

Comparative Cultural Studies of Nascent Neocolonial Literatures

- Anand Patil

Abstract: Defining post-colonial studies in Asian context (Shu-Mei-Shih) with “home-grown” theory is a new challenge for South Asian scholars, who have not yet “entered into their own ignorance” of neo-colonialism in so called “new” literatures. The dependence on post colonial theories and their applications by elite/ high-caste critics and NRIs in Conferences held in Europe and America determines our study of “emerging” literatures. Why Indians have not followed the counter discourses and resistance aesthetics neither of Frantz Fanon nor M.K. Gandhi, Kwame Nkrumah nor Kumau Braithwaite but Gayatri Chakravarty Spivak's leftist stance sans caste based culture study. The present paper proposes to discuss various aspects of emerging new literatures from the comparative and cultural perspectives. It explains the international contexts of Euramerica-centricism in neo-colonial texts and pleads for interdisciplinarity. It is the need of the time to introduce new cultural literacy of structures of literary feelings which are at work in production of the hybridity of a literary work. Comparative analysis of literary imperialism is the main objective of this key-note-address.

Keywords: Dneo-colonialism, cultural hegemony, emergence of literature, post-colonialism, Post-colonial Project, twin process of literary acculturation, cultural hegemony, Euramerica-centricism, resistance aesthetics, dependence complex, entering ignorance.

These people change thought at every moment. They have a proverb that color changeth at every seven year. They are like the pendulum of a watch, they can't be stable. Anyone who shouts and does anything straight or crosses or throws party, it is sure that they will begin to beat his drums, take it that the parliament of such people will be like them only. One thing they have, they will never allow their country to be ruled and if anybody ignores it, they will pierce his eyes. *But it is not that they are righteous or it cannot be claimed that they should be imitated. If Hindustan will imitate British people, I am sure that it will be totally ruined.* (Emphasis added) - M. K. Gandhi. *Hind-Swarajya*. 1909, translation from Marathi is mine. Pawanar: Paramdham Prakashan, 2009.19.

Gandhi's resistance aesthetics is more violent than Frantz Fanon's theories of anti-colonial violence. While describing the overall condition of Britain in the first decade of the previous century, when Fanon was not born, he had harshly criticized not only the western civilization but called the British Parliament a “prostitute.” He had juxtaposed the ethics and diversity of Indian culture against hedonist materialistic and moral less western civilization. His ideology was overshadowed by worst forms of imperialism. His aesthetics of resistance could not come to the center of Asia and we are paying the price for it today. In the hierarchy of colonized elite Indian critics, comparatist Jaidev used it in his *Culture of Pastiche: Existential Aestheticism in Hindi Novel* and turned the whole

tradition of criticism in Hindi upside down to such an extent that its Hindi translation was not published at all. Avdesh Kumar Singh (2005) has edited Seminar papers on "discourse of Resistance in the colonial period with special reference to English, Gujarati and Hindi literature". The mono literary studies in this anthology lack sound base of postcolonial theories. On the contrary, we have theory oriented comparative two doctoral works: my published and pirated thesis- *Western Influence on Marathi Drama: 1818-1947* (1993) and Manisha Anand Patil's *Alien Impact on Postcolonial Marathi Drama 1947-2000* (2008)."

Of course, there is the need of comparing emergence of "new" literatures in different colonies. Their literary histories may be different but dependence on center, inferiority complex, impact of "civilizing mission" etc might be common. Cultural colonization spreads through literary texts in local languages first and then through the dominant foreign language of the imperialists. "Amnesia" is an epidemic, which makes the "natives" forget their own culture. Hence the study of "new" literature in English in former colonies is a production of ignorance if neo-colonialism stabilized in the system of indigenous language literature is not comparatively understood. Immanuel Kant stated that the equal amount of ignorance needs to be produced for maintaining the dominance of certain theory or thought. Therefore knowledge of our own ignorance is a first step towards the knowledge of cultural imperialism in world literature. We hardly know what happened in British Bombay and Portuguese (see Anand Patil 1999). Edward Said (1994) has comparatively scrutinized the relationship between emergence of modern novel and Euro-American Empire and culture. Comparatists today are rethinking of Asian literary theory. But double colonization in India has less encouraged theorization of the terms of the debate which are listed in the themes of the Seminar: colonialism, post/neo/econo-colonialism/imperialism-identity-hegemony etc. Hence the organizers deserve compliments for selecting the topic audaciously to start the process of decolonizing the minds of the teachers first and then of the taught. It was Ngugi wa Thiong'o who wrote "Abolishing Departments of English in Africa in the 1970s. I hope, the present Seminar is intended to offer the same agenda of continuing the process of postcolonializing teaching and research. In a way it is a breath taking journey towards, in Fleming Braham's words, "entering our own ignorance." The histories of changes in labeling emerging literature in former colonies show how our critics deal with these factors. The colonial categorization like Anglo-Indian, Indo Anglian, Commonwealth, modern, "new" and other labels for Indian literature in English, and *aadhunik*, *Sadashiv Pethi mainstream-Brahminical*, *pradeshik*, *rural-Kshatriya-OBC*, *dalit-aadiwashi*- lower castes and tribes, sects, and religion based names at local/regional for Marathi literature is Anglo-America-centric. I (2011) have discussed how "modern" Marathi "rural and dalit" literature was born in "color and cloth but in the American cradles and on British soft beds of "modern aesthetics" distributed through Big Project of World literature and Modern

Aesthetics framed after the first World War. For awareness of such ignorance we need new concepts, theories and other tools to know from where the newness of nascent new literature came and what are its effects. Fleming Braham rightly argues,

But my point is much more cogently illustrated through reference to the subtleties chosen by W.H.New for the individual sections of the introduction to Commonwealth literature, Among two Worlds, 'Pattern of Dislocation', 'The Politics of Freedom,' 'In Search of Tomorrow's Traditions,' 'Home Ground, Foreign Territory,' 'Escape into Distance,' 'In Response to a New Old Land,' and 'Fastidious Antithesis,' (New 1975). I have deliberately omitted the geographical references because one of the interesting aspects of this list is the fact that several of the terms could be well have been applied to one or more of the other areas (66).

Why most of these “terms” absent in Indian literary criticism and histories mostly written by the comprador elite intellectuals? Isn't meant to produce ignorance to retain cultural hegemony and political neo-colonialism? To answer such questions, let us enter our own ignorance. Apart from Albert Memmi's *Colonizer and the Colonized*, Canadian historian W.H. New theorized the process of colonization and defined the literary relations between the center and periphery before Bhalchendra Nemade had graduated in English to copy his concepts without acknowledging his debt. At the outset of his article “Colonial Literatures” he states in “Colonial Literatures”:

The term 'colonial' applies most readily to political condition of dependency, whether passively accepted or actively enforced. It also alludes to the conditions literature, art and material production in dependent societies and to the sets of attitudes that confirm these conditions: attitudes and preoccupations about value, authority, and social priority in that practice reflect the norms of the controlling culture. From the general condition has arisen the metaphorical use of the terms 'colonial' and 'colonialism'—... the term 'colonial' is now generally associated with derivativeness, imitativeness, and ineffectuality (in Bruce King 102).

Read In the light of these concepts, literatures in formerly colonized countries prove not to be galvanized “new” but dependent-Euromerica centric, “derivative, imitative, and ineffectual”. E. M. Forster and George Orwell were more anti-colonial than the famous trio: Rao, Narayan and Anand or even than pseudo nativist Bhalchandra Nemade and moralist V.S. Khandekar, rural Anand Yadav and so called dalit Namdev Kambale. Both were blacklisted as “anti-imperialist” “white men. Forster wrote in his diary “Caste is fatal in India.” Orwell's fiction shows deeper consciousness of racism, and imperialism based on his experiences in India and Burma. In *Burmese Days* he portrays the critical and prejudiced attitudes of the British rulers towards natives. His *Burmese Days* opens with an ironic comment on the imperial tyranny which is illustrated in the physical appearance of the Burmese Magistrate U.Po Kyin:

He was a man of fifty, fat that for years he had not risen from his chair without help....for Burmese do not say and bulge like white men,

but grow fat symmetrically like fruits swelling (21).

On the contrary, Raja Rao and R.K.Narayan parade superiority of caste and local cultural colonialism. *The Serpent and the Rope* opens: "I was born Brahmin..." But Orwell exposes the lie in the colonizer's "civilizing mission" in a dialogue between Flory and Dr Veraswami in Burma:

Before we've finished Well's have wrecked the whole Burmese national culture... We are not civilizing them. We are only rubbing our dirt on them..I see (the Englishman) as a kind of up-to-date, hygienic, self satisfied, louse, creeping rounds the world building prisons. They build a prison and call it progress (53).

Therefore comparative cultural studies related to racialization and castealization of "emerging" new literature(s) will be a next progressive step to Homi K. Bhabha's *The Location of Culture*, which has not touched these aspects at all. But some of his concepts such as mimicry, signs taken for wonder, stereotypes, cultural hybridity, nation and narration etc. are more useful than Iyer-Naik- Mukherjee kind of impressionistic musing. But this complex process of acculturation of all emerging literature needs to be theorized and Steven de Totosy Zepneck, who wrote the exhaustive "foreword" to my *Literary into Comparative Culture Criticism*, has advised me to develop the "home- grown" theory of aesthetics based on caste and local culture to challenge Euromerica centricism. We will illustrate this point later. To the other extreme, knowledge produced in International Seminars and Conferences in Europe and America is being marketed as follows.

Postcolonial Studies and Beyond both calls for, and attempts to begin, a gathering of scholarly, critical political energies that is no longer detained by recycled debates and institutional jockeying, but instead is methodologically complex and eclectic, extroverted, experimental, and engaged in multiple sites of investigation and contest. One idea that this book clarifies, in its retrospect on postcolonial studies and its survey of the field's prospects, is that during the quarter century between 1978 and now, two simultaneous and overlapping, but not necessarily casually chained, events occurred: the disciplinary shift in postcolonial/global/third world studies from sociological and economic analysis to cultural and interpretive and theoretical/semiotic/discursive analysis; and challenge to theorize models and metanarratives built on the dominant paradigms of modernization..... Ania Loomba, Suvir Kaul, Matti Bunzl, Antoinette Butron, Jed Esty eds. *Postcolonial Studies and Beyond*, Delhi: Permanent Black, 2005:33,34. (D) Dukes University, USA.

This is the (neglected) improvised version of the "twin Process of acculturation" and modernization started after India's contact with Europe. It was well defined by the sociologist Rangnathan as Westernization-Anglicization + Brahmanization-Sanskritization (Maulwization-Urdusization) = acculturation-modernization. Now it is Euramericanization-diasporization-NRIzation + internationalization + Englishization-vernacularization = post modernization minus "post-colonization. Our history of modern Indian literatures displays less colonial consciousness than those in histories of African or Caribbean

new literatures, why? We are addicted to the glorified adjective “post-independence” albeit we suffer from “dependence complex”. I was surprised when two stalwart impressionist critics (whom I have called the mafias of literary opium) and ex-presidents of All India Marathi Literature “Sanmelaan” (conference) asked me: “Where are the white men to colonize India now? Do not bring extrinsic elements such as colonization and caste in pure literature...” Some “adept” and appropriated writers of lower castes immediately smell rats if any reference to “Brahman” or Vedic culture is made. Such comprador intellectuals make too simplistic, loud but ignorant claims about authenticity of their regional literatures (castealized: Brahmanical mainstream, rural, dalit etc.), although they do not read English. To be brief, brown consciousness is still in the white prison. Under such circumstances the cultural literacy of new terms, concepts and theories such as neo-colonialism, decolonization, resistance aesthetics, racialization- castealization of literature, mimicry, Friday-Crusoe, Prospero-Caliban complex, postcolonial project, subverting master text, cultural amnesia, stereotypes, Manichean system of dependency and exploitation, hegemonic cultural wars etc. are hardly discussed in double colonized –Brahmanized Indian criticism. Moreover, all critical writing in India is British-India-centric sans any reference to Portuguese Goa. How can comparative culture studies flourish and “the disciplinary shift in postcolonial/global/third world studies from sociological and economic analysis to cultural and interpretive and theoretical/ semiotic/ discursive analysis,” as imagined by Loomba and others, take place in our caste conditioned literary structures? My *Literature in British Bombay and Portuguese Goa* had initiated this “shift” but the next step would be the cultural study of castealization of Indian literatures and theorization of otherness audaciously. Elsewhere, I have pleaded for new cultural literacy and comparative cultural studies with reference to Hyacinth Cynthia Wyatt's, *R.K. Narayan as a Brahman Writer* (1997). A number of recent English books on Indian culture and literature, mainly written by Euramerican and NRI scholars, as mentioned above, show the continuation of the colonization in the guise of “civilizing mission” of the white man. Meenakshi Sharma has explained it as follows:

In the British enterprise of acquiring a mastery and command over Indian Languages for the purpose of facilitating the governance of India, the intimate connections between knowledge and power underlined by Foucault are obvious. Bernard Cohn in his significantly titled essay “The Command of Language and the Language of Command” argues that “the conquest of India was a conquest of knowledge “ (276) a knowledge acquired through the massive stock of information put together with great effort by thousands of Company officials... The texts produced as a result of these efforts “began the establishment of discursive formation, defined an epistemological space, created a discourse (Orientalism), and had the effect of converting Indian forms of knowledge into European objects”(10).

The traditional Brahminical/ Moulawi narrative authority was conquered by the British/Portuguese and they “represented the diversity

of 'Indian' pasts through a homogenizing narrative of tradition from a 'medieval' period to 'modernity' "(see Dipesh Chakrabarty *Subaltern Studies*, 5). First, the traditional cultural hegemony of Brahmins was drawn into the process of transformation. As a result in the long run, the authoritative control which the British had exercised over new social and material technologies was taken over by Brown Brahmins. For instance, ninety five percent college teachers in the University of Bombay were Brahmin till 1947. They mediated, with vested interests, Euramerican literary theories to retain their age old authority/ hegemony. In this context, "Indianization" of form and narrative is a very misleading concept because it was Brahminization-Sanskritization. Lord Macaulay's theory of filtration of education from high castes at the top to the lower castes in that rigid hierarchy holds true till today in shaping caste-wise structures of feelings. The dalit protest literature is derivative and confined to the local colonized dark cells. As internationalization of literature is a galvanized concept to free literary postcolonization process from the colonial stigma, "bahujanization" (transformation of mass literature) is used to hide the marks of the "twin process" mentioned above. Hence it is a need of the time to re-examine the neo-colonial features of post-independence Indian criticism. At the same time it is necessary to study as to why we do not have Eduard Said or Frantz Fanon, Ngugi wa Thiong'O, Kwame Appiah or Kwame Nkrumah. Pandit Nehru was fascinated by Russian Revolution and M.N. Roy modified Marxism for India but no Indian dared to adapt Lenin's pamphlet *Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism* (1917) as the originator of the term "neo-colonialism" Nkrumah did in his *Neo-colonialism, the Last Stage of imperialism* (1965) and stated,

In place of colonialism, as the main instrument of imperialism, we have today neo-colonialism... (Which) like colonialism, is an attempt to export social conflicts of the capitalist countries...

In short, it is a geopolitical practice of using capitalism business globalization and culture of imperialism to influence the under-developed country. The indirect cultural remote control and hidden agenda of cultural hegemony are more powerful than direct political control. Literature is the most effective cultural product and the electronic media has internationalized it. America has invested more capital in it than any other country. The cultural industry is dominated by the developed countries despite the "Flag Freedom" (Fanon) given to the colonized countries in the 1940s. Y.B. Chavan understood Lenin's book and concept of neo-colonialism better than any Marathi writer. Later philosopher Kwame Appiah defined Postcolonialism as a "space clearing gesture" and pleaded for healthy "nativism", and not for Nemade's opportunistic nativism. He debated "post" in post-colonialism and "post-modernism. So the ideology and practice of neo-colonialism in literati needs to be discussed comparatively.

From Nkrumah this concept has also been used in other contexts. A postcolonial culturalists is surprised by Robert Young's use of news paper cuttings showing imperialism advanced first "through

development and dependency theory” and then through “critical development theory”. The major issue is how to escape from the Western notion of development. Theorists have arrived at the conclusion that development theory goes beyond dependency theory.”Development” cannot be theorized in purely economic terms but has to incorporate other dimensions like culture, gender, society and politics. Young emphasizes sustainable development, “self-reliance” and “cultural pluralism and human rights” (55). Y.B. Chavan's speeches and writings write back to empire more effectively than Srinivas K. Iyengar's *History of Indian Writing in English*, Meenakshi Mukherjee's *Perishable Empire*, M.K. Naik's deeply colonized literary criticism and R.K. Narayan's fundamentalist nationalism in *The English Teacher*. Apart from clichés and binaries, It is the moral responsibility of our teachers of English “to enter into ignorance” with wider comparative perspectives and relate global literature in “Englishes” to emerging literatures in vernaculars.

Literary colonialism is better understood in comparative cultural studies. The nature of colonial consciousness depends not only on the type of governance implemented by the colonizers but also on the frame of local “internal colonialism”. Raja Rao's *Kantapura* and Thiong'o's *A Grain of Wheat* stand two poles apart in the shifts of point of view from “you” to “we”. Thiong'o's scenes are narrated by the communal consciousness of the whole village looking at most of the characters from the view point of the entire community. On the other hand, Rao tells the story from the Brahmanical point of view which focuses only on “Twenty four Brahman Quarters” in *Kantapura*. It is not “the prose epic “as Naik claims , but a Brahminical booklet of lip service to Gandhism cum nationalism and elite cultural hegemony. It means caste hierarchy makes all the difference in inter and intra -colonial consciousness in Indian creative writings. This might expose the power politics in cultural and literary image building industry.

In a comparative case study of colonial consciousness and identity crisis in Black American, Indian and African novelists, O.P. Juneja writes:

In the case of India, there was no predictable change in the social structure due to colonialism, perhaps because of the Hindu ethos and also because of the English policy of indirect rule after the mutiny of 1857. The traditional caste ridden society became more rigid and formal. As in Mulk Raj Anand's *Untouchable* and *Coolie*. Hindu ethos which had already withstood the pressures of earlier onslaught of other alien cultures made the Hindus, more so the Brahmins, more traditionalistic, ritualistic and philosophical. While Raja Rao's Ramswamy is preoccupied with some metaphysical questions in *the Serpent and the Rope*, Padmanabha Iyer keeps worrying about the Marxist dialectics in *Comrade Kirillov*. Both of them ignore sordid realities of existence. R. K. Narayan, on the other hand, takes up the colonial paradigm of the colonizer and colonized and examines its psychological implications as in case of Vasu and Natraj who act out the Prospero complex and the dependency complex between themselves in the *Man Eater of Malgudi* (2,3).

Of course, comparative reading of two Goan novels viz Francisco Louis Gomes's *The Brahman* (in Portuguese 1866) and Lambert

Mascarhenas's forgotten classic- peasant novel *Sorrowing Lies My Land* (1955) tell different tales of direct rule and "Inquisitions" in Goa. Only comparative culture study might reveal the politics of exclusion of such Goan Christian texts from so called Indian writing in English. Thus, the faces of innumerable Indian modernisms as an "armed version of colonialism" are quite different from "six faces of American modernism." The terms such as Euro-centric, America-centric etc. prove the basis of dependency theory. Faces of emerging modernism in India are not yet X-rayed. Literary neo-colonialism extracts the literary and linguistic natural resources of peripheral (poor) countries to flow to the economies of the wealthy countries at the center. For example, the investigation of the capital earned through Shakespeare cultural industry or translation and sales of Euramerican bestsellers in India by Britain and American publication industry will throw light on cultural, socio-economic bases of neo-colonial dependency. It can also be argues that investment by multinational corporations enriches few elites in underdeveloped countries, causes death of local languages, genres, arts and values, devastates eco-aesthetics of the *neocolonies*. This results in unsustainable development and perpetual underdevelopment of indigenous language and literature.

One variant of neo-colonialism theory critiques cultural colonialism. The dominant strong nations always desire to control poor nations' values through cultural means, such as media, language, literature, education literature etc.ultimately for economic gains. Elsewhere I (2011) have discussed at length how Anglo-American scholars designed the Big Project of Aesthetics and World Literature to control the cultures in colonies to be decolonized in the 1940s. The colonial mentality makes one believe that the foreigners' ways are always better and are held in a higher esteem than previous indigenous ways. It is interesting to study the superiority complex of American NRIs in Pune in caste hierarchy and their Americanization today which makes them equate the colonizers' race or ethnicity as being responsible for their *superiority*. They mediate western culture through "World Marathi Literary Congress: albeit they have nothing to do with indigenous culture and language. India has less movements of cultural rejection like Negritude, because the monopoly holders of cultural capital themselves became agents of Western imperialism. Dalit and rural literary movements reacted to Brahmanical domination and not to the Western cultural neo-colonization. Soon these emerging literatures were pampered and appropriated by neo-colonial systems. Their embracing seemingly "authentic local culture" was a part of the struggle against that domination and cultural hegemony, not against American "new" criticism.

On this background, let us rethink of, in Cesar Dominquez's words, literary emergence as a case study of theory in comparative literature (1).Least attention has been given to the theorization of the concept of "emerging literatures." Literary emergence does not mean an emerging literature. After listing three works he cites the definition of the term from OED: emergent: new and still developing (376). It is nascent and

“breaks the surface”. According to him,

...the very act of emergence implies a rereading of the canon through a special thematic and genological work which establishes intertextual, interliterary and interartistic networks, networks in which the translation processes are internal. Finally, an emerging literature, which offers itself in order to be received, provides immeasurable amount of material towards the realization of comparative poetics---The study of emergence requires an interdisciplinary focus as we are dealing with a phenomenon which goes beyond the boundaries of literary, artistic and cultural circles. This need has been ignored by the studies we have seen to date (2).

In order to trace the mechanism of emergence he has compared diverse editions of reference work on poetry published by Princeton University. Their “prefaces” show how non-western literatures were included in the name of “new literatures.” The policy was to retain colonial cultural hegemony. This emergence is associated with European languages used in non-western countries. Three contradictions in it are listed: 1) literatures in European languages are conceived as authentic autonomous systems, without possible interaction with non-European literatures, 2) national literature is privileged over any other literary literary formation, 3) the concentration of these literatures in new post-colonial states seems to ignore the fact that –the Soviet Union disappeared and 31 states were born... 4) the polarization in the ex-colonies of Britain and France overshadow the existence of other European and non-European empires (4). In this way the map of literary emergence resembles with the map of emerging markets, International financial Corporation etc. The map of new literary emergence in Indian regional languages also resembles these transformations studies comparatively. Therefore, “new” literatures in should not be studies as single national entities, but neo-colonial cultural products.

The emergence of all new literatures in constitutionally recognized Indian languages in the postcolonial period is mainly connected with the domination of “global English.” It's comparative analysis demands interdisciplinary approaches drawn from cultural semiotics, polysystem theory, interliterary theory, cultural materialism, systemic empirical theory, etc. A new literature never takes birth in a vacuum. For example, Shankar Sarada (2013) had recently traced the emergence of literature for children in Marathi at the beginning of the nineteenth century in the Marathi translations of English and Sanskrit books. The king of Tanjore in Madras Presidency published the Marathi translation of *Aesop's Tales* from English into Marathi titled “Isapnieeti” by Sakkkhan Pandit in 1806 and a new trend was set due to the printing press started by Joyce Carry. After a century the regional-rural (*pradeshik, gramin, anchalik*) implies a change. Traditionally this change is described by all Indian literary histories, which are outdated telephone directories, in the context of a literature within a framework of states in India. But two new brands namely rural and dalit literatures emerged in Maharashtra a state in India because the winds of change in American aesthetics of regionalism and Black aesthetics had started blowing through GateWay

of India in the 1930s, and latter the fellowships and awards (for half bright) played a significant role in the Cold War of ideologies and books. Very important case in point is the flood of American literature after PL480 pact in the 1960s. So there is a need of new literary competence to study a reconfiguration of the interliterary network in the same way as new rural/*dalit* (non- Brahmin caste based) text reconfigures the intertextual network which is quite different from Brahminical textures, to some extent. But both are conditioned by the hybridized culture of the process of internationalization. Therefore linking literary change (and with it literary emergence) literature by literature in India gives rise to production of ignorance. Simplified colonial impressionistic criticism is the outcome of neo-colonialism in caste hierarchy. This is well understood if their emergence is explained with a reference to “the wider context of a world literary mega-system as each of these literatures is no more than a small portion of a large picture (see Dominguez 3).

This makes us understand “national literature as a minimal unit of world literature” which “constitutes the superior state of the inter-literary process.” That regional language book, which is translated into English or any European language, is considered “great” /superior without knowing that it is never included in the Euramerican concept of World Literature but only source of study of poverty in the subcontinent. This is the improvised neo-colonial version of the earlier East India Company's policy:”Command of local language and language of Command “for conquest of knowledge. Hence there is a dire need of further microscopic comparative cultural studies to reinterpret Gauri Viswanathan's deconstructive findings in *Masks of Conquest: literary Study and British Rule in India* (1990). A new dimension to it will be added if the “literary emergence” and “writing back to cultural imperialism” during the progressive rule of Maharaja Sayajirao Gaikwad in Baroda in the second part of the nineteenth century. It should be noted here that Dr B.R. Ambedkar's (who was awarded scholarship on bond thrice as a special case) protest literature and Bhalchandra Nemade's (employed in London University for two years but paid through Sayajirao's funds for that Chair) opportunist nativism were made possible by the funds provided by that great reformer-visionary king. Viswanathan had deconstructed Tipu Sultan's letters to the British Parliament. But sixteen hundred files of secret letters written by the CIDs in British against revolutionary King Sayajirao to the Governor and Parliament still lie unexplored in the INDIA OFFICE in London. He had not only granted financial assistance to freedom fighters such as Lokmanya Tilak, Gopalkrishna Gokhale, Yogi Arvibdo Ghosh, Amin, reformists Jyotiba Phule, V.R. Shinde , historian Riyasatkar Sardesai etc. but also sanctioned pension for Savitribai Phule. These are the roots of literary emergence and new knowledge in Maharashtra and Gujrat (see Bhand 2012). His predecessor Sarfoji Raje Bhosale of Tanjaore in Madras Presidency, who had mastered English and French, had paved the path for literary emergence in Marathi and Tamil in the early nineteenth century. But Maharashtra has not yet “entered into own ignorance” till today. It will be far better comparative research in the area of emerging

literatures than third class mono-literary cut-pest thesis on William Golding without and golden elements in it.

Post-colonial theory is one of the useful means of understanding cultural legacy of colonial rule. That has framed the cultural identity of the colonized people. Neo-colonialism is the background for the contemporary dilemmas of developing a national identity after colonial rule. What role the twin process discusses earlier has played in shaping of the spirit of our national literatures? Post-colonialism helps to study how writers articulate, present and celebrate their post-colonial national identity. Our comparative case studies of influence of Western drama on Marathi Drama from 1818 to 2000 have demonstrated how the indigenous writer's relationship with the foreign text and its use or misuse matters most in literary acculturation (see Anand Patil 1993, Manisha Patil 2008). In such comparative cultural studies it is necessary to trace how knowledge of the subaltern people was generated, and applied against the colonized in service to the cultural and economic interests of the "mother country" and how colonialist literature justified colonialism by misrepresenting the "natives" as an inferior race and their heroes as savages. The post colonialist comparatist privileges "history from below", studies minutely manifestations of people outside the hegemony and the psychology of the colonization (Frantz Fanon). Critical international relation theory also plays a significant role in neocolonial comparative cultural criticism. The lasting effects of cultural colonialism (domestic as well as foreign) are of central interest in cultural critique of neo-colonialism. Not only Marxist dependency theory but multiple theories such as feminism, post-modernism, race and caste based home grown theories of otherness are necessary for new and better literary and cultural literacy. So the histories and criticism of literatures in India written under "the Brahminical shadows" has become a great suspect for the writers of the lower caste. The dilemma of the "colonizer and the colonized" persists constantly in specific Indian avatar. Vinay Dharwadkar's (NRI in America) "the Internationalization of Literatures" examines both national and transnational elements in "new" literature. He has juxtaposed several literatures and presented mere parallels. He concludes:

Since the mid-1960s, the international effects of the three sets of alternative poetic models discussed above (the American, the European, and the indigenous) have become more than noticeable in the various national traditions of the English-using world..... Likewise, the counter cultural irreverence and rebelliousness of American beat poetry, as well as the European and Latin American combination of left-wing politics, experimental styles, and anti-poetic devices, have surfaced with individual variations in brilliant comic and satiric poems around the Commonwealth, like those by Arun Kolhatkar in Marathi and English in India, and those by Earle Birney, Tom Wayman, Michael Ondaatje in English Canada... (76-77).

The post-colonial theory includes some features of post-modernism.

For example, hybridity, parody, subversion, decolonization, carnivalization, selflessness, and immanence are some of the salient characteristics of postmodernism. Salman Rushdie's *Midnight's Children*, Arundhati Roy's *God of Small Things*, Kiran Desai's *The Inheritance of Loss* and other "masterpieces of Indian English fiction display all these characteristics. But in what sense are they postcolonial? How does Rushdie write back to the Empire and "chutaniify" the whole Western tradition of novel? Has Marathi produced any rebel who "russafies" the comprador writers' tradition? Isn't Arvind Adiga's *The White Tiger* the best *dalit* novel? Why nascent literatures in Indian languages are blocked by translations of Euro-American best-sellers? Do we have adequate literary competence to understand international interliterariness in the text mentioned above? Are not Roy and Desai the grand daughters of Gabriel Garcia Marquez and Gunter Grass? How far is our syllabus "neo-colonized? Why some of the Asian texts are not juxtaposed with equal number of Euro-American texts?

The list of questions is not exhaustive. I hope, this seminar will raise many and also answer them. It may be more productive if an anthology of select papers is published. Before I conclude, as a postcolonial culturalist comparatist let me cite the experience that is my best teacher.

It means our teacher has to understand this complex process of neo-colonization and cultural imperialism in the international context and develop not only Coleridgean "imagination" of old kind but the "dialogic comparative imagination that leads to creativity. They have to go a step ahead of Dharwadkar's short survey and analyze intertextuality and politics of an act of writing poetry at the microscopic level. Thus the major argument of this Key Note Address (I don't like the metaphysical term "beej bhashan"-delivered by sterile!) may provide a better frame for further deliberations. You are in the better position to decolonize learning and teaching. At the risk of self-praise let me quote to small creative events in nascent literature. One of my research students, Anagha Joshi-Mudholkar (Nanded), who had proposed and married "inter-caste," has published a collection of Marathi poems under a single different surname ; "Kurundkar." The process of decolonization was started by her, but culture conditioning in the double colonized Hindu society over determined her choice of surname. Another past student of our Department of Marathi in Goa University, Neeta Torane – now a lecturer-recently asked me to write an "introduction" in English to her second collection of poems in Marathi! She had got those poems translated into Hindi, English and Konkani by her colleagues. Translations in presence of writers need new translation theories now. I had read the account of such international experiment in *World Literature Today*. In that international context I found this Goan venture very fruitful activity which has resulted into a novel experiment in not only translation but also in team work which is wanting in our "caste marked" (vilas Sarang's term) literati. This is how our "new" literatures have to emerge from our centers with little consciousness of decolonization rather than Euro-American air-conditioned NRI mediated and imported cradles.

References :

- Bhand, Baba.(2012) *Maharaja Sayajirao Gaikwad:Biography*. Aurangabad: Saket Prakashan.
- Brahm, Fleming.(1995). Entering Our Own Ignorance: Subject-Object Relations in Commonwealth Literature”, in *The Post-colonial Studies: Reader*. Eds. Bill Ashcroft et al. London: Routledge. 66-70.
- Dharwadkar, Vinay. “The Internationalization of Literatures” in Bruce King *Op. Cit.* PP.69-77.
- Dominguez, Cesar.(2009). ”Literary emergence as a case study of theory in comparative literature”.CLCWEB: Comparative Literature and Culture, 8.2 1-13. Trans. from Spanish. Clara Dechant and Mark D.Wiersma.
- Gandhi,M. K.(2009). *Hind-Swarajya*.1909, translation from Marathi is mine. Pawanar:Paramdham Prakashan.19
- Jaidev,(2003). *Culture of Pastiche: Existential Aestheticism in Contemporary Hindi Novel*. Shimala: IIAS.
- Juneja, O.P(1991). “Colonial Consciousness and Identity Crisis: The Case of Black American, Indian and African novelists,” Ramesh K. Srivastava ed. *Colonial Consciousness in Black American, African and Indian Fiction in English*.Jalandar: ABC Publication.
- King, Bruce. Ed.(1996). *New National and Post-colonial Literatures:An Introduction*. Oxford: OUP.
- New,W.H. Colonial Literatures” Bruce King *Op. Cit.* 103.
- Loomba Ania, Suvir Kaul, Matti Bunzl, Antoinette Butron, Jed Esty eds.(2005). *Postcolonial Studies and Beyond*, Delhi: Permanent Black,33,34. (D) Dukes University, USA.
- Patil, Anand.(1993). *Western Influence on Marathi Drama*, Panaji Goa: Rajhauns Vitaran.
- -----.(1999).*British Bombay ani Portuguese Govyateel Wangmay*. Mumbai: Granthali Prakashan. Literature in British Bombay and Portuguese Goa, trans. Manisha Patil. Germany: Laplambert Educational Publication in press.
- --,--,--.(2011). *Literary into Comparative Culture Criticism*. Ambala: Associated Publishers.
- Patil, Manisha Anand.(2008). “Alien Influences on Post-colonial Marathi Drama”. Doctoral thesis, unpublished, Mysore University.
- Said, Edward.(1994). *Culture and Imperialism*. New York. Vintage Books 1994.
- Sarda, Shankar.(2013).”Marathi Balsahityache Parbhrat Arambhparva.”*Mehata Granth Jagat:Diwali* ,27-30.
- Sharma, Meenakshi.(2003). *Postcolonial; Indian Writing between Co-Option and Resistance*. Jaipur: Rawat Publication.
- Singh, Aydeskumar.(2005). *Discourse of Resistance in Colonial Period*. New Delhi: Creative Books.
- Viswanathan, Gauri.(1990). *Masks of Conquest: literary Study and British Rule in India* London: Faber and Faber.
- Wyatt, Hyacinth Cynthia. (1997). *R.K. Narayan as a Brahman Writer*. Doctoral Thesis. Universitat Rovira: Virgili.Supervisor Dr Dolors Collellmir Morales, Reader in Commonwealth Studies.
- Young, Robert.(2001). *PostcolonialismAn Historical Introduction*. Oxford: Blackwell Pub.
- Professor Dr Anand Patil 09404140995 dr_anandpatil@rediffmail.com, <bookganga.com> ,<aranyanand.org>

