situation. Humour can be applied to anything. It is at this moment that the question of why a postcolonial writer utilizes it in the text emerges. What is the purpose of employing humour in a postcolonial text if it is used to affirm the superiority of one side and the minimized position of the other?

III- Results and discussion:

Farrell's political stance was extremely ambiguous and imprecise. It is reasonable to assume that Farrell intended to preserve this political flexibility on purpose. Farrell's political duality is a sign of his intentional blending of pro and anti-imperial ideas. *Troubles* and *The Siege of Krishnapur* carry the imprint of an Anglo-Irish novelist who couldn't decide between the British and their "other." He sees colonial identity as a problem arising between the two sides of the conflict resulting in the refusal of any fixed identity for both. Farrell's stance towards both conflicting sides demonstrates his doubt as to where his loyalties should belong. This lack of belonging to either side of the conflict and being torn between opposite allegiances make him unable to make a final decision as to which side he belongs.

IV- Conclusion:

Scholars, who are interested in how language and representation shape colonial societies, find that colonial discourse is a rich field of study. Our comprehension of the relationship between language, authority, and individual expression during the colonial period, advances thanks to the writings of authors like Homi Bhabha, Edward Said, Gayatri Spivak, and Franz Fanon. Through an analysis of the linguistic constructions produced by colonial powers to construct an unfair otherness about the colonized people, researchers discover the injustices committed by the colonizer. The article examines

multiple viewpoints about Colonial Discourse Studies and its role in perpetuating unjust otherness. It emphasizes how important it is to look at the ways in which language and discourse are employed to further colonial power relations by framing the colonized as the "other." Furthermore, it enables us understanding the impacts of colonialism and how it affects postcolonial countries. One can assess how language is employed to create and maintain power relations between colonizers and colonized people by researching and examining colonial discourse. It illustrates how, through the use of discursive techniques, the colonizer highlights the dichotomy that he would always be considered as superior to the colonized.

References:

- [1] Ashcroft, Bill, et al. *The Empire Writes Back : Theory and Practice in Post-Colonial Literatures*. W. Ross Macdonald School Resource Services, 2011.
- [2] Bhabha, Homi K. *The Location of Culture*. Routledge, 1994.
- [3] Chang, Hsiu-chen Jane . "Arthur Waley's the Way and Its Power: Representation of "the Other."" *Colonial and Postcolonial Studies*, edited by Merete Falk Borch et al., Amsterdam, Brill Print , 2008
- [4] Childs, Peter. *Paul Scott's Raj Quartet: History and Division*. victoria, University of Victoria, 1998.
- [5] Corzo-Duchardt, Beth. "Contested Territory: American Film Spectatorship, Colonial Mimicry and British Empire." *Screen*, vol. 56, no. 4, Dec. 2015, pp. 401–14, <https://doi.org/10.1093/screen/hjv051>. Accessed 23 Nov. 2020.
- [6] Ezzaher, Lahcen E. *Writing and Cultural Influence. Studies in Rhetorical History, Orientalist discourse, and Post-Colonial Criticism*, New York, Peter Lang, 2003.
- [7] Farrell, J. G. *The Siege of Krishnapur*. New York Review of Books, 2010.
- [8] Farrell, J. G. *Troubles*. New York Review Books, 2002.
- [9] Ferns, Chris. "Regions of Empire: Scott, Randall, Farrell and the Voices of the Colonized." *Writing Region and Nation. Proceedings of the 4th International Conference on the Literature of Region and Nation*, edited by [10] Davies James A, Swansea, University of Wales, 1994.
- [11] Foucault, Michel, et al. *Die Ordnung Des Diskurses*. Frankfurt Am Main Fischer Taschenbuch, 2019.
- [12] Goodman, Sam. "Mongrel Nation: Animality and Empire in the Novels of J.G. Farrell." *European Review of History: Revue Européenne D'histoire*, vol. 22, no. 5, Sept. 2015.
- [13] Lévi-Strauss, Claude. *The Raw and the Cooked*. Chicago University Of Chicago Press, 1996.
- [14] Markey, Alfred. "Troubles and Traumas Revisited: Sean O'Faolain, Edward Said and the Anticolonial Tradition." *Revista Canaria de Estudios Ingleses* , vol. 68, 2014.
- [15] Morey, Peter. *Fictions of India. Narrative and Power*. Edinburgh, Edinburg University Press, 2000.
- [16] Porter, Gerald . *Code-switching and Empowerment in the Macaronic Irish Lyric*. In: Erikoiskielet ja käännösteria. N° 35. Vaasa, 2008.
- [17] Reckwitz, Erhard: ""Colonial Discourse and Early South African Literature." *Intercultural Studies.*" *Intercultural Studies: Fictions of Empire*, edited by Vera Nünning et al, Heidelberg, 1996.
- [18] Sasani, Samira. "George Bernard Shaw's John Bull's Other Island and Homi K. Bhabha: The Colonizer and the Other in the Third Space." *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences*, July 2015, <https://doi.org/10.5901/mjss.2015.v6n4s2p324>.
- [19] Saunders, Mark. "The Tone of Empire: J. G. Farrell's Great Theme." *The Sewanee Review*, vol. 109, no. 3, 2001.
- [20] Said, Edward W. *Orientalism*. London, Penguin, 1985.
- [21] Spivak, Gayatri Chakravorty. *Can the Subaltern Speak? : Reflections on the History of an Idea*. Columbia University Press, 2010.
- [22] Turner, Bryan. "Edward W. Said: Overcoming Orientalism." *Theory, Culture & Society*, vol. 21, no. 1, Feb. 2004.
- [23] Wills, Clair. "Language Politics, Narrative, Political Violence." *Oxford Literary Review*, vol. 13, no. 1/2, 1991.