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Abstract:
The main concern of this research paper is to shed light on the Post-colonial Theory and show its effect on literary criticism, regarding its political, social, economic, and cultural dimensions. The paper is divided into three parts. The first part demonstrates the definition of the Post-colonial theory, and how it represents a new form of Colonialism. Moreover, this part states a comparison between Colonialism, Postcolonialism, and Neocolonialism. The second part depicts how “Displacement” is considered an outcome of Colonialism. In addition, the second part clarifies the causes which motivate people to immigrate whether economically, politically, educationally, or for other causes. Also, this part describes how “Exile” is regarded as a result of displacement, and what follows it of a state of “Nostalgia”. The third part of this research paper tackles the issue of “Hybridity”, showing the cultural diversity among different societies. This part illustrates the existence of negative Arab stereotypes in Western systems of knowledge and representation.
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التهجير وأزدواجية الهوية في نظرية ما بعد الاستعمار

ملخص:

يُمكن الاهتمام الرئيسي لهذه الورقة البحثية في إلقاء الضوء على نظرية ما بعد الاستعمار وإظهار تأثيرها على النقد الأدبي من حيث أبعاده السياسية والاجتماعية والاقتصادية والثقافية. تقسم الورقة البحثية إلى ثلاثة أجزاء. يوضح الجزء الأول تعريف نظرية ما بعد الاستعمار وكيف أنها تمثل شكلاً جديداً من أشكال الاستعمار. علامة على ذلك، يقوم هذا الجزء بإجراء مقارنة بين نظريات "الاستعمار" و"ما بعد الاستعمار" و"الاستعمار الجديد". بينما يصور الجزء الثاني كيف يعتبر "التهجير" أحد عواقب الاستعمار. كما يوضح الجزء الثاني الأسباب التي تدفع الناس للهجرة سواء اقتصاديًا أو سياسيًا أو تعليميًا أو لأسباب أخرى. ويفض هذا الجزء أيضًا كيف ينظر إلى "المنفي" على أنه أحد توابع التهجير، وما يلي ذلك من حالة "المنفي إلى الماضي". وأخيراً يتناول الجزء الثالث من هذه الورقة البحثية موضوع "الهجينة"، موضوعاً التنوع الثقافي بين المجتمعات المختلفة. ويبين هذا الجزء وجود صور نمطية عربية سلبية في النظم الغربية لا سيما في الإعلام والمجتمع الأمريكي وكيفية دحض هذه الأفكار والعمل على تقبل الآخرين.

الكلمات المفتاحية: الاستعمار، ما بعد الاستعمار، الاستعمار الجديد، التهجير، المنفي، الحنين، الوطن، التهجين.
Introduction

Postcolonial theory expresses the interrelationship of human sciences, whether social, intellectual, psychological, or political in approaches that indicate how connected these categories are. In this regard, Postcolonial theory provides a framework that illustrates to what extent the critical theories are similar in depicting human oppression.

This chapter is divided into three parts; the first part examines a selection of the various definitions of Postcolonial theory for pinpointing its relation to other literary theories, particularly Marxism and feminism, and holds a comparison among Colonialism, Postcolonialism, and Neocolonialism. The second part deals with the concept of Hybridity, highlights its cultural and psychological influence on immigrants, and traces its development from being used in Latin to refer to biological studies till its current usage in cultural theories. Moreover, the second part sheds the light on Bhabha’s theory of “Third Space” and other relative theories. Finally, the third part discusses the concepts of Displacement, showing its psychological impact on immigrants, and Diaspora. In addition, the final part tackles the concepts of Exile and Nostalgia as outcomes of Displacement. As the whole study is concerned with depicting Hybridity and Displacement in selected novels by Palestinian writers, the researcher sets Palestine as a social setting for underscoring Displacement.

Postcolonial Theory

Postcolonial theory has impacted literary criticism through its many political, economic, social, and cultural dimensions. As defined in Dictionary of Sociology, Postcolonial theory is “a loosely-related set of ideas concerned with the social, economic and political conditions of former Colonies” (237). In Colonialism/Postcolonialism (2005), Ania Loomba states that “It might seem that because the age of colonialism is over, and because the descendants of once-colonized peoples live everywhere, the whole world is postcolonial. And yet the term has been fiercely contested on many counts” (12). Bill Ashcroft et al. in their introduction to The Post-colonial Studies Reader (1995), claim that “Postcolonial studies are based in the 'historical fact' of European colonialism and the diverse material effects to which this phenomenon gave rise” (2).

Consequently, Postcolonial Theory may be considered as a changeover area as Hall shows “the concept may help us to do is to describe or characterize the shift in global relations which marks the
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(necessarily uneven) transition from the age of Empires to the post-independence and post-decolonization moment” (246). Postcolonial theory came to be known as a literary theory in the second half of the 20th century, as defined in *Penguin Dictionary of Sociology*, “Colonialism, which reached its height in the nineteenth century, was reversed in the second part of the twentieth century when colonies gained their independence” (300).

Helen Gilbert and Joanne Tompkins in *Post-Colonial Drama Theory, practice, politics* (1996) argue that the term “Postcolonialism” is “narrowly defined” since it can be regarded as an extension of colonialism. They claim that:

Post-colonialism is, rather, an engagement with and contestation of colonialism’s discourses, power structures, and social hierarchies. Colonization is insidious: it invades far more than political chambers and extends well beyond independence celebrations. Its effects shape language, education, religion, artistic sensibilities, and, increasingly, popular culture. A theory of post-colonialism must, then, respond to more than the merely chronological construction of post independence, and to more than just the discursive experience of imperialism(2).

Thus, the term “Postcolonialism” is used to point out the repercussions of colonialism. Moreover, such term refers to the ensuing interactions between the cultures of the colonizer and the traditions of the colonized. In addition, Postcolonialism can be thought of as a resistance to all forms of colonialism in an attempt to put an end to the intellectual, political, educational, historical, cultural, and financial effects of colonialism. Stephen Slemon regards Postcolonialism as “a mode of misidentifying whole societies from the sovereign codes of cultural organization, and an inherently dialectical intervention in the hegemonic production of cultural meaning” (14). In other words, Post-Colonial theory tends to tackle the issues existing within the ex-colonized societies. Therefore, Post-Colonial theory tackles the outcomes of Colonialism as “Postcolonialism often also involves the discussion of experiences of various kinds, such as those of slavery, migration, suppression and resistance, difference, race, gender, place” (Quayson2).

Douglas Robinson in his book *Translation and Empire Postcolonial Theories Explained* (1997) points out that Post-Colonial theory has three definitions. The first one is “The study of Europe’s former colonies since independence; how they have responded to, accommodated, resisted or overcome the cultural legacy of colonialism during independence. ‘Postcolonial’ here refers to cultures after the end of
colonialism” (13). Regarding the first definition, it is close in meaning to the usage of the term “Postcolonialism” as it gives due care to the cultural, political, social, economic, and literal consequences of colonialism since these countries had their independence.

As for the second definition, he states that Postcolonialism is “The study of Europe’s former colonies since they were colonized; how they have responded to, accommodated, resisted or overcome the cultural legacy of colonialism since its inception. ‘Postcolonial’ here refers to cultures after the beginning of colonialism” (13). Such definition sheds the light on many issues which the colonized countries got through during the era of colonialism. In other words, it uncovers the real causes of the colonizers to invade any country with the aim of expanding and enhancing their economic ambitions represented in searching for raw materials or taking control over the colonized countries wealth, and reveals their fake slogans of spreading civilization, and protecting nations. Moreover, this definition describes the manner with which the colonized countries resist colonialism and promote nationalism.

The third definition of Postcolonialism is more extensive: “The study of all cultures/societies/countries/nations in terms of their power relations with other cultures/etc.; how conqueror cultures have bent conquered cultures to their will; how conquered cultures have responded to, accommodated, resisted or overcome that coercion” (14). This definition illustrates the cultural relations among nations and the diversity of their unique cultures, societies, languages, economic and military systems, which in turn paves the way for colonizing countries to impose its culture, language, and domination on colonized nations.

**Colonialism, Post Colonialism and Neocolonialism**

As defined in *The Sage Dictionary of Sociology*, Colonialism is the “political rule of one nation, country or society by another, usually some way off. But it now more commonly refers to the domination of large parts of the world by white Christian European states in the 19th and 20th centuries” (41). Hence, it is clear that colonialism refers to the European occupation and hegemony over many countries all over the world in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. In *Culture and Imperialism* (1993), Edward Said states that both Britain and France during the twentieth century took control over 30 percent of the earth. Thus, Colonialism is considered as the outcome of imperialism or what Said called “metropolitan West” which refers to the paramount essence of imperialism, which he defined as "the practice, the theory, and the attitudes of a dominating metropolitan center ruling a distant territory."
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(9). Said makes it clear that the fundamental motive of the domination over the colonized countries was that the colonizer's aims were mainly economic (8–10). Imperialism still has a significant cultural impact today. To understand this, Said suggests looking at how colonialists and imperialists used culture to govern countries and peoples.

Consequently, the growth of European capitalism is based on the colonial expansion which European countries. The prosperity of colonist countries depends mainly on their benefits from colonized countries’ raw materials and agriculture. Ronald H. Chilcote claims that European countries enhance their economy through the importation of the colonized countries’ natural resources. He points out that such importation during Colonialism was not enough for European countries as they tended to the continuity of this exploitation through setting up an international market along with imposing control over the rules of such market (81–83). As a result, it is clear that the profiteering of the colonized countries’ resources promotes the colonialist countries’ economy instead of improving the conditions of the colonized one.

The colonizer gains hegemony and control over the colonized with the support and assistance of the local elite in any colonized society. Nathan Brown advocates this notion, claiming that the colonizer seeks to achieve economic expansion which in turn enhances its economy. In addition, the colonizer tends to have supporters within the colonized society (105–106). While the majority of the colonized society unite in their resistance against the colonizer, the elite betray their homeland through lending a hand for the colonizer in return for achieving their own ambitions.

Graham Huggan and Helen Tiffin in their book Postcolonial Ecocriticism: Literature, Animals, and the Environment (2010) argue that the European countries regard the indigenous societies as less enlightened, unstable, “primitive”, childish, and “closer to animals” (5). Moreover, Frantz Fanon in The Wretched of the Earth agrees with Huggan and Tiffin, claiming that “Centuries will be needed to humanize this world which has been forced down to animal level by imperial powers” (100). Furthermore, the colonizer from the very beginning of occupying an independent country declared that slavery was not a colonial objective in itself, claiming that spreading culture among the colonized societies was the fundamental motive beyond its existence in these societies. However, the actual motive was totally different as it was only for economic purposes. Nasser Hussain states that the colonist regime during the nineteenth century “was neither despotic nor democratic” as it did not treat the colonized people as if they were slaves, but in the same way there was
some kind of autocratic control. The colonizer tends to impose the law of “emergency powers” which was constantly used in an oppressive way (25). Hence, the actual purposes of the colonizer’s control over any colonized country were totally for financial motives not for spreading his art and culture, which makes the colonized societies suffer economically.

Moreover, the consequences of the colonizer’s withdrawal were much more catastrophic that these consequences resulted in famines and depressing human conditions. Fanon underlines the fact that when the colonized societies resist the colonizer to have their independence, the colonizer tends to enforce economic pressure on the colonized countries by virtue of its massive control over the raw materials in those countries. In other words, the colonizer makes it clear that “Since you want independence, take it and starve” (76).

Neocolonialism is regarded as an outcome of colonialism. Kwame Nkrumah points out that Colonialism “has achieved a new guise. It has become neo-colonialism, and neo-colonialism is fast entrenching itself within the body of Africa today through the consortia and monopoly combinations that are the carpet baggers of the African revolt against colonialism and the urge for continental unity” (31). Hence, the term “Neo-colonialism” has come into existence with the end of colonialism in its typical or classical meaning. Neocolonialism is used to refer to the political and economic impacts of colonialism.

Neo-colonialism is defined in The Penguin Dictionary of Sociology as “a situation where, despite formal political independence, previous colonies are still dependent upon and subordinated to a metropolis through economic influence” (193), which includes “the global economic power of trans-national corporations” (211). Neo-colonialism is a reborn version of colonialism whereby the former colonized countries are exploited both economically and politically. Kwame Nkrumah claims that “The essence of neo-colonialism is that the state which is subject to it is, in theory, independent and has all the outward trappings of international sovereignty. In reality its economic system and thus its political policy is directed by outside” (9). In this light, decolonized countries are both postcolonial and neocolonial.

Mark Langan points out that “the concept of neo-colonialism draws more attention to the power strategies and political objectives of foreign actors (including governments and corporations) as they seek to maintain and to extend influence over African governments” (27). Moreover, Langan states that European governments seek to establish their entities in former colonized countries through the establishment of foreign corporations or multinational companies. In addition, European
governments offer financial aids to the former colonized countries. These policies outwardly attempt to develop and promote the economy of former colonized countries, yet actually they ensure their existence within colonized countries through getting control over their economy (5). Through setting up multinational companies, European countries ravage the colonized countries’ raw materials which greatly flourish the economy of European governments.

Douglas Andrew claims that Neocolonialism tracks colonialism in exploiting colonized countries’ raw materials in the form of establishing universal corporations which depend mainly on the reliance of colonized countries on the European ones (4-5). Since Colonialism has evolved into Neocolonialism, former colonial powers rapidly realize that it is a necessity to go on exploiting their former colonies. Furthermore, developing states remained reliant on developed countries for marketing and processing raw materials to colonial powers as former colonies were unable to secure economic development and manufacture their own products.

Financial aids are a form of Neocolonialism. The foreign countries apparently claim that they offer such aids as a gift with the aim of developing the former colonized countries’ economy, however, they exploit these aids as a “short-term payment that would denude African empirical sovereignty” (5). Similarly, Nkrumah illustrates that Neo-colonial domination over these countries “may be secured by payments towards the costs of running the state, by the provision of civil servants in positions where they can dictate policy, and by monetary control over foreign exchange through the imposition of a banking system controlled by the imperialist power” (ix). Therefore, financial aids are used as a method of political subjugation and economic manipulation. In this vein, Nkrumah states that “‘Aid' therefore to a neo-colonial state is merely a revolving credit, paid by the neo-colonial master, passing through the neo-colonial state and returning to the neo-colonial master in the form of increased profits” (xv). Hence, former colonial countries exploit these aids to support their position in the ex-colonized countries politically and economically.

It is essential here to take into consideration that ex-colonizers control former colonized ones through the support they gain from New-colonialist leaders. Regarding such matter, Langan claims that “African elites who took part in relations of neo-colonialism would govern on behalf of foreign benefactors and would in effect ‘betray’ the economic interests of their own people” (4). In addition, the leaders of the Neocolonialist countries pay little attention to the welfare and benefit of their own country. Nkrumah points out that these leaders “have therefore
little interest in developing education, strengthening the bargaining power of their workers employed by expatriate firms, or indeed of taking any step which would challenge the colonial pattern of commerce which is the object of neo-colonialism to preserve” (1). This policy indeed deprives the new-colonialist countries from achieving economic prosperity which in turn makes them suffer economically for a long time.

To conclude, colonialism refers to the actual domination of a country over another and the extent to which the colonizer imposes his hegemony politically, economically, socially, and culturally. While Postcolonialism and Neocolonialism refer at the same time to the period after colonialism, yet they differ in some points. First, Postcolonialism as mentioned earlier refers to the political and social resistance which the former colonized countries adopt to get rid of the remains of colonialism, while Neocolonialism refers to the political and economic compulsion which the ex-colonizer imposes over the former colonized lands. Secondly, Postcolonialism is concerned with the concepts of nationalism and decolonization, yet Neocolonialism is concerned with a new version of Colonialism. Thirdly, Postcolonialism aims at the reconstruction of the former colonized lands, which consecutively enhance their economy. On the other hand, Neocolonialism expresses to what extent the ex-colonizer exploits the developing countries economically and politically, which widens the gap between the developed countries and the developing ones.

Colonizers exploit colonized countries militarily, economically, psychologically, and culturally. Ann B. Dobie states that “Colonizers not only physically conquer territories but also practice cultural colonization by replacing the practices and beliefs of the native culture with their own values, governance, laws, and belief. The consequence is loss or modification of much of the precolonial culture” (208). As a result, colonized people come to be immersed in the sense of being inferior to the colonizers and imitate the colonizers in all life fields for cultural assimilation. Hence, the colonized people are introduced to a new culture different from their native one, a process which creates a hybrid identity.

Displacement

Displacement is a postcolonial theory that expounds the issue of identity as a product of Colonialism. It is essential here to shed the light on the definition of “Displacement”, and to what extent it is used as a synonym for “Diaspora”. Moreover, it is important to explore its economic and political causes and effects. The Displacement of Palestinians is a good example, reflecting the suffering and pain which they confront once they are forced to immigrate or abandon their homeland.
Angelika Bammer defines Displacement as “the separation of people from their native culture, through physical dislocation (as refugees, immigrants, migrants, exiles, or expatriates) or the colonizing imposition of a foreign culture” (xi). Displacement, as defined in *Cambridge Advanced Learner’s Dictionary & Thesaurus*, is “the situation in which people are forced to leave the place where they normally live”. Therefore, Displacement is a process by which people are obliged to depart their homeland to evade political oppression or human rights violation.

Displacement and Diaspora have equivalent meanings. Wanni W. Anderson and Robert G. Lee argue that “Displacement shares with Diaspora the notions of physical dislocation, banishment, and exile, but emphatically draws attention to the cultural dimension; that is, how one’s ancestral culture or the culture of the birthplace as been dislocated, transformed, rejected, or replaced by a new one” (11). Thus, both Displacement and Diaspora can be used to tackle issues of exile, immigration, Nostalgia and hybridity.

The concept of Diaspora refers to the state of any scattered people in the world that has been forced to immigrate. Vijay Agnew refers to Diaspora as “the dispersion of a group of people from one center or two or more peripheral places, as well as to the collective memory” (193). In addition, he points out that Diaspora may depict “communities that have been unwillingly dispersed by slavery, genocide, war, expulsion, indentured labor, political exile or refugee exodus” (193). Thus, the term “Diaspora” is used to describe the forcible movement of a group of people from their country to other regions for different reasons.

According to *IOM Glossary on Migration*, the term “Diaspora” is used to describe “migrants whose identity and sense of belonging, either real or symbolic, have been shaped by their migration experience and background. They maintain links with their homelands, and to each other, based on a shared sense of history, identity, or mutual experiences in the destination country” (49). There is a sense of loss and Displacement when people are forced to emigrate from their homeland which in turn leads to fragmented identities once they mingle with another culture. Robin Cohen points out that Diaspora “signified a collective trauma, a banishment, where one dreamed of home but lived in exile” (ix). There is some kind of cultural trauma which occurs when individuals experience catastrophic experiences once they immigrate to another country. These catastrophic experiences permanently alter immigrants’ consciousness and identity.

**The Causes of Displacement**

Displacement occurs for political, economic, educational, social reasons. Immigrants leave their homeland to have better life conditions.
Gareth J. Lewis points out that “Migration is a two way of process; it is a response to economic and social change and equally it is catalyst to change for those areas gaining and losing migrants” (1). However, forced Displacement based on economic or political causes have a massive impact on immigrants. Michael M. Cernea and Scott Guggenheim claim that Displacement “caused by disasters that ranged from famines in Africa, wars in the Middle East, or to homelessness in America, the close of the twentieth century will be remembered for the large numbers of people evicted from their houses, farms and communities and forced to find a living elsewhere” (1). The twentieth century has witnessed a huge number of immigrants forced to depart their homelands. This “Forced Displacement” is a result of starvations, calamities, and wars.

Forced Displacement due to political or economic reasons has greatly affected the identities of those immigrants. Hariz Halilovich argues that people exposed to forced Displacement are psychologically torn as their identities “have been partially or completely replaced, adapted, hybridised and entangled with new identities, roles and places, while in other instances there is a prevalent feeling of permanent ‘misplacement’, with an inability to reconstruct a sense of belonging in a new social environment” (54). Suffering from the absence of their families, relatives, and friends, immigrants become deeply involved with the senses of Nostalgia and Displacement. Moreover, he points out that “Narrating memories enables them to connect with their own past lives, mourn their losses and get closures, as well as connecting with other survivors and sympathetic audiences” (57). Thus, the anguish caused by forced Displacement incites concurrent feelings of relief and peacefulness.

Exile as a Form of Displacement

Exile is considered as one of the forms of Displacement. It is defined in Cambridge Advanced Learner's Dictionary & Thesaurus as "the condition of someone being sent or kept away from their own country, village, etc., especially for political reasons”. Hence, it refers to the forced immigration of some people for fear of oppression for various causes particularly political ones. People obliged to live in exile are forced to adapt to new communities, learning new languages and adjusting to new different customs and traditions. Commenting on the impact of exile, Edward Said states that:

Exile is strangely compelling to think about but terrible to experience. It is the unhealable rift forced between a human being and a native place, between the self and its true home: its essential sadness can never be surmounted. And while it is true that literature and history contain heroic, romantic, glorious even
triumphant episodes in an exile’s life, these are no more than efforts meant to overcome the crippling sorrow of estrangement. The achievements of exile are permanently undermined by the loss of something left behind forever (Reflections, 173).

Therefore, people in exile are immersed in the sense of loss and dislocation. Such state of loss can be physical due to immigrants’ departure from their homeland or psychological as they yearn for the social cultural relations of their home. This trauma drives them to lose their identity and adopt a new one. Regarding the dilemma of loss, Julia Mirsky argues that “Mourning in migration is not seen as a state, but rather as a process similar to the one all mourners go through, from an initial denial of loss, through realization and reconciliation with the reality of loss” (14). Thus, the state of loss created due to Displacement leads people in exile to a condition of wretchedness and gloom.

Since culture is part of human consciousness, the cultural displacement caused by exile is more influential. Exile is concerned with cultural Displacement more than physical one as the cultural aspects of any human mainly constitute his personality. Adapting a new culture creates a human being with a “fragmented identity,” which in turn makes him/her psychologically perplexed. Liisa Malkki argues that “Often the concern with boundaries and their transgression reflects not so much corporeal movements of specific groups of people, but rather a broad concern with the ‘cultural Displacement’ of people, things and cultural products” (25). Thus, the sense of self loss is often associated with the psychic grief more than the departure itself. Roberta Rubenstein states that “Most individuals experience such loss not merely as separation from someone or something but as an absence that continues to occupy a palpable emotional space” (5). Being obsessed by his/her absence from homeland, one is addicted to Nostalgia, which is a mixture of cognition and affection, defined by evoking previous events with major archetypal aspects of personal meaning and sentiments of affection. Nostalgia is a stage between reality and imagination where one recalls past experiences that have a significant impact on emotions and affection. Reality in the sense that the immigrants are actually away from homeland and imagination as nostalgia creates a state of pleasure, which reminds the immigrants of their past glorious memories.

**Nostalgia**

Nostalgia is often discussed in relation to the issues of self-loss and Displacement. Nostalgia as defined in *Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary & Thesaurus* is “A feeling of sadness mixed with pleasure and
affection when you think of happy times in the past”. Nostalgia deals with the glorious moments of the past along with the anxieties of the present. Dennis Walder regards Nostalgia as one of the consequences of Displacement, arguing that the sense of Displacement lasts for a long time. After that “the clinical and military resonances disappear, and a psychological and psychiatric discourse takes over. Nostalgia becomes a state of mind rather than a physical condition although the somatic continues as an undercurrent of implication” (8). Once the immigrants leave their country and get rid of military, economic or whatever causes forcing them to depart, they get obsessed by nostalgia psychologically. As a result, Nostalgia involves an emotive sequence of incidents which entail feelings of loneliness and anxiety.

The issue of Nostalgia tackles the loss of homeland and the memories which immigrants leave behind. Moreover, Nostalgia refers to incidents that become part of the past and can never be restored. Pietro Castelnuovo Tedesco points out that Nostalgia is “a regressive manifestation closely related to the issue of loss, grief, incomplete mourning, and finally depression” (110). Realizing that restoring such moments physically through returning home is endlessly beyond immigrants reach, they suffer from numerous mental diseases.

Nostalgia evokes positive and negative emotions for immigrants. Recollecting memories reminds immigrants of their past lives. Therefore, nostalgic experiences are effective as a source of inspiration for immigrants. Kaplan points out that Nostalgia is a “warm feeling about the past, a past that is imbued with happy memories, pleasures, and joy” (465). In addition, he states that this feeling is so vivid that it creates an “air of infatuation and a feeling of elation” (465). Recollecting memories makes immigrants feel nostalgic, which in turn fuels positive emotions. These emotions create feelings of happiness and satisfaction.

On the other hand, Nostalgia has negative effects on immigrants as it drives them to be immersed in melancholy. Roderick Peters argues that Nostalgia turns from “a fleeting sadness and yearning to an overwhelming craving that persists and profoundly interferes with the individual’s attempts to cope with his present circumstances” (135). Nostalgia causes a state of rejection towards immigrants’ current life and is often triggered by a negative feeling of isolation.

**Hybridity**

Postcolonialism tackles many issues related to cultural differences, one of them is Hybridity. Vanessa Guignery claims that hybridity sheds the light on “the transcultural forms that resulted from
linguistic, political or ethnic intermixing, and to challenge the existing hierarchies, polarities, binarisms and symmetries (East/West, black/white, colonizer/colonized, majority/minority, self/other, interior/exterior).” (3). Thus, Hybridity is the outcome of a mixture of two diverse cultures.

Hybridity is an expansive term used in many biological and cultural matters. Amar Acheraïou claims that “it was Charles Darwin who first employed it in 1837 in his experiments with cross-fertilization in plants” (88). After being used in biological matters, the term was used to describe the colonizer/colonized relationship, particularly the effects of Poscolonialism on the identity of the colonized. Hybridity as defined in The Penguin Dictionary of Sociology is “an anthropological interpretation of the relationship between Westernization and local cultures - that indigenous cultures are not simply destroyed but combined and merged with Western cultures through a process of adaptation” (187). It is noticeable that there has to be a mixture among different cultures, which in turn lets people of indigenous cultures adopt certain qualities of superior ones. However, the colonizers believe that they are superior to the colonized people. Lois Tyson points out that:

The colonizers believed that only their own Anglo-European culture was civilized, sophisticated, or, as postcolonial critics put it, metropolitan. Therefore, native peoples were defined as savage, backward, and undeveloped . . . The colonizers saw themselves as the embodiment of what a human being should be, the proper “self”; native peoples were considered “other,” different, and therefore inferior to the point of being less than fully human. This practice of judging all who are different as less than fully human is called othering, and it divides the world between “us” (the “civilized”) and “them” (the “others” or “savages”) (419-20).

Such attitude towards the ex-colonized people drives them to adopt mimicry which Tyson refers to as “the attempt of the colonized to be accepted by imitating the dress, behavior, speech, and lifestyle of the colonizers” (427). Mimicry is viewed as a new pattern of conduct in which the colonized people imitate the person in authority in the hope of gaining equal power. During the process of imitation, colonized people cut their own identity off which in turn creates a state of bewilderment between the real identity and the new adopted one.

It is essential here to note that the cultural diversity among human beings is a constituent part of human nature. Dougherty and Kurke state that the Greek culture is a mixture of numerous ones due to the cultural interactions with other peoples (9). The Greeks, for instance, made use of Egyptian and Mesopotamian cultures and discoveries to
develop theories which advance our understanding of the whole universe. Concerning the cross-cultural interactions, Arun Bala claims that the Greeks could “transform loose computing rules in mathematics and astronomy, discovered by Egyptian and Mesopotamian cultures, into an abstract system of deductive geometry and to articulate a wide spectrum of broad conceptions about the cosmos culminating in the Aristotelian synthesis” (27). Consequently, all cultures are considered hybrid as they interact with each other.

Furthermore, the discourse of Hybridity is so flexible that it can be practiced in any society political, ideological, and economic purposes. Acheraïou claims that Hybridity discourse “is able to integrate multiple, even contradictory, discursive practices. In the main, from the standpoint of cultural and identity politics this resilience allows the discourse of hybridity to cater for multiple cultures and subjectivities” (153). Owing to its discursive suppleness, Hybridity accommodates competing, often seemingly incompatible political and intellectual beliefs.

However, as mentioned earlier, superior cultures tend to impose its hegemony over indigenous ones. Amar Acheraïou points out that “being in the position of power and domination, colonizing nations have both the means and the ambition to impact deeply upon indigenous cultural, political, and socio-economic structures” (17-18). These practices lead to the marginalization of the colonized people’s culture. Moreover, the colonizer seeks systematically to strip the indigenous people from their culture. Feeling superior, the colonizers regard the colonized people as primitive with detestable culture.

Consequently, the colonizer makes use of the educational system as a means to take control over the native people through having an entire management of the educational curricula in these colonized countries (Christian 188). The colonizer’s involvement in the colonized people’s education not only affects their way of thinking, but also aims to uproot their customs and traditions, which isolate them from their cultural heritage.

Rebecca Swartz points out that “education in colonial contexts was far broader in its aims. Education involved transforming relationships to land and labour, and shifting religious and ideological positions of children, families and communities in varied social contexts. Education took place within and outside of schools” (4). Colonizers control education in colonized countries to use indigenous people as a tool to assist colonizers in achieving social and economic development. Once students in colonized countries know more about the culture of colonizers,
they admire colonizers’ style of living and tend to immigrate. This foreign education plays an influential role in oppressing colonized countries.

Consequently, individuals within such colonized countries are confused when asked about their real identity. The concept of identity is used to refer to “people’s concepts of who they are, of what sort of people they are, and how they relate to others” (Hogg and Abrams 2). Thus, indigenous people do not exactly know to which culture they belong. They are torn between the adaption of the new culture and their real identity. Arab immigrants around the world still suffer from this dilemma. Since the events of 9/11 which have negatively changed the image of Arab people who are regarded as either victimizers or terrorists.

This attitude towards Arab people has forced them to be politically blamed. This belief in turn makes Arab people suffer from discrimination. As a result, many Arab Americans tend to hide their identity in order not to be treated with any kind of prejudice. Nadine Naber claims that “Arabs face many difficulties when they want to mingle in the American society. The early wave felt that they needed to change their language into English and their names into more American names. For example, Yousef would become Joseph or even Joe” (42). Being forced into changing their real names, immigrants adhere to assimilating into the American society.

The issue of identity has many political, social, and economic dimensions. Edward Said illustrates in the existence of negative Arab stereotypes in Western systems of knowledge and representation. He states that Arab Americans have been exposed to an ideological process of stereotyping which conveys a Western rejection of Otherness. That is, the Arab (or Oriental) represents everything that the Western (or Occident) is not (Orientalism, 45-54). Also, the American media has depicted Arab people as savages, killers, and terrorists through defaming their image in most of their shows and Hollywood films. Jack Shaheen has stated this point of view which shows how Hollywood misrepresents Arab people through using the strategy of repetition “as a teaching tool, tutoring movie audiences repeating over and over, in film after film, insidious images of the Arab people” (7). This negative stereotype about Arab people is an obstacle which immigrants face in the American society.

Homi K. Bhabha is one of the most influential writers who have immense contributions to the establishment of Hybridity as a notable cultural theory in literary studies. Bhabha views Hybridity as a product of the colonial power. Hybridity reflects the “process of domination through disavowal (that is, the production of discriminatory identities that secure the pure and original identity of authority). Hybridity is the revaluation of
the assumption of colonial identity through the repetition of discriminatory identity effects” (*The Location of Culture* 159). Bhabha claims that the relationship between the colonizer and the colonized is often characterized by some kind of adaptation and rejection at the same time. As for Ambivalence, it is regarded as an objectionable issue for the colonizer as it tends to construct a condition of disturbance which is threatening to existence and colonial hegemony (121-28). Ambivalence is a constant feeling of hesitation between aspiring for something and looking forward to its opposite. Ambivalence reflects the mixture of attraction and revulsion which describes the relationship between the colonizer and the colonized. On the other hand, “Mimicry” simply refers to the adaptation of the colonizer’s culture. During such process of adaptation, the colonized still bears in mind his attitude of resisting the colonizer which in turn creates a state of rejection of the colonizer’s culture. Hence, “Mimicry” is described as “mockery” since it distorts what it mimics.

Paradoxically, Bhabha states that there must be a cultural interaction between the colonized and the colonizer. He argues that there is no culture in the world that is pure due to these interactions. Thus, Bhabha paves the way to what he calls “the third space.” He argues that “by exploring this third space, we may elude the politics of polarity and emerge as the others of ourselves” (39). Applying the concept of the third space to the colonial discourse, Bhabha states that the relationship between the colonizer and the colonized ought to be in that space. Regarding that, Bhabha points out that “The non-synchronous temporality of global and national cultures opens up a cultural space—a third space—where the negotiation of incommensurable differences creates a tension peculiar to borderline existences” (218). The third space helps to advance the establishment of a new paradigm for theorizing cultural differences which do not contradict one another. They exist together at the same time, resulting in many identities.

Bhabha argues that the cultural theory of “the third space” aims at creating a unique entity based on openness, accepting one another, impartiality, equality, and egalitarianism. According to *Cambridge Advanced Learner Dictionary*, egalitarianism is defined as “believing that all people are equally important and should have the same rights and opportunities in life”. Bhabha asserts that this space “may open the way to conceptualizing an international culture, based not on the exoticism of multiculturalism or the diversity of cultures, but on the inscription and articulation of culture’s hybridity” (38-39). Hybridity is concerned with the idea of open-mindedness and modernity. Thus, hybridity is exalted and privileged as a form of superior cultural thought. In addition, Bhabha
affirms that “the process of cultural hybridity gives rise to something different, something new and unrecognizable, a new area of negotiation of meaning and representation” (211). Therefore, the third space is an “energetic space” which makes it possible to create new horizons of cooperation and coexistence in which the clash of different cultures is replaced with harmony and meeting of minds.

Bhabha states that all cultures are constantly exposed to hybridity due to the cultural interactions among peoples of different ethnicities and nationalities. Hence, two unstable identities of two conflicting cultures create a new space called “in-between” or “the third” (218). Consequently, such process leads to the development of double identities or hybrid ones which Bhabha refers to as “neither the one nor the other” (25). This identity is characterized by cultural diversity and variation. Therefore, this space lays the first stone for establishing a fertile environment which enables the immigrants to adapt the new cultures. Bhabha argues that “in-between the designations of identity, becomes the process of symbolic interaction, the connective tissue that constructs the difference between upper and lower, black and white” (4). The benefit of “in-betweeness” lies in its capacity to straddle two cultures and clear the difference. The concept of the third space “opens up the possibility of a cultural hybridity that entertains difference without an assumed and imposed hierarchy” (4). Thus, Bhabha pays attention to the flexibility of hybridity in tackling the issue of adapting and meanwhile rejecting the superior culture via this third space.

Bill Ashcroft et al. define hybridity as “the creation of new transcultural forms within the contact zone produced by colonization” (135), adding that “Hybridity has frequently been used in postcolonial discourse to mean simply cross-cultural exchange” (136). Hence, they make use of the term “Hybridity” to “underline other attempts to stress the mutuality of cultures in the colonial and post-colonial process in expressions of syncretic, cultural synergy and transculturation” (136). Transculturation is the process of a cultural transition characterised by the flow of new cultural elements and the alteration of existing ones. This process of transculturation leads to syncreticity and cultural synergy which together mean the blending of many religions, civilizations, or concepts in a cooperative way. Moreover, Hybridity marks the duality of cultures through a series of actions to refute the ideological belief that one culture is superior to another. Consequently, people may feel relieved once they settle anywhere, finding it possible to assert themselves without restriction due to the mutual understanding based on accepting the cultural diversity.
Robert Young traces the origins of the term “Hybridity” from being used in biology to mean “the offspring of a tame sow and a wild boar” to modern cultural meaning (5). Young assumes that all human beings are equal as the cultural diversity or diversity in general is part of human nature. He states that “if the hybrid issue was successful through several generations, then it was taken to prove that humans were all one species, with the different races merely subgroups or varieties—which meant that technically it was no longer hybridity at all” (9). Moreover, Young asserts that Hybridity in the past had a racial meaning, yet in modern world it is “the creation of a new form, which can then be set against the old form” (23). This new form creates new realms of communication.

Bakhtin deals with Hybridity from a linguistic perspective, defining it as “a mixture of two social languages within the limits of a single utterance, an encounter, within the arena of an utterance, between two different linguistic consciousnesses, separated from one another by an epoch, by social differentiation or by some other factor” (358). He divides hybridity into two forms: unconscious or organic hybridity and intentional one. Regarding the organic hybridity, Bakhtin claims that it “is one of the most important modes in the historical life and evolution of all languages” as languages change due to their interchange with each other. This interchange gives birth to new forms of combination rather than separation among different languages. On the other hand, intentional hybridity marks that “two points of view are not mixed, but set against each other dialogically” (360). Thus, it is noticeable that these forms stand against each other as the first calls for coexistence while the latter stands for separation.

Gilory in his book The Black Atlantic: Modernity and double consciousness (1993) argues that hybridity is useful as to its influence on a society. For instance, he states that the black musical culture, which African Americans created to express their cultural heritage through music, provides “a great deal of the courage required to go on living in the present” (36). Moreover, in his book Between Camps (2000), he points out that there is no pure culture, but an “intermixture, fusion and syncretism without suggesting the existence of anterior “uncontaminated” purities” (250). In addition, he refers to the lack of critical language which “is undermined and complicated by the absurd charge that attempts to employ the concept of hybridity are completely undone by the active residues of that term’s articulation within the technical vocabularies of nineteenth-century racial science” (251). Thus, there is no pure culture due to the
interchange of different cultures which results in a state of hybridity as a cultural production.

Nikos Papastergiadis states that any society can be considered hybrid “whenever two or more cultures meet” (2). Therefore, a new form of identity exists within such society. Moreover, he states that hybridity is an outcome of “the Twin process of globalization and migration” (3). Furthermore, he claims that “identities are in a constant state of interaction” (4), which in turn leads to numerous hybrid societies. However, he points out that Colonialism is the fundamental cause of the double identity; “colonialism which presupposed the distinct separation of races also laid down the routes which brought into contact people of diverse places” (144). The colonizer tends to impose culture on the colonized and assumes racial superiority over the colonized. This attitude allows new identities to sprout and others to shrivel. In addition, he reveals that hybridity in the modern age adopts a new structure because of globalization. Hence, “it is necessary to re-examine the concept of hybridity in relation to the ongoing colonizing of the mind and the destruction of traditional social forms” (188). The term “Globalization” indicates the usage of new technologies, languages, and even methods of thinking. Hence, new cultural practices emerge in an age of hybridity and globalization abolishing conventional social forms in colonized countries.

Conclusion
Postcolonial theory provides issues that are used in social, political, cultural, psychological fields as the consequences of the colonial role are never erased. Therefore, the themes of identity and the clash of cultures are still tackled by numerous writers particularly those from ex-colonized countries. Postcolonial theory examines how the colonial experience in pre-modern and modern times has affected a particular place. This theory also examines how the postcolonial experience may affect a particular place and how people living in colonized countries are affected by colonization or imperialism. In addition, this chapter shows how far Postcolonial theory is related to other critical theories, particularly Marxism and Feminism. Postcolonial theory is a reaction to conquered countries' economic exploitation. While Postcolonial theory is related to Feminism as women in colonized countries are deprived of most of her political, economic, and human rights. Moreover, this chapter tackles the similarities existing among Colonialism, Postcolonialism, and Neocolonialism, as the colonizer still controls the resources of the colonized. Further, this chapter explores the concept of Hybridity and the related issue of fragmented identities since immigrants tend to adapt new cultures once they settle in a
new society. Also, the current chapter states that there is no pure culture due to the multicultural interactions among all world countries. In addition, it handles the question of Displacement and its outcomes represented in exile in addition to Displacement relation to the matter of Nostalgia and to what extent the immigrants are psychologically torn. The Displacement of the Palestinian people is set as a good example depicting their agony and suffering which they experienced since 1948. In the next two chapters, Suzan Abolhawa and Leila Halaby’s novels will be discussed in the light of Hybridity, Displacement, Exile, and Nostalgia.
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