

Ambivalence of Identity as an Extension of Colonial Discourse in Charles Dickens' *Great Expectations* and Aravind Adiga's *The White Tiger*

Göksel Kaya*

School of Foreign Languages, Beykent University, Istanbul, Turkey

Corresponding Author: Göksel Kaya, E-mail: gokselkaya@beykent.edu.tr

ARTICLE INFO

Article history

Received: February 02, 2018

Accepted: April 08, 2018

Published: April 30, 2018

Volume: 6 Issue: 2

Conflicts of interest: None

Funding: None

Keywords:

Cultural Identity,

Ambivalence,

Class Conflict,

Postcolonialism

ABSTRACT

The aim of this study is to critically analyse the identity issue based on postcolonial theory in one of the most important novels of the Victorian era, Charles Dickens' *Great Expectations* and another novel, *The White Tiger* with which Indian writer Aravind Adiga won the Booker Prize in 2008. This study attempts to implement such an exploration not only in the context of western thought, but also from different angles with the realities of the oppressed nations of the Third World, especially India in order to construct the 'other' based on the other individuality. Both of the prominent writers in their works lay bare many scenes that focus on the problems of the heroes creating the basis of the events in question. That is why they take into consideration the state of the individual, because the central characters' conflicts and developments present different aspects of the novel while constructing the individuality and identity behind the societal problems in terms of class conflict. They live under different circumstances to discover themselves and in each of the novels we can bear witness to the existence of some characters who achieve a sense of personal and social identity in the Victorian society of England, a time when great social and economic changes were taking place; and then in India where people suffer from the administrations of the members of Gandhi family led by especially Indira and Rajiv Gandhi. This study thereby examines how the individuals are exposed to the social, economic and political factors of the country where they live.

INTRODUCTION

Great Expectations (1861) and *The White Tiger* (2008) were written by writers from two different territories of colonial experience. Instead of an examination of postcolonial experience and class conflict in one specific region, this study examines how postcolonialism and class conflict are perceived in various regions. Both novels provide an opportunity to raise the voice which has been drowned out for a long time. By raising their voice, the oppressed gain the chance to represent their own reality that has been represented by others, namely the oppressor and the coloniser or the capitalists.

The postcolonialism refers to the neocolonial period of the countries concerned as well as both the colonisation and decolonisation: "We use the term 'post-colonial', however, to cover all the culture affected by the imperial process from the moment of colonisation to the present day" (Ashcroft, Griffiths & Tiffin 2010: 2). Thus, it points to a period of the first colonial contact as well as that after independence. In order to explain the colonisation process, it is highly important to know about the discourse of the coloniser as well as the condition of the colonised. Postcolonialism seeks to put an end to the imperial dominance which tries to achieve superiority over its subjects. According to Loomba, "the process of 'forming a community' in the new land necessarily meant

un-forming or re-forming the communities that existed there already, and involved a wide range of practices including trade, settlement, plunder, negotiation, warfare, genocide, and enslavement" (Loomba 2015: 20). That is to say, both the coloniser and the colonised are under the influence of colonisation and acquire new roles and aspects as a result of the colonial interaction. In this regard, colonisation results in a dominant, hegemonic culture that inculcates its ideas and customs into an indigenous society which is regarded as inferior to the coloniser.

This study will be discussed in a thematically comparative approach through the practical applicability of the theory to the textual analysis of both novels. It will focus on the term 'identity' that will be enhanced by some concepts of post-colonialism of different theoreticians such as Homi Bhabha, Frantz Fanon and Gayatri Spivak and also some definitions and explanations of terms such as 'colonial discourse', 'ambivalence', 'mimicry', 'violence' and 'subalternity' that belong to the postcolonial process will be elaborated.

2. ALMOST THE SAME BUT NOT QUITE

The concept of belonging to a society made up of a particular social category or group with whom you have some values

in common is the base of identity that gives you a sense of personal location. Identity may be defined as 'belonging' or what you have in common with any group of which you are a member and what differentiates you from others. Especially since the Second World War, the legacy of colonialism as well as some other social movements such as the end of the Soviet Union, racial, ethnic, cultural and class conflicts throughout the world that have placed identity on the political arena has put the question of identity at the centre of debates. In order to understand better the role which it plays in the individual, it is highly important to theorize it within a postcolonial perspective that defines the colonial discourse. 'Discourse', as Foucault theorises it, is a system of statements within which the world can be known: "[...] discursive formation really is the principle of dispersion and redistribution, not of formulations, not of sentences, not of propositions, but of statements [...] the term discourse can be defined as the group of statements that belong to a single system of formation" (Foucault 2002: 121). That is to say, according to him, "it is the system by which dominant groups in society constitute the field of truth by imposing specific knowledge, disciplines and values upon dominated groups. As a social formation it works to constitute reality not only for the objects it appears to represent but also for the subjects who form the community on which it depends" (Ashcroft, Griffiths & Tiffin 2013: 51). According to Bhabha, it aims to legitimate its view taking control over other lands and its population: "The objective of colonial discourse is to construe the colonised as a population of degenerate types on the basis of racial origin, in order to justify conquest and to establish systems of administration and instruction" (Bhabha 1994: 101). Nevertheless, the colonial discourse does not function as planned by the coloniser and it makes up two diverse identities: firstly, the colonised subject is regarded as the other of coloniser outside western culture; secondly, they seek to domesticate colonised subjects by bringing them inside western culture. Yet they might fail to adapt them into their civilization and cannot keep control over them. Thus, they are not only domesticated and harmless but also wild and harmful. Consequently, they do not have a stable identity and are part of two different polarities. This concept, 'ambivalence', is a term used in the field of psychoanalysis "to describe a continual fluctuation between wanting one thing and wanting its opposite (also 'simultaneous attraction toward and repulsion from an object, person or action')" (Young 2005: 153). When it is adapted into the colonial discourse theory of Bhabha, it refers to the mixture of attraction and repulsion that characterises the relationship between the coloniser and the colonised: "The relationship is ambivalent because the colonised subject is never simply and completely opposed to the coloniser. Rather than assuming that some colonised subjects are 'complicit' and some 'resistant', ambivalence suggests that complicity and resistance exist in a fluctuating relation within the colonial subject" (Ashcroft, Griffiths & Tiffin 2013: 13). Hence, according to Bhabha, ambivalence ruptures the authority of the colonial domination in as much as it spoils the relationship between coloniser and colonised (Bhabha 1994: 118). By the same token,

this ambivalence "between the colonized and the colonizer reconciles the colonial discrepancy among them. It provides a solution to the hostile encounter and suppression initiated between the colonized and the colonizer" (Al_Ogaili & Babae 2016: 30). In this respect, two different identities are very likely to melt into one pot so long as they don't bear hostility towards each other.

Another important keyword concerning the colonial discourse is 'mimicry' which describes the ambivalent relationship between the coloniser and the colonised: "When colonial discourse encourages the colonised subject to 'mimic' the coloniser, by adopting the coloniser's cultural habits, assumptions, institutions and values, the result is never a simple reproduction of those traits. Rather, the result is a 'blurred copy' of the coloniser that can be quite threatening" (Ashcroft, Griffiths & Tiffin 2013: 155). Therefore, colonial dominance is disrupted by the effect of mimicry and it creates an uncertainty in keeping control over the attitude of the colonised.

In the light of these facts, Bhabha's postcolonial theory provides an explicit understanding of both novels in a better way. Above all, Bhabha defines 'colonial mimicry' as "the desire for a reformed recognisable Other, as a subject of difference that is almost the same, but not quite" (Bhabha 1994: 122). When British colonisers try to colonise the natives, they recognise 'a reformed other' that becomes almost the same, but not quite the same as the British. However, according to him, the coloniser want the colonised to accept their dominant power and mimic white men as long as they remain the same, but not white. For instance, Australia, which is included in *Great Expectations* is an extension of this British policy. Many writings refer to the natives of Australia not as Aborigines but descendants of English - born settlers just as Louisa Anne Meredith defines them: "[...] not to the aborigines, but the 'currency' as they are termed, in distinction from the 'sterling' of British-born residents" (Meredith 1844: 50). Thus, Bhabha's notion of colonial mimicry can be adapted to Australia although both coloniser and colonised are British. In the nineteenth century, the Australian society mimics the upper-class society of Britain even if the population is made up of transported English convicts, lower- and middle-class emigrants:

Many of their houses are elegant villas, with rooms of noble dimensions, expensively furnished with almost every luxury to be found in a gentleman's residence in England, and environed by beautiful gardens, where every description of fruit, both European and tropical, is cultivated. The numerous servants too are a great and universal expense. The smaller houses of merchants, and various Professional and official men, have much the style of those in suburban streets in England, standing alone or in pairs, all protected from the sun by verandas from six to twelve feet wide, with pretty gardens in front, often fenced by hedges of gay geraniums. (Meredith 1844: 53)

Consequently, to make a comparison between the reality and the mimic, they are 'almost the same but not quite' the same as the upper class living in Britain and those "returning

to, or for the first time visiting England, with the purpose of remaining there to enjoy their accumulated wealth, and after a short trial, coming back to the colony, heartily disgusted with the result of their experiment" (Meredith 1844: 51). In addition to Meredith's comments, Robert Hughes says: "the colonial elite after 1800 had arrived at an idea of gentility [...] that was distinguished by its inability to relax", and adds: "all colonial standards - of rank, etiquette, taste and the 'interesting'- were English" (Hughes 2003: 124-5). As Bhabha says, "[...] the discourse of mimicry is constructed around an ambivalence [...] mimicry emerges as the representation of a difference that is itself a process of disavowal" (Bhabha 1994: 122). Hence, according to him, as well as it is a complex of reform or discipline appropriated by the Other, it is also the sign of the inappropriate and this poses a threat to the colonial power (Bhabha 1994: 122). Also, John Plamenatz, when he talks about nationalism that he divides into two types (western and eastern nationalism which is to be found in Eastern Europe, Asia, Africa and Latin America), he asserts: "it is both imitative and hostile to the models it imitates" (Plamenatz 1976: 34). In other words, that the countries except western ones accept the values set by the alien culture is imitative and also involves rejection: "In fact two rejections, both of them ambivalent: rejection of the alien intruder and dominator who is nevertheless to be imitated and surpassed by his own standards, and rejection of ancestral ways which are seen as obstacles to progress and yet also cherished as marks of identity" (Plamenatz 1976: 34). This suggestion has a bad impact also on India which is another colony of Britain, yet different from the case of Australia, Gandhi gives a great emphasis on the impact of Britain in India while talking about the power of their civilization: "The English have not taken India; we have given it to them. They are not in India because of their strength, but because we keep them" (Gandhi 1938: 31). In accordance with this assumption, he claims: "Indians were seduced by the glitter of modern civilization that they became a subject people", and adds: "what keeps them in subjection is the acceptance by leading sections of Indians of the supposed benefits of civilization" (as cited in Chatterjee 1993: 86). Partha Chatterjee also agrees with Gandhi:

[...] as long as Indians continue to harbour illusions about the 'progressive' qualities of modern civilization, they will remain a subject nation. Even if they succeed physically in driving out the English, they would still have 'English rule without the Englishman', because it is not the physical presence of the English which makes India a subject nation: it is civilization which subjects. (Chatterjee 1993: 86)

Furthermore, the modern civilization seems to have brought about increased wealth, prosperity, health and happiness. In contrast, what modern civilization does, in fact, is to make man a prisoner of his craving for luxury and bring upon society the evils of poverty, disease, war and suffering. Thus, it aims to suppress the oppressed in distant lands.

As far as *Great Expectations* is concerned, Pip's connection to Australia and the convict Magwitch's role being there make up the essence of the novel. Magwitch has been sent

to Australia which was founded as a penal colony in the late eighteenth century in order that England could send their excess prisoners to a place instead of hanging convicts in England where punishments for even minor crimes were severe. He cannot be allowed a return to England and so he has to maintain his life on his own earning a great deal of money through the wool trade. Hughes also refers to the convicts sent by England:

Dickens knotted several strands in the English perception of convicts in Australia at the end of transportation. They could succeed, but they could hardly, in the real sense, return. They could expiate their crimes in a technical, legal sense, but what they suffered there warped them into permanent outsiders. And yet they were capable of redemption—as long as they stayed in Australia. (Hughes 2003: 586)

Due to this fact, his conviction prevents him from being a true gentleman in the colony. He tells Pip that notwithstanding his wealth, the upper class look down on him: "The blood horses of them colonists might fling up the dust over me as I was walking [...] When one of 'em says to another, He was a convict, a few year ago, and is a ignorant common fellow now, for all he's lucky, [...]" (Dickens 2008: 293). In this respect, Magwitch's aim of creating a gentleman lies in his wish to be a part of that society and he mentions: "If I ain't a gentleman, nor yet ain't got no learning, I'm the owner of such. All on you owns stock and land; which on you owns a brought-up London gentleman?" (Dickens 2008: 293). Magwitch gets inspiration from another convict, Compeyson, who uses his upper-class status to get him out of trouble and he learns the formation of mimicry from him. Anyway, he regards himself as Compeyson's 'black slave' and relates how impressive he is upon him: "[...] the man got me into such nets as made me his black slave. I was always in debt to him, always under his thumb, always a working, always a getting into danger. He was younger than me, but he'd got craft, and he'd got learning, and he overmatched me five hundred times told and no mercy" (Dickens 2008: 320). He thereby learns everything from him just like a colonial slave because his criminal status makes him inferior to others as well as the native population of the colony. Through Magwitch, Australia provides Pip with money to mimic the life of the English upper class in order that he can promote his class status, while Miss Havisham, for Pip, arouses a desire of class transgression. In other words, Pip does not mimic Miss Havisham, but her standing in the society. Thus, it is Magwitch's wealth from Australia that allows Pip to assume the role of an English gentleman and to stay at Herbert's in London and receive a gentleman's education from Mr. Pocket and he helps him provide the means for his mimicry in England. Therefore, the mimicry of English class distinction forces Magwitch to form his own mimicry and the wealth he has pushes him to be implicated in a form of colonial mimicry upon Pip in England in order that he can become a gentleman in his place: "And then, dear boy, it was a recompense to me, look'ee here, to know in secret that I was making a gentleman" (Dickens 2008: 293). If the mimicry he tries to create becomes successful, Pip will gain

the benefits of the colony without having to work, which disrupts the English imperial authority. Bhabha's theory of mimicry marks the subversion of this authority: "The menace of mimicry is its double vision which in disclosing the ambivalence of colonial discourse also disrupts its authority" (Bhabha 1994: 126). What causes this ambivalence to seem dangerous is that Pip is not conscious of himself as the mimicker until he finds out who sponsors his education and wealth. Even though he once thought highly of his benefactor, later when he finds out who he is, Pip puts an end to the mimicry by refusing money from him and decides to make his own way up the social ladder. However, Homi Bhabha's theory of mimicry helps explain a distinct paradox in *The White Tiger*: that Balram kills a man whom he not only admires but also imitates. Bhabha describes the relationship between the coloniser who seek to keep control and dominance and the colonised who seek to mimic the coloniser. In the course of mimicry, the authority of the coloniser is liable to be undermined. As the colonised begin to struggle against the master, their resistance rises and endangers the colonial power in the end (Bhabha, 1994). Likewise, Balram is the representative of the colonised. He struggles and overthrows his master, Ashok, the character that pushes Balram to bear a grudge against him as a master and to mimic him in the end. This relationship between the servant and the master lays the foundation for Bhabha's theory of mimicry. Hirsh Sawhney casts light on the relationship by associating it with class-based resentment:

The servant-master system implies two things: One is that the servants are far poorer than the rich—a servant has no possibility of ever catching up to the master. And secondly, he has access to the master—the master's money, the master's physical person. Yet crime rates in India are very low. Even though the middle class—who often have three or four servants—are paranoid about crime, the reality is a master getting killed by his servant is rare.... You need two things [for crime to occur]—a divide and a conscious ideology of resentment. We don't have resentment in India. The poor just assume that the rich are a fact of life... But I think we're seeing what I believe is a class-based resentment for the first time. (Sawhney, 2008)

They also become so close that Ashok gets behind the wheel and Balram becomes the passenger. Balram wants to drink the same whisky, sleep with blonde women, shop at the same mall as well as Ashok. As Balram seeks to imitate Ashok's behaviour, Ashok's own personal attitude gets worse. Accordingly, the authority of the superior is undermined and Balram's power increases. When Ashok wants to be with a whore, Balram gives him a disobedient, cynical look and says: "A whore? That's for people like me, sir. Are you sure you want this?" (Adiga 2008: 216) When Ashok's new girlfriend talks about replacing Balram, Balram becomes aware of his own end. Hence, he does not want to remain subject to him and the moment of his violent rebellion has just come to the surface and the philosophy of Frantz Fanon about violence which has an impact on *The White Tiger* comes into question. He writes that violence is a means for the liberation and self-expression of the colonised:

"The native discovers reality and transforms it into the pattern of his customs, into the practice of violence and into his plan for freedom" (Fanon 2001: 45). With regard to colonial discourse, Fanon identifies three phases that postcolonial writers go through: assimilation, adaptation and the fighting phase. Based on these phases, *The White Tiger* is a novel based on the third one. According to Fanon, in this fighting phase "the native, after having tried to lose himself in the people and with the people, will on the contrary shake the people" (Fanon 2001: 179). Violence is the solution to one man's oppression, because it enables Balram to escape the rooster coop. On the other hand, the effect of the violence is to replace one master with another. After the murder, Balram continues to imitate the behaviour of his master. Fanon thinks that as long as people continue to mimic each other, another new corrupt system will replace it: "[...] while he is breaking down colonial oppression he is building up automatically yet another system of exploitation" (Fanon 2001: 115). He thinks that throwing the coloniser out of one's country will not be enough, but the necessity of creating a new civilisation which is different from the western one is highly important for the emancipation of a nation. He draws attention to the fact that the indigenous middle class of the newly independent nation makes use of its privileged education and position to mimic the colonial administration for its own interest. The people conceive themselves to have obtained their independence, but they are exposed to the neo-colonial rule in which the national bourgeoisie that comes to power continues to exploit the people in a similar way to the coloniser. John McLeod sums up what Fanon says:

The new administration does little to transform the nation economically. It does not set up new industries, or tend to the needs and condition of the people, or redistribute wealth. It does not govern in the interests of the people. Instead it keeps the new nation economically linked to the interests of the old colonial Western powers by allowing foreign companies to secure lucrative contracts in the new nation, by continuing to send profits, goods and materials abroad rather than focus on improving the material existence of the people, by fashioning the nation into a tourist destination for wealthy Westerners whose ability to spend retains their power over native life. (McLeod 2010: 70)

What Fanon asserts turns out to be true also in India whence the coloniser have been expelled. Thus Balram's act of killing does not put an end to the corrupt principles of the old order altogether, but keeps them alive in another new form. As he begins his taxi business in Bangalore, Balram asks himself: "What would Mr. Ashok do?" (Adiga 2008: 299) Learning lessons of corruption of the government officials from Ashok's family, Balram bribes police officers to make up to them and drive them to rupture the other adversary taxi services. Furthermore, towards the end of the novel, one of Balram's drivers runs over a child, replicating what Balram experienced before when Pinky Madam ran over a child. Balram bribes police officers to avoid punishment as well as Ashok. Yet, unlike the previous one, Balram assumes responsibility and does not allow the driver to be punished. Hence, Balram becomes a 'mimic man', emulating the social

and business practices of his former master. Balram gets ahead by opening up his own taxi company and becoming the new Ashok: "Once I was a driver to a master, but now I am a master of drivers." (Adiga 2008: 302) Based on this continuation of the old order, Sara Schotland says:

Balram's act of murder and theft tests the viability of Fanon's theory of constructive violence [...] whether Balram's violence is a purgative creative act or rather results in a new incarnation of the master-servant dyad that is barely distinguishable from the old order. In important respects, Balram's neocolonialism ends up mimicking the old order against which he revolts. (Schotland, 2011)

As to Magwitch, he makes use of violence in a diverse way to form his own mimicry upon Pip and then to try to overthrow the power that represents the whole English imperial authority. Rather than fight against the authority he is not able to change, Magwitch aspires to form his own English gentleman and take over from the strict authority. He initially appears with violent nature and this drives Pip not to suspect him as a benefactor; but when Pip comes to know that the money comes from Magwitch through Australia, he finally makes out why he will never be a English gentleman because of the fact that the means he uses to gain his status are not approved by English imperial authority. However, to understand better why both main characters, Pip and Balram want to go through this phase, it will be highly necessary to have a look at what kind of life they maintain. For one thing, what Bhabha says, as far as the importance of time moulding one's identity into a form, draws the outline of their identity: [...] Beginnings and endings may be the sustaining myths of the middle years; but in the fin de siècle, we find ourselves in the moment of transit where space and time cross to produce complex figures of difference and identity, past and present, inside and outside, inclusion and exclusion. (Bhabha 1994: 2)

Pip looks for his real existence during his progression and has problems in having a settled identity because he goes through some conflicts in his own class status. These conflicts cause him to lose contact with his own past as he cannot understand where he belongs. In the meantime, he gets lost in order to find a place in the society for himself. Pip forgets more about his village and his own identity: "On a moderate computation, it was many months that Sunday, since I had left Joe and Biddy. The space interposed between myself and them, partook of that expansion, and our marshes were any distance off" (Dickens 2008: 169). His refusal of his past can be recognised by his reaction to Joe's visit in London. Pip makes a confession of what he thinks for Joe's visit: "[...] though I was bound to him by so many ties; no; with considerable disturbance, some mortification and a keen sense of incongruity. If I could have kept him away by paying money, I certainly would have paid money" (Dickens 2008: 199). This is one of the most important events in realising the change in Pip. His uncomfortable feelings about Joe's visit demonstrate that he does not let old sincerity impair his progress to his new elevated status. The entrepreneurial hero, Balram, is also on the way to a new identity and status caused by the corruption of the society

which pushes him to lose contact with his past in the India of darkness, which is 'that of misery, destitution and illiteracy', in order to set up a new life in the India of light which is 'that of wealth, technology and knowledge' (Mendes 2010: 277). He becomes India's developing economic strength, a modern Indian hero. Lily Want asserts: "having grown up amidst starvation and overwhelming oppression, Balram fails to emerge with his honesty", and adds: "in his avidity to rise, family bonds, family allegiance and family obligation cease to have any meaning for Balram now" (Want 2011: 75). This is one of the reasons why he breaks all ties with them which are the remnants of the past.

Bhabha defines present which corresponds to 'beyond as a spatial distance'. It marks progress and promises the future: "The imaginary of spatial distance – to live somehow beyond the border of our times – throws into relief the temporal, social differences that interrupt our collusive sense of cultural contemporaneity. The present can no longer be simply envisaged as a break or a bonding with the past and the future, no longer a synchronic presence" (Bhabha 1994: 6). Within this framework, what Pip goes through in the present is an extension of both past and future during his transition from childhood to maturity. The expectations and experiences permit him to imagine alternative origins and a better destination for his future. Balram's individual ambition also represents his progress and he regards himself as the future of India: "I'm tomorrow. In terms of formal education, I may be somewhat lacking. I never finished school, to put it bluntly. Who cares! I haven't read many books, but I've read all the ones that count. I know by heart the works of the four greatest poets of all time – Rumi, Iqbal, Mirza Ghalib, and a fourth fellow whose name I forget. I am a self-taught entrepreneur" (Adiga 2008: 6). Balram is the representative of the Indian poor yearning for their 'tomorrow'. In addition, he recalls his past as well as his present status, from a sweet-maker to an entrepreneur: "Yes, Ashok! That's what I call myself these days. Ashok Sharma, North Indian entrepreneur, settled in Bangalore... I would show you all the secrets of my business... my drivers, my garages, my mechanics, and my paid-off policemen. All of them belong to me – Munna, whose destiny was to be a sweet-maker!" (Adiga 2008: 302).

Whereas the members of the high class like Miss Havisham and Ashok are real figures of the society, Pip and Balram mimic their lives. Just as Bhabha argues: "[...] one takes reality into consideration while the other disavows it and replaces it by a product of desire that repeats, rearticulates 'reality' as mimicry" (Bhabha 1994: 130). Pip's journey to a new identity begins on the first day when he meets Miss Havisham and Estella at Satis House. Miller says that his first visit marks milestone in his life (Miller 1958: 264). This visit is not only leaving his house for a day but also a parting from his identity to a new one. As it is mentioned, "[...] Pip makes an inner, spiritual pilgrimage – one that never loses touch with a particular, and yet generalised, social reality. We see the social meaning inhering in the changes wrought in one individual" (Smith 1968: 170). That house causes great changes in him. He enters a very new world, which introduces him to new concepts of life. They will figure

prominently and destructively in Pip's future expectations. Pip might have had an ordinary life as a blacksmith's boy in his village without conflicts if he had never gone there. Besides, Estella disrupts the balance of the young boy. Her treatment of Pip including her words about his hands and boots gives rise to a confusion and a deep hurt in him. Pip describes Estella's effect on him in this way: "I had never thought of being ashamed of my hands before, but I began to consider them a very indifferent pair. Her contempt was so strong, that it became infectious, and I caught it" (Dickens 2008: 55). Herst casts light on the importance of Estella for Pip's expectations in an explicit way: "She is, in effect, the necessary preparation for the complete surrender of will and self which attends Pip's acquisition of his great expectations" (Herst 1990: 130). Thus, Estella's effective judgement brings about inconsistent thoughts and feelings for Pip. After that, he starts to make comparisons, which make him discontented with himself. One day he decides to be uncommon like Estella. Therefore, he starts to follow a way that will take him to a different identity and this journey begins by educating himself with the help of Biddy. Each of Pip's visits to Satis House creates a boy who gets more lost in his life as Pip starts to be unhappy about his home and he cannot be a part of Satis House. Balram's life also changes after leaving his village, Laxmanargh and starting to work in Ashok's house as a driver. As long as Ashok behaves well against Balram, he continues to be an ideal person that Balram admires and mimics. Yet a turning point comes when Pinky Madam runs over a child on a highway while driving drunk. The family wants Balram to sign a false confession; they expect that Balram will take the rap and go to jail 'loyal as a dog' (Adiga 2008: 169). This is an incident he will never forget. Schotland accentuates the reason for their demand: "Although Ashok and Balram had formed a sort of bond, when the rubber met the road and an accident occurred, Ashok was ready to coerce Balram into giving up his implicitly worthless life so that Pinky Madam could escape the consequences of her transgressions" (Schotland 2011: 9). Besides, after Ashok's new girlfriend entreats him to employ another driver, Balram infers that he has to act before he gets fired and kills his master. These are the facts that remind him of his status, but the habits that he has fallen into through his employer causes him to go beyond his standing and like Pip, he doesn't know where he belongs. Consequently, the point where they are now functions like interstitial space opened up also by the questions of Renée Green with where as well as who and what in his work, Sites of Genealogy, displaying and displacing the binary logic through which identities of difference such as black/white, self/other are often constructed. Green explains this structure in this way: "I used architecture literally as a reference, using the attic, the boiler room, and the stairwell to make associations between certain binary divisions such as higher and lower and heaven and hell. The stairwell became a liminal space, a pathway between the upper and lower areas, each of which was annotated with plaques referring to blackness and whiteness" (Bhabha 1994: 3). 'Stairwell', as it is seen explicitly, as liminal space becomes the connective tissue that builds up the difference between two contrasting points.

Like the stairwell, the space between two houses where Pip and Balram are becomes the process of symbolic interaction. Pip gets confused between two worlds, which also means two identities: to become a gentleman or an apprentice to Joe. Firstly, he becomes an apprentice, but this does not satisfy him as he cannot fit himself to that identity and he also thinks of a wider world that can bring him his expectations. Similarly, Balram will decide upon whether he will go on to work as a driver or become a prominent entrepreneur. Even if he remains loyal to his employer, the incidents he cannot put up with induces him to make a final decision on the way to become wealthy and that he kills his employer, Ashok, gives rise to a sense of newfound freedom and identity for Balram.

As Pip mentions, he has changed and the things are not the same as they used to be: "Finally, I remember that when I got into my little bedroom, I was truly wretched, and had a strong conviction on me that I should never like Joe's trade. I had liked it once, but once was not now" (Dickens 2008: 96). Pip knows he is leaving for somewhere unknown; he knows that he is taking a risk by entering the new world. In the end, what he says sheds light on his alteration and how successfully he is able to mimic the life of the upper class society: "We changed again, and yet again, and it was now too late and too far to go back, and I went on. And the mists had all solemnly risen now, and the world lay spread before me" (Dickens 2008: 146). Similarly, Balram is aware of the change that has an effect upon himself even if he has some moments of self-doubt: "[...] the colour imagery that is used confirms the fact that his evil is a product of the evil into which he was born, the 'darkness' of India" (Goh 2011: 336). Hence, while plotting the murder he looks at some black water and associates the blackness of the water with the burden of the crime that he will commit: "[...] a voice inside me said, 'But your heart has become even blacker than that, Munna'" (Adiga 2008: 265). In this regard, as Goh says, "the sheer catalogue of social evils that Balram has to negotiate, from childhood upwards, tends to lend moral weight to the unrepentant declaration he makes near the end of the novel" (Goh 2011: 336). In the light of this fact, what Goh claims turns out to be true because of the fact that Balram is so content to climb up to high social ladder rather than remaining constantly a servant: "I'll never say I made a mistake that night in Delhi when I slit my master's throat. I'll say it was all worthwhile to know, just for a day, just for an hour, just for a minute, what it means not to be a servant" (Adiga 2008: 320-1).

Family seems to be a burden for both protagonists, Pip and Balram, which leads them to mimic another life. As a family member, Pip's brother-in-law Joe Gargery is really an important character throughout the novel who keeps his helpful figure to lead Pip. According to Newey, "Joe is more specifically a moral compass and instrument of self-definition in a spiritual autobiography which, in the manner of old Puritan confessors, brings shape and meaning to the individual life and instruction to others" (Newey 2004: 188). After his visits that house, his thoughts about Joe change. There are also other scenes in which Pip confesses to the reader that he is ashamed of his home and even Joe. This time Pip

is not only unhappy about himself, but also he starts to be uncomfortable for Joe whom he always shared a strong and a good friendship: "I'm afraid I was ashamed of the dear good fellow - I know I was ashamed of him [...]" (Dickens 2008: 92). Besides, when Joe visits him in London, Pip mentions the distance between them in terms of sincerity: "whenever he subsided into affection, he called me Pip, and whenever he relapsed into politeness he called me Sir" (Dickens 2008: 204). Joe doesn't know how to treat him because of the mimicry Pip puts into motion. When familiar sincerity comes into his mind, he remembers the innocent boy whom he loved, but when he becomes aware that the boy he loved is not the same as before, he tries to behave in a way he is expected to. When Pip enacts a mimicry, Joe attempts to behave in the same manner as his, but he is not able to sustain the same performance because he is content with his social standing. Joe understands Pip's alteration and his final speech makes a clear explanation of himself as someone who knows where he belongs and who he is, unlike Pip: "You and me is not two figures to be together in London; [...]. I'm wrong in these clothes. I'm wrong out of the forge, the kitchen, or off th' meshes. You won't find half so much fault in me if you think of me in my forge dress, with my hammer in my hand, or even my pipe" (Dickens 2008: 205). The way Joe expresses himself points out important identification of two different worlds, the one which he lives in and the one which Pip tries to live. Herst says that Joe does not have a place in the confused and confusing world beyond the forge, the kitchen and the marshes and adds: "The world of the forge is a world of voluntary acceptance of the limitations that serve to keep Joe 'simply right', an acknowledgement of a good man's essential marginality, and helplessness, in the complex world where Pip must find his way" (Herst 1990: 123). Pip's dreams finally come true: he is presented a life and an identity that he has always searched for. He is given the chance to leave everything in that village and to make a new beginning as he expected. Accordingly, Pip feels that he is no more the common boy who worked in the forge. The ending of his apprenticeship to Joe makes the reader understand how he is happy with the ending. His explanation of burning his indentures in the fire signifies his escape from his old status and identity: "[...] Joe brought out my indentures from the press in the best parlour and we put them in the fire and I felt that I was free" (Dickens 2008: 133).

The impact of the family is also of great importance for Balram especially due to his domineering grandmother. Balram's aversion to his family highlights Adiga's message that in India the presence of family, as an institution, exerts a great pressure upon each member of the family. In India, loyalty to family is so great that "You were rude to your mother this morning' would be morally the equivalent of 'You embezzled funds from the bank this morning'" (Jeffries, 2008). That Balram and his brother are sent by a tyrannical grandmother to work in teashops as an occupation of their caste is an indication of strictness of family rules. For instance, Balram writes his grandmother an apologetic letter for his refusal to marry a girl who will bring a dowry that the grandmother would no doubt appreciate, as the way she behaved when Balram's brother married: "I can't live my life in a

cage, Granny. I'm so sorry" (Adiga 2008: 278). Schotland maintains that family life in India poses an obstacle to those who strive to start an independent life (Schotland 2011: 2). Thus, whenever they see their family suffer from the masters they decide to break off with the family's impact on them: "[...] the Indian family, is the reason we are trapped and tied to the coop. [...] only a man who is prepared to see his family destroyed – hunted, beaten, and burned alive by masters – can break out of the coop. That would take no normal human being, but a freak, a pervert of nature" (Adiga 2008: 176).

Taking into consideration the striving for socio-economic liberation and self-determination, the status of the subaltern subject is redefined in terms of an emancipatory reversal of the people who have suffered in the course of history: "It is the disjunctive, fragmented, displaced agency of those who have suffered the sentence of history – subjugation, domination, diaspora, displacement – that forces one to think outside the certainty of the sententious" (Bhabha 1992: 56). The term 'subaltern' derived from the use of Gramsci refers to non-élite or subordinated social groups that are regarded as colonised. Spivak also draws attention to these voiceless subalterns. He cites Ranajit Guha's definition of subalternity: "The social group and elements included in this category represent the demographic difference between the total Indian population and all those whom we have described as the 'élite'" (Guha & Spivak 2008: 44). The term 'élite' refers to dominant foreign groups, mainly British officials of the colonial state and dominant indigenous ones, industrial bourgeoisie and feudal lords. The insertion of India into colonialism is defined as a change from feudalism into capitalism inaugurated by the coloniser. This change is also the indication of subjection of the colonised. The government, which is included in *The White Tiger* seems to speak for men of the lower class but without doubt is interested only in its own wealth and power. This is how Indian democracy has not been functioning appropriately. It performs the policy of the corrupt colonial masters. However, the caste to which Balram's father, a rickshaw driver belonged is the voice of the colonised subject. Spivak's concept of subaltern leads to the premise that "subaltern cannot speak" (Spivak 1988: 104). In this respect, Adiga seems to make the subaltern speak through Balram becoming another image of Ashok: "Yes, Ashok! That's what I call myself these days. Ashok Sharma, North Indian entrepreneur, settled in Bangalore [...] I would show you all the secrets of my business [...] my drivers, my garages, my mechanics, and my paid-off policemen. All of them belong to me – Munna, whose destiny was to be a sweet-maker!" (Adiga 2008: 302). Schotland asserts that Balram has no other choice but to turn to violence because he lives in a desperate world where he does not benefit from legal opportunities (Schotland 2011: 2). Nevertheless, even if he conceives to be successful to mimic his master, his caste never allows him to become a true member of the élite. Similarly, no matter how successfully he tries to mimic the life of an English gentleman, his low birth never allows Pip to become a true gentleman too. When his property is gone and he loses his class power, this assertion turns out to be true. Magwitch will never be

an English gentleman in Australia or England, either. The money Magwitch gives to Pip cannot make him a true gentleman, but it is effective in setting up Herbert's career because he has only middle-class ambitions. Herbert's manner of talking to Pip is indicative of how he appreciates the capital and makes good use of it: "When you have once made your capital, you have nothing to do but employ it" (Dickens 2008: 169). Besides, Magwitch's death indicates the end of his secret colonial effect and Pip's expectations but after he joins Herbert in Cairo, they can make their fortunes as imperial traders. Therefore, that money leads them to become middle-class individuals of the imperial power. As it is known, English authority does not sanction Pip's mimicry of upper-class life enabled by Magwitch and Australia. However, the imperial attempts which Pip and Herbert make are different from Magwitch's imperial effect because their activities are authorized by the state and they have legitimate right to bring the wealth back into England. Consequently, they do not disrupt the social structure of English life.

3. CONCLUSION

This paper conveys the purpose of both novels that is to give voice to the oppressed who struggle for a better life so as to seize a place in the newly-established world order. They suggest that the oppressed should not knuckle under the sovereignty of the domineering ruling class, but work hard to overthrow it. It also gives the example of the Australian case as a colony in parallel with what Meredith said, in order to associate it with *Great Expectations* in which Australia is also included. Even if the population consists of transported English convicts, lower- and middle-class emigrants, they are not able to mimic British-born citizens or their lifestyle completely, because mimicry also involves rejection of the other (Bhabha, 1994). Therefore, Magwitch who was sent to Australia as a convict and cannot be allowed a return to England decides to form his own mimicry upon Pip. Magwitch sets him up with an education that is suitable for a young man with great expectations, but at the same time makes it clear that Pip should not endanger his high-class reputation by working for the money that he has been given. Pip is meant to live the life of an upper-class gentleman who is not expected to maintain his life earning money. If Pip were trained for any kind of job, he would become a member of the middle-class rather than the upper-class gentleman that Magwitch dreams he will be. Nevertheless, when Pip comes to know that the money comes from Magwitch through Australia, he puts an end to mimicry and finally realises why he will never be an English gentleman because of the fact that British imperial authority does not approve the means he used to gain his status. Pip's 'great expectations' of becoming a gentleman end with failure because it lacked one very important Victorian virtue: hard work. In other words because his efforts to become a gentleman were financed not by his own efforts, but by money given to him by a convict, he failed. Harold Perkin says that being a true gentleman is not genetic and even a poor man is likely to be a gentleman by clawing his way

to the top (Perkin 2002: 278). In the course of mimicry, the authority of the coloniser is liable to be undermined (Bhabha, 1994). As the colonised begin to struggle against the master, their resistance rises and endangers the colonial power in the end. Even if Magwitch fails to fight against British patriarchal authority through Pip, Balram, representative of the colonised, struggles and overthrows his master, Ashok, who is forced to lead a corrupted life caused by his family ties. Balram's fascination with his master's lifestyle makes him emulate Ashok. In the end, after killing his master, Balram becomes a 'mimic man', emulating the social and business practices of his former master. Balram gets ahead by opening up his own taxi company and becoming the new Ashok.

REFERENCES

- Adiga, A. (2008). *The White Tiger*. London: Atlantic Books.
- Al_Ogaili, T. & Babae, R. (2016). "Ambivalent Colonial Relations In Octavia Butler's *Wild Seed*". *International Journal of Human Sciences*. 13(1): 22-31.
- Ashcroft, B., Griffiths, G. & Tiffin, H. (2010). *The Empire Writes Back*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Ashcroft, B., Griffiths, G. & Tiffin, H. (2013). *Post-Colonial Studies: The Key Concepts*. New York: Routledge.
- Bhabha, H. K. (1994). *The Location of Culture*. London and New York: Routledge Classics.
- Bhabha, H. K. (1992). Postcolonial authority and post-modern guilt. In L. Grossberg, C. Nelson, & P. A. Treichler (Eds.), *Cultural Studies* (pp. 56-68). New York: Routledge.
- Chatterjee, P. (1993). *Nationalist Thought and the Colonial World*. London: Zed Books.
- Dickens, C. (2008). *Great Expectations*. M. Cardwell (ed.). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Fanon, F. (2001). *The Wretched of the Earth*. London: Penguin Books.
- Foucault, M. (2002). *The Archaeology of Knowledge*. London: Routledge.
- Gandhi, M. K. (1938). *Hind Swaraj or Indian Home Rule*. Navajivan Publishing House.
- Goh, R. B. H. (2011). Narrating "Dark" India in *Londonstani* and *The White Tiger: Sustaining Identity in the Diaspora*. *The Journal of Commonwealth Literature*, 46: 327-344.
- Guha, R. & Spivak, G. C. (2008). *Selected Subaltern Studies*. Oxford University Press.
- Herst, B. F. (1990). *The Dickens Hero: Selfhood and Alienation in the Dickens World*. London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson Ltd.
- Hughes, R. (2003). *The Fatal Shore: A History of the Transportation of Convicts to Australia 1787- 1868*. London: Vintage.
- Jeffries, S. (2008, October 16). 'Roars of anger'. *Guardian*, <http://www.guardian.co.uk/books/2008/oct/16/booker-prize>
- Loomba, A. (2015). *Colonialism/Postcolonialism*. London: Routledge.
- McLeod, J. (2010). *Beginning Postcolonialism*. New York: Manchester University Press.

- Mendes, A. C. (2010). *Exciting Tales of Exotic Dark India: Aravind Adiga's The White Tiger*. *The Journal of Commonwealth Literature*, 45: 275-293.
- Meredith, L. A. (1844). *Notes and Sketches of New South Wales*. London: William Clowes and Sons.
- Miller, J. H. (1958). *Charles Dickens: The World of His Novels*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Newey, V. (2004). *The Scriptures of Charles Dickens: Novels of ideology, Novels of the Self*. Ashgate Publishing Company.
- Perkin, H. (2002). *The Origins of Modern English Society*. New York: Routledge.
- Plamenatz, J. (1976). 'Two Types of Nationalism' in *Nationalism: The Nature and Evolution of an idea*. E. Kamenka (ed.). London: Edward Arnold.
- Sawhney, H. (2008, September 12). *India: A View from Below*. <http://www.brooklynrail.org/2008/09/express/india-a-view-from-below>.
- Schotland, S. D. (2011). *Breaking out of the rooster coop: violent crime in Aravind Adiga's WHITE TIGER and Richard Wright's NATIVE SON*. The Pennsylvania State University, University Park, PA.
- Spivak, G. C. (1988). *Can the Subaltern Speak? Marxism and the Interpretation of Culture*. C. Nelson & L. Grossberg (eds.). Macmillan.
- Want, L. (2011). *The Poetics and Politics of Cultural Studies in Aravind Adiga's The White Tiger*. University of Kashmir, Srinagar: Asiatic, Volume 5, Number 1, 69-77.
- Young, R. J. C. (2005). *Colonial Desire: Hybridity in Theory, Culture and Race*. London and New York: Routledge.