

<https://doi.org/10.48047/AFJBS.6.Si4.2024.5420-5436>



African Journal of Biological Sciences

Journal homepage: <http://www.afjbs.com>



Research Paper

Open Access

REVISITING TO REAPPRAISE POSTCOLONIALTHEORY: TOWARDS THE POST- POSTCOLONIAL

Aman Sharma, Dr. Sarika

1Maharishi Markandeshwar (Deemed to be University), Mullana, Ambala, India

aman.sharma@mmumullana.org

2Maharishi Markandeshwar (Deemed to be University), Mullana, Ambala, India

dr.sarika@mmumullana.org

Volume 6, Issue Si4, Aug 2024

Received: 15 June 2024

Accepted: 25 July 2024

Published: 15 Aug 2024

doi: [10.48047/AFJBS.6.Si4.2024.5420-5436](https://doi.org/10.48047/AFJBS.6.Si4.2024.5420-5436)

Abstract

Contemporary postcolonial studies have become stereotypical and repetitive, equating British Victorian literature with British imperialism, as if there could be one-to-one correspondence between literature and life. Literature indulges in transmutation of life, fictionalizing the chronicle of life. Hence postcolonial studies as we read analyses give the feeling of déjà vu. There is a need to revisit to reappraise postcolonial theoretics, in order to indulge in not only pertinent analyses but also sanitize to comprehend boundaries between life and fiction. Then there is the case of Spivak in her paper -Three Women's Texts and a Critique of Imperialism (1985) that has engendered postcolonial studies, especially of the type that Spivak indulged in while critiquing British Victorian literature. In Spivak's paper we find polemics and politics with little of cogency and coherence. Sensitive reading is the need of the hour, which has been christened as Post-Postcolonial theory, in order to go beyond Spivakian politico-polemic and not indulge in 'coercive criticism'. This is all the more important since other scholars like Said followed Spivak to indulge in similar postcolonial analyses, and voluminous scholarship of this type has gradually accumulated. Spivak, in her paper presented the formulaic: British novel as -imperialist narrativization of history. Good in -Presentism: Postmodernism, Poststructuralism, Postcolonialism (2005) has broken new ground by giving the concept of -Presentism that he explained as -the primacy of the present, and the refusal to be guided by a vision either of the past or of the future. Hence, the need for Post-Postcolonial theory.

Keywords: Diachrony, contingency, presentism, poststructuralism, Manichean.

1. CONVENTIONAL POSTCOLONIAL

Present paper attempts to discuss study of literature both in its historico-geographical dimensions as well as its chronicling on the international scale. The attempt is to prepare a 'foreword' for studying literature on the global level. Here 'global' would stand for attempting criticism with adequate knowledge of its diachronic relations as also the contingent nature of literature vis-a-vis international relations as manifest in sundry creations as well as dissemination of literature. Reference may be made to G.

Good's paper –Presentism: Postmodernism, Poststructuralism, Postcolonialism (2005), wherein he stresses synchronicity of literature that he terms as –presentism, and explains it as: –Presentism is the belief in the primacy of the present, and the refusal to be guided by a vision either of the past or of the future (Good287). Good also discusses –poverty of postcolonial theory (as opposed to the richness and diversity of the literature itself)... (Good292). This is evident in treatment of Victorian literature by critics like E. Said and his study *Culture and Imperialism* (1993) since it reduces nineteenth century literature to being –complicit with imperialism (Said 293). Thus it would be befitting to retitling Said's study as –European Culture and Imperialism (Said293). Good further elaborates that this is the case since

Said has little to say, aside from a prefatory acknowledgement of their existence, about Russian, Islamic, Chinese, imperialism. The guilt is focused on the West, and for Said this taints all of its ‘cultural production’ in this period, however remote a work's themes might appear to be (Good 293).

Theory functions on the concept that deliberating upon injustices political or cultural will be followed by a change for the better that will usher egalitarianism, or alternately as Good says: –the total nature of the condemnation of Western society coexists with cynical acceptance and professional careerism (Good 297). The aim is to revisit the awareness that literature impinges on historical relations allied to geographical boundaries, in its creation as well as consumption. G. Spivak in –Three Women's Texts and a Critique of Imperialism (1985) christened this perspective as –worldling. The aim is to articulate our consumption of literature as well as elaboration of our understanding of literature. Of course, elaboration/expansion of comprehension is dependent upon elaboration/expansion of analysis and criticism. Internationalizing is simultaneous with internationalizing about the discipline, since literature

concerning postcolonial/neo-colonial is dependent upon such diverse relations as literature has with egalitarianism, in the shadow of imperialism. Said elaborated upon the phenomenon by explaining that –texts are worldly‖ (1983, 04). This is further explained by A. JanMohamed in –The Economy of Manichean Allegory‖ (1985), wherein he enumerates the role of ideology in literary creations. He says: –colonialist fiction is generated predominantly by the ideological machinery of the Manichean Allegory‖ (JanMohamed 102). This calls for comprehension of ideology as embedded in literature. However, F. Jameson has further explained –Third World‖ literature and its subject matter. Jameson says that –all third world texts are necessarily ...to be read as...national allegories‖ (1986,78).

2. NARRATIVIZING NATION PROBLEMATIC

H. Bhabha has discussed –nation,‖ and –narration‖ as also the interweaving of the two. Bhabha says: –Nations, like narratives, lose their origin in the myths of time and only fully realize their horizons in the mind’s eye‖ (Bhabha01). Said explained the complexity that there is no dissociation between nations and their narratives. He said that –Nations themselves *are* narrations‖ (xiii). These appear to be rather formulaic since they merely generalize. The concept of narrative manifests the idea of nation and vice-versa. Then other features are superadded, videlicet allegory or fiction, or merely a text with colonial value, making literature denser, since narrative comes to emblemize ideology. It doesn't remain literature *per se*. Theory of postcoloniality manifests such manoeuvres, where literary narratives and construction of nations become synonymous. Said juxtaposed novel, imperialism, culture and narration in *Culture and Imperialism*. This universalizes such literature as also its literariness, conflating literature with the non-literary, like imperialism, also rendering it metaphoric with addition of allegory, irony and others. As opposed to syntagmatic such literature is rendered paradigmatic that has been seen as one of the agendas of postcoloniality as a chronicle.

3. SPIVAKIAN POSTCOLONIAL

Postcolonial criticism has analyzed British literature of nineteenth century. Spivak in –Three Women’s Texts and a Critique of Imperialism,‖ read Victorian novels as expressions of British Imperialism. She said: –it should not be possible to read nineteenth century British literature without remembering that imperialism, understood as England’s social mission, was a crucial part of cultural representation of England to the English‖ (Spivak 243). This set the agenda for

later studies of Victorian literature, and the genre of novel came to be seen as an emblem of British imperialism as well as ideology. A little later, Said in *Culture and Imperialism* developed upon the subject and explained that –the novel [is] *the* aesthetic object whose connection to the expanding societies of Britain and France is particularly interesting to study (xii). Later on, in her essay Spivak called British novel as –imperialist narrativization of history (Spivak 244). Hence, British novel of nineteenth century more than any other genre has described imperialism and still denied its truth as well as British Foreign policy to all who ventured to ask or study. This is all the more reason to analyze British novel in greater detail and also undertake writing of literary history to reveal British literature’s saturation in imperialism.

Later postcolonial studies have tended to discuss such aspects of English novel as also to study the imperialist aspect as prominent influence on both the form as well as ideology of the genre. This has resulted in giving a prominent place to Victorian studies in postcolonialism. It has also provided a chronological sheet anchor to postcolonial studies vis-a-vis imperialism and modernity. Thus, comprehending Victorian novel is important to understanding postcolonial theory. It is Victorian novel that traces the chronology of British imperialism describing the genre’s geopolitics as well as much of the source material for the theoretical model. Postcolonial enterprise has succeeded by stomping over Victorian novel through its in-depth study. It needs to be remembered that study of Victorian culture and literature before embarking upon postcolonial theory would be in order. This may also lead to critiquing the theoretical model. Postcolonial studies have overwritten the Victorian period of the genre at the expense of overlooking Victorian novel’s themes, its intellectual acumen as well as sundry indeterminacies of the genre’s tropes. Many of the paradigms have escaped the notice of the postcolonial and they have produced rather one-sided reading of British novels of the period. Said’s insights and Spivak’s studies have only been generic. The very assumption of these theorists that novel can be the medium of studying British imperialism and culture of the period is a mere generalization of these readerly texts. Here, analysis of a specific moment in Victorian fiction proves the case in point.

Spivak, in her –Three Women’s Texts and a Critique of Imperialism (1985) is seen to be undertaking reading in the postcolonial mode, with a flourish, since many of the premises and assumptions of postcoloniality become visible. The essay came out in *Critical Inquiry* (1985), as also getting

reprinted many times. The paper has emerged as an authentic reading of Charlotte Bronte's *Jane Eyre* vis-a-vis postcolonial theoretics. All subsequent criticism regarding *Jane Eyre* has meekly followed the path charted by Spivak, only further developing/elaborating the theorist's reading. In addition to this, postcolonial studies concerning Victorian culture and literature have to defer to the reading by Spivak. Much of later criticism has simply paid homage to Spivak's study. Ann McClintock called it –the planned epistemic violence of the imperialist project‖ (McClintock 16). There have been studies that ignored Spivak's work concerning the postcolonial but they got unfavourable reviews. Here, we can cite the instance of Thomas Richard's *Imperial Archive: Knowledge and the Fantasy of Empire* that was reviewed by Chris Bongie. Spivak's paper tends to overshadow such studies, hence a need to look at her paper more closely.

4. SPIVAKIAN HERMENEUTIC PROBLEMATIQUE

The essay opens with Spivak trying to explain the rationale of postcoloniality. She discusses history of literature vis-a-vis postcolonial theory. She alludes to –obvious ‘facts’: –it should not be possible to read nineteenth century British literature without remembering that imperialism, understood as England's social mission was a crucial part of cultural representation of England to the English‖ (Spivak 242). Then she further says: –the role of literature in the production of cultural representation should not be ignored.‖ She considers these as –facts‖ and goes on to surmise as follows: –these two obvious ‘facts’ continue to be disregarded in the reading of nineteenth century British literature. This itself attests to the continuing success of the imperialist project, displaced and dispersed into more modern forms‖ (Spivak 242). Spivak configures a theoretical model and generalizes:

if these ‘facts’ were remembered, not only in the study of British literature but in the study of the literatures of the European colonizing cultures of the great age of imperialism, we would produce a narrative, in literary history, of the ‘worlding’ of what is now called ‘the Third World’ (Spivak 242).

Spivak's ‘reasoning’ in the paper may be traced: from –‘facts’,‖ scarcely authenticated, taking up premises instead of ‘demonstrable truths’, leading to a conclusion, supposed to be a truth which the earlier mentioned –‘facts’,‖ –attest‖ moving to a hypothesis treated as reality, encapsulated within –if...then,‖ formulating the penultimate is supposed to be treated with an authenticity of proof based on a mathematical demonstration of –facts.‖ The essay is both ‘unassailable’ as

regards its logic and also not verifiable, hence intriguing. It needs to be mentioned that the writer's -rule|| lies in stating a rule. The essay derives its power from its assertiveness and certainty employed while making out assertive statements and words like -facts,|| along with bold surmises regarding these -facts,|| whose knowledge would lead to altering history of literature. Spivak reads texts to demonstrate that a knowledge of such -facts|| will lead to altering history of literature by applying her concepts to -cult text of feminism,|| *Jane Eyre*, along with Jean Rhys's *Wide Sargasso Sea* (1966) in the form of -*Jane Eyre's* re-inscription,|| as also Mary Shelley's *Frankenstein* (1818), including -analysis—even a deconstruction—of a -worlding' such as *Jane Eyre's*” (Spivak 244). Spivak's essay unravels itself in a simple manner. She reads Bronte by re-examining some scenes from the text: -the beautifully orchestrated opening of *Jane Eyre*|| along with cartographing -Jane's self-marginalized uniqueness|| (Spivak 246). Rochester appears to Jane which reveals how -Bronte renders the human/animal frontier as acceptably indeterminate|| (Spivak 247), which concludes with -allegorical language of Christian psychobiography...marks the inaccessibility of the imperialist project as such to the nascent -feminist' scenariol (Spivak 249). Spivak's reading of the novel as also the text's structure develops -from counter family to family-in-law to community of families|| (O'Connor 301). Spivak says: -in terms of the narrative energy of the novel, how is Jane moved from the place of the counter family to the family-in-law? It is the active ideology of imperialism that provides the discursive field|| (Spivak 247). This comprises of about three and a half pages from the beginning wherein Spivak has covered ample ground: she has analyzed *Jane Eyre's* theoretics of -the nineteenth century British novel|| which the text evoked as also -manifesto' of the theory of the literary history of postcoloniality.

Spivak's paper -Three Women's Texts and a Critique of Imperialism|| inspired many studies in the Spivakian mode. Some of them are May Ellis Gibson (1987), Penny Boumelha (1988), Laura E. Donaldson (1988), Susan L. Meyer (1990), Elsie B. Michie (1993), Joyce Zonana (1993), and Sophie Gilmartin (1997). These studies have attempted to tread the ground that Spivak trod albeit more elaborately, concentrating on such areas as relations of the colonizer with his colonies, videlicet colonized places like Africa, India, Ireland or Jamaica, explaining concepts like orientalism or the evils of sati, racism or the curse of slavery. O'Connor explains this academic enterprise as -a massive effort of retroactive documentation|| (O'Connor 301-02). Studies right from 1985 concerning *Jane Eyre* reveal consolidation of the Spivakian approach

buttressed by closed reading of rights and practices at colonized spaces. Scholars minutely study broad statements made by Spivak in her paper. They furnished documentary evidence for the same as well as engendering a narrative of the type of history of literature that Spivak only broadly envisioned. They do not interrogate Spivak's arguments and their viability. This has also indulged in replication of Spivakian propositions, instead of questioning the premises of her scholarship or charting into unexplored areas. It is peculiar that scholars have spent time and labour on *Jane Eyre* and postcoloniality. The basal structure of Spivak's argumentation remains uninterrogated. Take the instance of Susan Meyer who explained that *Jane Eyre* commenced with questioning the logic of imperialism as well as its ideology, but eventually her scholarship attempted explaining that *Jane Eyre* upheld the practice of imperial rule.

5. CRITIQUING SPIVAKIAN POSTCOLONIAL

One reason for wholesale accepting of postcolonial argumentation by Spivak lies in her further repudiation of feminist studies of the Victorian period as supporting imperialism of the Victorian times. Scholars avidly agreed with Spivak since they felt the need to show their awareness of the critical arena as well as theoretic competence in order to escape being labelled as upholders of the position of the Self at the cost of the Other. They could be branded racists otherwise. It is in the context of the nineteenth century English novel that Spivak's logic consists of generalizations as also being expansive. Spivak began to theorize British literature like *Jane Eyre* and she was severe on the text's authentic critics, i.e., Sandra Gilbert and Susan Gubar. She accused them of indulging in -expanding empire of the literary discipline, rather than challenging or changing it (Spivak 243). So, she castigated feminist studies of Victorian literature in a harsh manner. She spoke:

It seems particularly unfortunate when the emergent perspective of feminist criticism reproduces the axioms of imperialism. A basically isolationist admiration for the literature of the female subject in Europe and Anglo-America establishes the high feminist norm. It is supported and operated by an information retrieval approach to 'Third World' literature which often employs deliberately 'non-theoretical' methodology with self-conscious rectitude.

In this essay, I will attempt to examine the operation of the -worlding of what is today -the Third World by what has become a cult text of feminism: *Jane Eyre* (Spivak 243-44).

Spivak intended to discuss literature of the Third World and its treatment by critics, but she commenced with reading criticism on *Jane Eyre* and feminist theoretics. She was dissatisfied with the critics' handling of literature from the margins and labelled it as –disciplinary imperialism (O'Connor 303). Spivak was severe on a specific domain of criticism, as well as –the isolationist outlook of feminist poetics (O'Connor 303). She went on to critique *Jane Eyre* studies and after a couple of paragraphs she began to deliberate upon criticism of literature of the Third World, as well as –the ‘worlding’ of what is today the Third World (Spivak 243-44).

Spivak indicts England's nineteenth century rule of Britain as imperialistic and explained it as –England's social mission, followed by the same in the next century with –self-conscious rectitude (Spivak 243). She discussed –the empire of the literary discipline (Spivak 243) as colluding with the nation's imperialist designs since literature of the period never took a count of its diachronic relationship with British empire. Spivak felt that feminist poetics strengthened and expanded this empire. Spivak's theoretics found immediate acceptance with feminists, especially her pronouncements on Victorian novel. Feminists possessed ‘political integrity’ that Spivak doubted and hence, subsequently feminists have attempted to exhibit their compatibility with post-colonial theoretics. They cogently and comprehensively appraise relation of Brontes and women novelists and their response to imperialism. Criticism that followed Spivak's paper has exhibited conciliation. Spivak's opinion that British novel upheld imperialistic ideology has met with general approval, but feminist criticism does not iterate Victorian novel's patterns.

6. POSTCOLONIAL GENERALIZATIONS

Jenny Sharpe in *Allegories of Empire* (1993) said that –*Jane Eyre* has become a contested site for establishing the relationship between feminism and imperialism (Jenny Sharpe 29). Another interesting fact is that Spivak's paper has given rise to generalization, although it itself was situated in specifics. Normally, contextualization lends support to a prevailing thesis instead of accumulating a plethora of ideas leading to the proposing of a thesis. A postcolonial appraisal of *Jane Eyre* has opened Spivakian insights prone to mere generalizations. Scholars have written voluminously regarding scholarship centered on critiquing *Jane Eyre*, including feministic perspectives of the Spivakian paradigm leading to other texts by the novelist, as well as other novels of the Victorian period and genres from those times. Some studies can easily be recalled:

Meyer's, *Imperialism at Home* (1996); Deirdre David, *Rule Britannia* (1996); Firdous Azim, *The Colonial Rise of the Novel* (1993) and Suvendrini Perera, *Reaches of Empire* (1991). Michie applauds Meyer's *Imperialism at Home* (1996) for balancing and –keeping both race and gender in view at the same time (Michie 304). Paula Krebs applauds the same study for rising to the occasion regarding Spivakian challenge to the feminist literary scholarship (Paula Krebs 110). Azim devotes four chapters in a study *The Colonial Rise of the Novel* (1993) out of a total of seven to Bronte's work explaining that such a reading –can be extended to the nineteenth century as a whole (Azim 173).

Said in *Culture and Imperialism* (1993) analyses Jane Austen's *Mansfield Park* (1814) in the manner that reminds of Spivak's analysis of *Jane Eyre*. Spivak marginally discussed Antigua, the place in the West Indies from where Sir Bertram accumulated his wealth, a fact that author of *Jane Eyre* –would not, could not recognize (Spivak 93). Said commenced his acclaimed text in a manner that owes its fundamentals and logic to Spivak's insights. It seems that Said was favourably impressed by Spivak's writings and forceful style. He even advocated similar readings of novels to widen our mental horizons. Said was also impressed by the potential for diverse interpretations of Charles Dickens' *Great Expectations* (1861) and Peter Carey's creative critique of the same. Carey brought out a novel entitled *Jack Maggs* (1997), on the lines of *Great Expectations*, –Bertha Mason figure, a convict who got his wealth from the colony and financed Pip's transformation into –gentleman. Said's comments on *Great Expectations* inspired Carey to write *Jack Maggs*. This was anticipated by Michael Noonan's *Magwitch*. Carey wrote *Jack Maggs* through the Saidian postcolonial lens, primarily and it was only secondarily that he delved into Dickensian sources. Carey in *Jack Maggs* was Spivakian, in the sense that he turned the plot of *Great Expectations* into a text of postcolonial literature.

It is only recently that critics have started discussing ‘foreign goods in domestic literature’ with Spivakian materialist insights. Elizabeth Gaskell wrote *Cranford* in 1853 focusing on Indian tea, silk and rubber. Also, Wilkie Collins published *The Moonstone* (1868) with eponymous diamonds from India. Such novels have been interpreted in the materialist postcolonial manner, reminiscent of Spivak. Here mention may be made of Jeffrey Cass's –*The Scraps, Patches and Rags of Daily Life*, (1999) and Ashish Roy's –*The Fabulous Imperialist Semiotic of Wilkie Collins's The Moonstone* (1993). Novels which seemed rather innocuous and fairly congenial

have been interpreted with a markedly postcolonial slant. Mention may be made of Elaine Freedgood who read *Great Expectations*, with the reference to –Negro-head tobacco as a work about race, caste and class. Spivak’s essay has carried the day as Freedgood discussed *Jane Eyre* and its –mahogany furniture as the decadent spoils of deforestation and slavery abroad (O’Connor 305).

7. SPIVAKIAN HERMENEUTIC AND STEREOTYPE

It is clear that Spivak’s study has turned out to be the basis for subsequent postcolonial study of nineteenth century novel. Critics have developed formulations laid down by Spivak as also adapted them for further application. There have been close readings of texts with characters on the margin or goods pouring in from abroad. Critics throughout have elaborated a manner of critiquing whose basis was laid out by Spivak. Even where her work is not cited formally, her approach to nineteenth century fiction has been upheld. It began with an individual and turned out to be a group pursuit, carried out collectively as also cooperatively. It becomes worrying when we go back to Spivak’s paper and find the paper is replete with polemics rather than history. It explains what history of literature should articulate, not about the manner in which the history of literature should be done. It is an instance of how history of literature should be done, stressing the manner of its conforming to a predetermined course of what ought to be taken up in the study of history of literature.

Spivak’s study led to the study of nineteenth century British novel whose character became repetitive and it turned the rise of Western colonial culture into a plateau, along with devastation of tradition and rituals that had been a major concern of writing of such postcolonial theoreticians. Imperialism and its culture in the colonies has met its match in the imperialism exhibited by postcolonial studies of nineteenth century British novel. The latter’s investment in profit can be seen as colonization in reverse. It is monotony of uniformity and repetition that should explain to us that it is similar to Said’s oriental studies. O’Connor calls such studies as –Victoriantalism - the mining of a distant, exotic, threatening, but fascinating literature to produce and establish a singularly self-serving body of knowledge (O’Connor 305). Such a corpus of knowledge is more needed by its postcolonial producers rather than a discussion of its subject matter at hand. O’Connor explains that Spivak –initiated...Victoriantalistendeavour by making *Jane Eyre* the object not of analysis but of analytical expansion (O’Connor 305). Spivak’s paper gained its

force from –compulsive momentum of synecdoche|| (O’Connor 305). The novel by Charlotte Bronte belongs to the nineteenth century and as O’Connor says, –there is something inhuman in the suggestion of an equivalency between postcolonial management of the nineteenth century novel and nineteenth century administration of empire|| (O’Connor 307). It is like –reducing people to popular fictions,|| or alternately –elevating fiction to unreasonably anthropomorphic heights|| (307). So, there is –a casualty in postcolonial theory’s revisionary efforts|| (O’Connor 307). According to O’Connor –that casualty has been the nineteenth century English novel|| (O’Connor 307). It has –in the missionary hands of political criticism, come perilously close to being delivered of its own existence|| (O’Connor 307). O’Connor says: –I call this special brand of extermination genrecide|| (O’Connor 307). He further elaborates regarding –the very inhumanity of my own claim that matters here|| (O’Connor 307). O’Connor presents his insight: –novels are not people (neither are they ciphers for culture or imperialism) and hence the violence that can be done to them – and the truths that can be extracted from them – must be measured differently than we have yet done|| (O’Connor 307). O’Connor’s –analogy|| is not to compare novels to ‘_natives’, but rather to compare their historical construction as apposite Others.

It is in the concept of othering that –the novel presumably helped cast the native as Other|| (O’Connor 307). Having said this O’Connor elaborates on his own insight: –postcolonial critique of othering frequently treats the Victorian novel as its epistemological Other, as a metonymic embodiment of all that the revisionary project officially and expressly resists|| (O’Connor 307). Here, Spivak’s own phrasing may be recalled:

My readings here do not seek to undermine the excellence of the individual artist. If even minimally successful, the readings will incite a degree of rage against the imperialist narrativization of history, that it should produce so abject a script for her (Spivak 244).

Spivak’s paper has been the cornerstone of postcolonial theory. It has paid special attention to nineteenth century British novel and succeeding critics discuss it with a tone of condescension. It arises from the –assumption that the Victorian novel is a simple thing indeed, a largely symptomatic repository of ‘_culture’ that is by definition always also an ‘_allegory of empire’|| (O’Connor 308). It was Rudyard Kipling who originally used the phrase –allegory of empire.|| Later the phrase became very significant for postcolonial theory. Sara Suleri’s *The Rhetoric of*

English India, for instance, opens with an elaborate discussion of its ambit and meaning. The phrase became the title of Jenny Sharpe's study *Allegories of Empire: The Figure of Woman in the Colonial Text*. The phrase has been discussed by other critics also like Fredric Jameson and Abdul JanMohamed.

8. SPIVAKIAN BLIND-ALLEY: EFFACEMENT OF DIFFERENCE BETWEEN LIFE AND LITERATURE

Such postcolonial theoretics leans heavily on its pre-conceived notion regarding sheer simplicity of nineteenth century British novel, and also regarding the texts in the aforesaid genre as monotonously narrating the same pattern of stories, in novel after novel. Spivak _applied' her _insights' to Victorian novel and henceforth succeeding critics have done the same with missionary zeal, with the proviso that nineteenth century novel (like a juvenile delinquent) needs to be put in its/her place.

Such observations entail an honest revisiting of the postcolonial theoretics through –a genuinely post-postcolonial criticism|| (O'Connor 308). Such revisiting ought to refigure the relationship of nineteenth century novel to British empire, eschewing the inclination of reprimanding Victorian novel, for its alleged bad, inappropriate politics as also to stop schooling the subsequent scholars by such limiting prescriptive politicized criticism. –Post-Postcolonial criticism|| would be less reflexive and be cautious about critical paradigms that would show one-to-one correspondence among culture, empire and novel, lest literature be treated as an entity that could be unravelled through a fixed grandma recipe. There has to be a theoretical model that does not act like a procrustean bed, as postcolonial theoretic has been doing for the last few decades. This is reminiscent of A.S. Byatt's –fatal family likeness|| afflicting so much of theoretics today (Byatt 02). This has come to pass when literature and ideology stand filtered through paradigmatic thought. The idea of investing criticism of literature with a specific pre-conceived politicization is not limited to postcolonial theoretics alone but it has showered its generosity on –Marxist, Feminist, New Historicist, and Queer Criticism, too|| (O'Connor 308). O'Connor succinctly outlines an oven-fresh theoretical model: –A post-postcolonial criticism would—could--help launch a much-needed of disciplinary reform, one that would begin by acknowledging the damage that agenda-driven scholarship has done to the fragile, increasingly embattled field of literary study|| (O'Connor 308).

Literary criticism has been crassly criticized for quite some time now to enable it for various hermeneutic projects. Such a situation has indulged in *reductio ad absurdum*. Literature is shrunk to a formula to enable it for a politicized reading. The results are predictable, whereby complexity of literary aesthetics has been rendered obscure. This has been one of the causes for the literary vocation's stagnation. Scholars have raised this issue in their studies. Take the instance of Mark Taylor, who in his study *The Moment of Complexity* (2001) has stressed the need to break old shackles and instead of indulging in the simplifications of paradigms and processes there is a dire need of comprehending them in their complexity. Taylor further defines complexity: –A complexity that can be reduced to simplicity is no complexity at all (Taylor 60). Hence it is time to comprehend complexity as it is. As O'Connor said: –this is a paradox we would do well to learn to live with and work within: sometimes the best way to manage complexity is to let it be simply and unapologetically complex (O'Connor 309).

9. RECLAMATION: TOWARDS POST-POSTCOLONIAL

Study of Victorian literature is wanting in this aspect. It has to come out of the politicized thinking. There are scholars like Amanda Anderson and Eve Kosofsky Sedgwick who have questioned paradigms of Victorian studies which are politicized and reduce literature to just one perspective of postcoloniality. Sedgwick even questioned the –hermeneutic of suspicion, which has been one of the prominent characteristics of the paradigm. While critiquing British novelists' hermeneutic paradigms there has been a tendency to avoid blaming paradigms as malice and indict analysis of paradigms as the reason for uniperspectival readings. They propose newer improved paradigms for analyzing literature as literature in an egalitarian manner. Anderson in her study *The Powers of Distance: The Cosmopolitanism and the Cultivation of Detachment* (2001) advocated –detachment as an alternative to the popular theoretic rubric of cosmopolitanism (Anderson 05). Sedgwick in –Paranoid Reading and Reparative Reading, and in her essay co-authored with Adam Frank entitled –Shame in the Cybernetic Fold: Reading Silvan Tompkins (1995) repudiated –hermeneutics of suspicion, which was the prevailing mode of analysis in the eighties and nineties. She recommended a novel psychoanalytic approach taken from Silvan Tompkins' work, discussing cybernetics and shame. She went on to explain that questing for an ideal paradigm is a search for the methodological grail. Thus, criticism has been pre-occupied with the undesirable and now is the time to explore newer possibilities for analysis

and move ahead of the stasis that presently holds contemporary criticism. The proposal is that contemporary paradigmatic thought be abandoned to seek a more equitable and dynamic way of reading and interpreting literature. Such a postcolonial criticism would indulge in a reclamation by situating literature back to its proper place at the center of literary studies and heralding it as literature which is ornate and affluent with a history of myriad shades. Dedicated studies of literature would find their proper place in this reclamation and there would be globalizing of literature but not globalizing about it in a politicized manner. There would be a more searching and keener exploration of literary details indulged in with an open mind. Details regarding an author's life and belief would also be interpreted in a manner which would be literary rather than political, doing justice to complexities of literary texts. The aim henceforth would be to analyze literature's sheer complexity and history and not to rigidly compartmentalize and control it. It would become an enterprise wherein a few will do well, but then it would be genuine scholarship where there will be no partisanship. It will be honest inquiry and not political propaganda masked as literary interpretation. There would be dignity and there would be substance as also engendering newer knowledge through fair and equitable perspective. Positive possibilities seem to be many.

REFERENCES

- Anderson, Amanda. -Cryptonormativism and Double Gestures: The Politics of PostStructuralism. *Cultural Critique* 21 (Spring 1992): 63-95.
- Anderson, Amanda. *The Powers of Distance: Cosmopolitanism and the Cultivation of Detachment*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton UP, 2001.
- Austen, Jane. *Mansfield Park*. 1814. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2003.
- Azim, Firdous. *The Colonial Rise of the Novel*. New York: Routledge, 1993.
- Bhabha, Homi. Ed. *Nation and Narration*. London and New York: Routledge, 1990.
- Bongie, Chris. Review of Thomas Richards's *Imperial Archive*. *Victorian Studies* 38, 3 (Spring 1995): 469-69.
- Boumehla, Penny. -_And What do the Women Do?_: Jane Eyre, Jamaica and the Gentleman's House. *Southern Review* 21, no. 2 (1988): 111-122.
- Bronte, Charlotte. *Jane Eyre*. Harmondsworth, Middlesex: Penguin, 1981.
- Byatt, A.S. *The Biographer's Tale*. New York: Knopf, 2001.
- Carey, Peter. *Jack Maggs*. Toronto: Vintage, 1999.

Cass, Jeffrey. –The Scraps, Patches, and the Rags of Daily Life: Gaskell’s Oriental Other and the Conservation of Cranford.‖ *Papers on Language and Literature* 35, (Fall 1999): 417-33.

David, Deirdre. *Rule Britannia: Women, Empire, and Victorian Writing*. Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell UP, 1996.

Dickens, Charles. *Great Expectations*, 1861. Ware: Wordsworth Editions, 1992.

Donaldson, Laura E. –The Miranda Complex: Colonialism and the Question of Feminist Reading.‖ *Diacritics* 18, no. 3 (Fall 1988): 65-77.

Freedgood, Elaine. –Mahogany Furniture as Sadistic Souvenir: Deforestation and Slavery in *Jane Eyre*,‖ delivered at the University of Pennsylvania, 17 April, 2001, and –What Goes Around: Negro-Head Tobacco and Aboriginal Genocide in *Great Expectations*,‖ delivered at the Marxism 2000 conference, University of Massachusetts, Amherst, September 2000. Quoted in Erin O’Connor. –Preface for a Post-Postcolonial Criticism.‖ In *Theory’s Empire: An Anthology of Dissent*. Daphne Patai and Will H. Corral. Eds. New York: Columbia UP, 2005; 297-312.

Gaskell, Elizabeth C. *Cranford*. Baltimore: Woodward, 1893.

Gibson, May Ellis. –The Seraglio or Suttee: Bronte’s *Jane Eyre*.‖ *Postscript* 4 (1987): 01-08.

Gilbert, Sandra M. and Susan Gubar. *The Madwoman in the Attic: The Women Writer and the Nineteenth Century Literary Imagination*. New Haven: Yale UP, 1979.

Gilmartin, Sophie. –The Sati, the Bride, and the Widow: Sacrificial Women in the Nineteenth Century.‖ *Victorian Literature and Culture* 25, no.1 (1997): 141-58.

Good, Graham. —Presentism: Postmodernism, Poststructuralism, Postcolonialism.‖ In *Theory’s Empire: An Anthology of Dissent*. Daphne Patai and Will H. Corral. Eds. New York: Columbia UP, 2005, 287-297.

Jameson, Fredric. –Third World Literature in the Era of Multinational Capitalism.‖ *Social Text* 15, (Fall 1986): 78.

JanMohamed, Abdul R. –The Economy of Manichean Allegory.‖ In –*Race, Writing, and Difference*. Ed. Henry Louis Gates Jr. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1985.

Kipling, Rudyard. *The Collected Works of Rudyard Kipling*. New York: AMS Press, 1970.

Krebs, Paula. Review of Susan Meyer’s *Imperialism at Home: Race and Victorian Women’s Fiction*. *Clio* 28, 1, Fall 1998.

- McClintock, Anne. *Imperial Leather: Race, Gender, and Sexuality in the Colonial Contest*. New York: Routledge, 1995.
- Meyer, Susan L. –Colonialism and Figurative Strategy of *Jane Eyre*.|| *Victorian Studies* 33, 2 (Winter 1990): 247-68.
- Meyer, Susan L. *Imperialism at Home: Race and Victorian Women's Fiction*. Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell UP, 1996.
- Michie, Elsie B. Review of Susan Meyer's *Imperialism at Home: Race and Victorian Women's Fiction*. *Modern Philology* 97, 2, 1997.
- Michie, Elsie B. –‘The Yahoo, Not the Demon’: Heathcliff, Rochester, and the Simianization of the Irish.|| *Outside the Pale: Cultural Exclusion, Gender Differences, and the Victorian Woman Writer*. Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell UP, 1993, 46-78.
- Noonan, Michael. *Magwitch*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1983.
- O'Connor, Erin. –Preface for a Post-Postcolonial Criticism|| in *Theory's Empire: An Anthology of Dissent*. Daphne Patai and Will H. Corral. Eds. New York: Columbia UP, 2005, 297-312.
- Perera, Suvendrini. *Reaches of Empire: The English Novel from Edgeworth to Dickens*. New York: Columbia UP, 1991.
- Richards, Thomas. *Imperial Archive: Knowledge and the Fantasy of Empire*. London and New York: Verso, 1993.
- Roy, Ashish. —The Fabulous Imperialist Semiotic of Wilkie Collins's *The Moonstone*.|| *New Literary History* 24, 3 (Summer 1993): 657-82.
- Said, Edward W. *Culture and Imperialism*. New York: Knopf, 1993.
- Said, Edward W. *The World, the Text, and the Critic*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard UP, 1983.
- Sedgwick, Eve Kosofsky. –Paranoid Reading and Reparative Reading; or, you're so Paranoid, You Probably Think This Introduction Is About You.|| In *Novel Gazing: Queer Readings in Fiction*. Ed. Eve Kosofsky Sedgwick. Durham, N.C.: Duke UP, 1997, 01-37.
- Sedgwick, Eve Kosofsky and Adam Frank. –Shame in the Cybernetic Fold: Reading Silvan Tomkins.|| *Critical Inquiry* 21, no. 2 (Winter 1995): 496-522.
- Sharpe, Jenny. *Allegories of Empire: The Figure of Woman in the Colonial Text*. Minneapolis:

University of Minnesota Press, 2011.

Spivak, Gayatri Chakravorty. -Three Women's Texts and a Critique of Imperialism. || *Critical Inquiry* 21, no.1 (Autumn 1985): 243-261.

Suleri, Sara. *The Rhetoric of English India*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1983.

Taylor, Mark. *The Moment of Complexity: Emerging Network Culture*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2001.

Zonana, Joyce. -The Sultan and the Slave: Feminist Orientalism and the Structure of *Jane Eyre*, ||

Signs 18, 3 (Spring 1993), 46-78.