NEOCOLONIAL DETERRITORIALIZATION OF MIDDLE EASTERNERS IN MOHSIN HAMID'S *THE RELUCTANT FUNDAMENTALIST* AND *EXIT WEST* AND NADEEM ASLAM'S *THE WASTED VIGIL* AND *THE BLIND MAN'S GARDEN*

Pamukkale University
The Institute of Social Sciences
Doctoral Thesis
The Department of English Language and Literature
English Language and Literature
PhD Programme

Özgür ESEN

Supervisor

Associate Prof Dr. Baysar TANIYAN

September 2023
DENİZLİ

TEZ ONAY FORMU

I hereby declare that all information in this document has been presented in accordance with academic rules and ethical conduct. I also declare that as required by these rules and conduct I have fully cited and referenced all material and results that are not original to this work.

Signature:

Name, Last Name: Özgür ESEN

To my wife and son

Emine & Yağızalp

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

First and foremost, I would like to express my deepest gratitude and thanks to my thesis supervisor, Assoc. Prof. Dr. Baysar TANIYAN, who supported me throughout the completion of this thesis. Without his help, support, guidance and encouragement, this thesis would never have been materialized. It is a great honour for me to study with him.

I also would like to thank the jury members of the Dissertation Monitoring Committee, Prof. Dr. Mehmet Ali ÇELİKEL, Prof. Dr. Zekiye ANTAKYALIOĞLU and Assist. Prof. Dr. Reyhan TANIYAN whose invaluable suggestions help me complete my dissertation.

I am also grateful to my lecturers in the Departments of English Language and Literature in Aydın Adnan Menderes University for their support and encouragement during my doctorate.

Finally, I am indebted very much to my wife, Emine ESEN for her endless support and patience.

ABSTRACT

NEOCOLONIAL DETERRITORIALIZATION OF MIDDLE EASTERNERS IN MOHSIN HAMID'S *THE RELUCTANT FUNDAMENTALIST* AND *EXIT WEST* AND NADEEM ASLAM'S *THE WASTED VIGIL* AND *THE BLIND MAN'S GARDEN*

Özgür ESEN

Doctoral Thesis

The Department of English Language and Literature

The Doctoral Programme in English Language and Literature

Supervisor: Assoc. Prof. Dr. Baysar TANIYAN

August 2023, Vii+208

Neocolonialism refers to the new exploitation methods performed by imperialists to maintain exploitation in Third World countries after the decolonization period. Having begun as the implementation of indirect methods through economic and logistic supports for the regimes controlled by the political Islam and fundamentalists in the Middle East during the Cold War, neocolonialism has transformed into an extreme form of exploitation through military invasions in the region after the 9/11 terrorist attacks. The study argues that those policies have deterritorialized Middle Easterners through migrations and inland dislocations and offers discussions for associating their physical dislocations with the fluidity of identity. Utilizing Deleuze and Guattari's understanding of nomadic identity and defining those dislocations as neocolonial deterritorialization, the study explores the alterations Middle Easterners undergo due to their compulsion to directly experience the neocolonial spaces or the factors created by neocolonial policies. In this regard, this dissertation aims to analyse the deterritorializing impact of neocolonial policies through Mohsin Hamid's *Exit West* and *The Reluctant Fundamentalist* and Nadem Aslam's *The Wasted Vigil* and *The Blind Man' Garden*.

Keywords: Neocolonialism, Deterritorialization, the Middle East, Mohsin Hamdi, Nadeem Aslam.

ÖZET

MUHSİN HAMİD'İN *GÖNÜLSÜZ KÖKTENDİNCİ* VE *BATI ÇIKIŞI* VE NADEEM ASLAM'IN *VİRAN ÜLKENİN BEKÇİSİ* VE *KÖR ADAMIN BAHÇESİ* ROMANLARINDA ORTADOĞULULARIN YENİ SÖMÜRGECİLİK ALTINDA YERSİZYURTSUZLAŞMASI

Özgür ESEN
Doktora Tezi
İngiliz Dili ve Edebiyatı Ana Bilim Dalı
İngiliz Dili ve Edebiyatı Doktora Programı
Danışman: Doç. Dr. Baysar TANIYAN
Ağustos 2023, Vii+208

Yeni sömürgecilik, sömürgesizleşme döneminden sonra emperyalist ülkelerin Üçüncü Dünya ülkelerinde sömürü düzenini devam ettirmek adına uygulamaya başladıkları yeni yöntemleri ifade eder. Soğuk Savaş döneminde, Orta Doğu'da köktendincilere ve siyasal İslam'ın kontrolündeki rejimlere ekonomik ve lojistik destek verilmesi ile tezahür eden yeni sömürgecilik, 11 Eylül terörist saldırılarının ardında bölgede yoğun askeri müdahalelerin başlaması ile en uç halini almıştır. Bu çalışma, bölgede uygulanan yeni sömürgeci politikaların göçler ve ülke içi dislokasyonlarla Ortadoğuluları yersizyurtsuzlaştırdığını ve bireylerin fiziksel yer değiştirmelerini kimliğin akışkanlığı ile özdeşleştirilebileceğini tartışmaktadır. Deleuze ve Guattari'nin göçebe kimlik kavramını kullanan ve bu yer değiştirmeleri yeni sömürgeci yersizyurtsuzlaşma olarak betimleyen bu çalışma, yeni sömürgeci politikaların şekillendirdiği faktörleri ya da uzamları deneyimlemeye zorlanan Ortadoğuluların kimlik değişimlerini odaklanmaktadır. Dolayısıyla, bu çalışma Orta Doğu' da uygulanan yeni sömürgeci politikaların bölge insanı üzerindeki yersizyurtsuzlaştırıcı etkisini Mohsin Hamid'in *Gönülsüz Köktendinci* ve *Batı Çıkışı* ve Nadeem Aslam'ın *Viran Ülkenin Bekçisi* ve *Kör Adamın Bahçesi* romanları kapsamında incelemektedir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Yeni Sömürgecilik, Yersizyurtsuzlaşma, Mohsin Hamid, Nadeem Aslam

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PLAGIARISM…… i
DEDICATION…….…….. ii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENT……. iii
ABSTRACT……..…… iv
ÖZET……...…….. v
TABLE OF CONTENTS…….. vi
INTRODUCTION……...…… 1

CHAPTER I

FROM COLONIALISM TO NEOCOLONIALISM

1.1 Colonialism…… 8
1.2 Postcolonialism ……. 20
1.3 Neocolonialism…….. 39
1.4 Neocolonialism in the Middle East…… 56
1.5 Deterritorialization of the Middle Easterners through Neocolonialism……. 65

CHAPTER II

THE RELUCTANT FUNDAMENTALIST* AND *EXIT WEST

2.1 Neocolonial Deterritorialization in *The Reluctant Fundamentalist* ……...71
2.2 Mohsin Hamid as a Deterritorialized Writer……...72
2.3 Neocolonialism in *The Reluctant Fundamentalist*.……....73
2.4 Unbelongingness of Middle Easterner Migrants and Neocolonial Deterritorialization in *The Reluctant Fundamentalist* ……..…..81
2.5 Neocolonial Deterritorialization in *Exit West* ……100
2.6 The Extreme Form of Neocolonialism in the Middle East in *Exit West* …….. 101
2.7 Forced Emigration and Neocolonial Deterritorialization in *Exit West* …….. 119

CHAPTER III

THE WASTED VIGIL* AND *THE BLIND MAN'S GARDEN

3.1 Neocolonial Deterritorialization in *The Wasted Vigil*…….140
3.2 Nadeem Aslam as a Deterritorialized Writer……..141
3.3 History of Neocolonialism in the Middle East in *The Wasted Vigil* ……..142
3.4 Transformation of the Deterritorialized in *The Wasted Vigil* ……..…….....151
3.5 Neocolonial Deterritorialization in *The Blind Man's Garden*……...……..162
3.6 Neocolonial Military Interventions in the Middle East in *The Blind Man's Garden* ……....163
3.7 Deterritorialized Locals in the Neocolonial Space in *The Blind Man's Garden* …….……...173

CONCLUSION……..……...191
REFERENCES……..... 202
VITA……. 208

TABLE OF ABBREVIATIONS

EW	*EXIT WEST*
TRF	*THE RELUCTANT FUNDAMENTALIST*
TWV	*THE WASTED VIGIL*
TBMG	*THE BLIND MAN'S GARDEN*

Introduction

Literature is political. It does not only reverberate politics but also explores social, economic and cultural dynamics which create the infrastructure of political issues. While this corporation enables literature to shed light on the political history of the world, it also deals with the impacts of the politics on individuals and underlines human beings' urges which promote those political developments. One of those urges which become a notable subject matter is human beings' will to power, and literature becomes a tool to justify the urge to control and to exploit others through colonialist attitudes. This literary tradition is regarded as colonial discourse, and it creates dichotomy to generate hierarchy and maintain exploitation. Colonial period lasts for centuries and comes to an end with the postcolonial era when the colonized peoples get their independence. This also finds reflection in literature and there happens a flow of literary pieces which undermine the dichotomy that the colonial discourse has built.

After World War II, the political conjuncture all around the world necessitated the birth of a new exploitation method: Neocolonialism. War-torn European colonialists had difficulty in coping with the political and economic responsibilities in their colonies. The United States, eager to take an active role in building global hegemony, turned that political impasse into advantage by promoting a process of decolonization and designating governments subserving its profits. Letting ex-colonies to be independent, neocolonialists designated puppet regimes or governments in those newly found Third World countries and conducted direct and indirect methods to continue their dominance over those pseudo independent ex-colonies. The Cold War was the period when the US practised indirect neocolonial methods in the Middle East. The economic and logistic support of the US neocolonialism for Islamist guerrillas did not only enable the retreat of the Soviets, but also resulted in unbounded rise of fundamentalists in the region. After the 9/11 terrorist attacks, the US neocolonialism defined fundamentalists, who had been seen as freedom fighters in their fight against communism, as radical terrorists and it performed the extreme form of neocolonialism, direct military interventions, in the Middle Eastern countries under cover of war against terrorism. Direct and indirect neocolonial methods that have been conducted in the region since the Cold War have generated an everlasting chaotic atmosphere, and this dissertation aims to analyse the deterritorializing impact of the neocolonial turmoil on individuals as represented in Mohsin Hamid's *The Reluctant Fundamentalist* (2007) and *Exit West* (2017) and Nadeem

Aslam's *The Wasted Vigil* (2008) and *The Blind Man's Garden* (2013). The dissertation also argues that neocolonial subjects who become deterritorialized due to neocolonial policies undergo alterations in their identities since their physical dislocations enable them to accumulate new characteristics through their interactions with factors in new territories.

Deleuze and Guattari (2003) regard identity not as a being but a process of becoming and utilize the term, deterritorialization, to underline the mobility of identity. For them, physical dislocations open possibilities for subjects; thereby, enabling them to experience possibilities during reterritorialization and to accumulate them to cultivate subjectivity. Those perpetual physical movements hinder fixation of identity and provide multiplicity for subjects. The dissertation refers to Deleuze and Guattari's understanding of deterritorialization to associate characters' dislocations by neocolonialism with the alterations in their identities due to their experiences in the neocolonial space and defines it as neocolonial deterritorialization.

The first chapter will involve the theoretical background where the detailed examination of colonialism, postcolonialism and neocolonialism will be provided. It will begin with the history and characteristics of colonialism and will argue the impact of colonialist attitude on literature. It will then continue with the postcolonialism part in which the cultural legacy of colonialism is analyzed through the postcolonial terminology. The chapter will also argue that postcolonialism remains incapable of embracing the political and economic developments, such as indirect and direct exploitation methods, after decolonization and define the new era as the neocolonial period. Enunciating that the neocolonial period starts in the Middle East during the Cold War through economic, political and logistic supports for the regimes encouraged by the political Islam and fundamentalists and transforms into the direct invasions after the 9/11 terrorist attacks, the chapter will regard Middle Easterners' dislocations by neocolonial policies as neocolonial deterritorialization.

The second chapter will examine the neocolonial spaces after 9/11 terrorist attacks in Mohsin Hamid's *The Reluctant Fundamentalist* and *Exit West* and will analyse the deterritorializing impact of those spaces on Middle Easterners. The chapter will also argue that Middle Easterners' dislocations by neocolonialism establishes a firm ground for analysing them withing the understanding of Deleuze and Guattari's deterritorialization. The dissertation considers Mohsin Hamid as an appropriate writer to explore neocolonial

deterritorialization because his personal background has enabled him to experience consequences of neocolonialism both in the West and in the Middle East. In addition to his perpetual dislocations in his childhood due to his family's migrations, he also directly experiences Islamophobia triggered by the 9/11 terrorist attacks during his postgraduate in New York and then witnesses the cruelty that neocolonialism has generated in the Middle East after the attacks when he returns to the region. *The Reluctant Fundamentalist* and *Exit West* become prominent as notable novels which shed light on the impact of neocolonialism on Middle Easterners.

Being published in 2007, *The Reluctant Fundamentalist* was inspired by Hamid's own experiences in the US during the post 9/11 period. The novel indicates the adverse impact of neocolonialism on Middle Easterner immigrants who become outcast in the neocolonial atmosphere after the attacks, and the title refers to those immigrants' reluctance to return to their countries and to adapt the circumstance generated by neocolonialism. The story centres on Changez's American dream which fails due to Islamophobia emerging after the attacks. Hamid also associates Changez's American dream with neocolonialism because Changez leaves his country and migrates to America to regain the wealth that his family has lost in the new economic structure. His initial deterritorialization finds reflection in his identity. As an ambitious economic immigrant, Changez receives an acceptance from Princeton University, completes his bachelor's degree successfully and begins to work at one of the most prestigious finance companies in the US. He moves up the career leader expeditiously and becomes an accomplished financier who serves for the US capitalism. His ambition and dedication avail his adaptation and acceptance to the American way of life, and this new territory offers a lot of possibilities through which he starts to feel and behave as if he were American. However, the 9/11 terrorist attacks, which do not only generate Islamophobia in the West, but also pave the way for direct neocolonial interventions in the Middle East under cover of war against terrorism, dispose Middle Eastern immigrants of the opportunity to live in the cosmopolitan USA. Perceiving that he is a representative of the US neocolonialism and contributes to the destruction in the Middle East, Changez quits his job and decides to return to his country. The dissertation regards his dislocation as deterritorialization triggered by the 9/11 terrorist attacks, the consequences of neocolonial logistic and economic support for fundamentalists since the Cold War, and direct military interventions after the attacks. His deterritorialization from his American dream creates a

political stance which is against the US imperialism, and he starts to work at a university where he raises awareness of the US neocolonialism. As a deterritorialized neocolonial subject who internalizes possibilities he encounters during his dislocations, he has difficulty in adapting to his country and becomes a neocolonial nomad experiencing unbelongingness.

Exit West, published in 2017, is one of the earliest literary reactions to the contemporary refugee crisis that has been triggered by neocolonial policies performed in the Middle East. Dealing with a variety of aspects of refugee problems through the mass migration from the Middle East to the West, Hamid, in the novel, reflects the impact of direct neocolonial military interventions on locals, fictionalising an unnamed Middle Eastern city which becomes a war zone of fundamentalist terrorists and the US neocolonialism. The story revolves around a couple, Nadia and Saeed, whose ordinary lives are turned upside down by the neocolonial war. They notice that they cannot survive in the unnamed neocolonial Middle Eastern city because it is bombed and invaded by both terrorist groups and neocolonial forces. The political, social, economic and cultural devastation in their country forces them to migrate to different territories through magical doors, and their deterritorialization begins. Using the doors, they migrate to different cities, such as Mykonos, London and California, to build a safe life, but their relationship deteriorates, and they split up. The dissertation underlines that Hamid's aim is not to reveal the hardships refugees face on the way but to highlight the alterations deterritorialization promotes through interactions with new territories. Hence, Hamid's attitude complies with Deleuze and Guattari's understanding of deterritorialization because physical dislocations in the novel offer possibilities for subjects to form subjectivities, and Hamid reflects neocolonial deterritorialization through Nadia and Saeed's perpetual migrations, highlighting the alterations they undergo during their reterritorialization.

The third chapter will scrutinize the neocolonial Afghanistan and Pakistan through Nadeem Aslam's *The Wasted Vigil* and *The Blind Man's Garden* and will associate Middle Easterners' inland dislocations by the neocolonial war as neocolonial deterritorialization. The chapter will also debate that Middle Easterners' inland dislocations by the neocolonial war paves the way for analysing their alteration within the scope of Deleuze and Guattari's deterritorialization. Like Hamid, Nadeem Aslam is also referred as a deterritorialized writer in the dissertation. He was born in Pakistan and

moved to Britain at the age of fourteen due to his family's political stance. His father was a communist and they had to abandon their country due to the dictatorship of General Zia who was supported by the US neocolonialism during the Cold War. His family's political dislocation was directly related to neocolonial policies conducted by the US because indirect means of neocolonialism, such as logistic and economic support for such regimes subserving for the US, enabled those regimes to build strict hegemony over locals. Those, like his family, who were against the US neocolonialism or fundamentalism, did not have any other option apart from leaving their countries, and his family's neocolonial deterritorialization generates, in his fiction, a tendency to reflect the atrocity created by the US neocolonialism in the region. The dissertation refers to two of his novels, *The Wasted Vigil* (2008) and *The Blind Man's Garden* (2013), as the ones which reflect the deterritorializing impact of the political and social deviousness of the Middle East since the Cold War. What meets these novels on a common ground is that both reflect how neocolonialism penetrates target countries and increases its hegemony through indirect means and how it transforms into an extreme form and devastates target countries through direct military interventions. They also lay bare that neocolonialism has destroyed the political, economic, social and cultural structures in the region where locals become deterritorialized in their own countries.

In *The Wasted Vigil*, narrating the intertwined stories of characters with different religious and racial backgrounds through two different time spans, Nadeem Aslam traces the history of neocolonialism which transforms from indirect logistic and economic support to direct military invasions in the Middle East. In the past time of the narrative, he regards Afghanistan and Pakistan as neocolonial spaces where the US conducts indirect means, interfering in the internal affairs of the countries and supporting fundamentalists in the war against communism. The present time of the narrative reflects the contemporary political, social, and economic disarray created by the direct military invasion of the US in Afghanistan and Pakistan after the 9/11 terrorist attacks. Referring to the development of neocolonialism in the region, the narrative reflects how neocolonialism deterritorializes subjects by gathering different characters each of whom represents a political side in the neocolonial period and by revealing their alterations due to deterritorialization in the neocolonial space. The novel revolves around the tragic story of Marcus who loses his wife, Katrina, his daughter, Zameen, and his grandson, Bihzad, in the neocolonial Afghanistan and sets frequent journeys to find them. These journeys

enable Marcus to meet David, a CIA agent, and Casa, a fundamentalist, and they come together at Marcus' house. Lara, a Russian woman who looks for his missing brother, Benedikt, and Dunia, an open-minded local woman, join the group at the house. Aslam fictionalizes the house as a microcosm of the neocolonial Afghanistan where the group interact with each other and argue about politics and religion without guns or bombs. While the gathering reveals the alteration that David experiences upon witnessing the real face of neocolonialism during his reterritorialization, it also offers Casa possibilities to moderate his strict religious opinions upon his dislocation from fundamentalists. Hence, reflecting the history of neocolonialism in the Middle East, Aslam also tells the story of neocolonial subjects whose bodies and identities become deterritorialized in the neocolonial Afghanistan and whose reterritorialization reveals their transformation.

In *The Blind Man's Garden*, Aslam depictures the contemporary Afghanistan and Pakistan where the US neocolonialism and fundamentalists have created atrocity through air strikes, raids, and suicide bombings after the 9/11 terrorist attacks. The narrative has an empathetic attitude towards locals, and canonizing religious characters who keep themselves distance from radical groups, Aslam attempts to underline that many ordinary locals who live a modest life in their countries become deterritorialized due to the direct military interventions and cruelty of fundamentalists whose unbounded political and military rise is associated with neocolonial aids during and after the Cold War. The novel revolves around dolesome experiences of Rohan family whose lives are turned upside down through the neocolonial fight between the US forces and fundamentalists in the region. Rohan is a devout who fastens upon the doctrines of the bigoted society designated by neocolonial policies during the Cold War. His wife, Sofia, is not alive in the present time of the narration and the narrative associates her death with Rohan who gives up providing her medicine since she apostatizes. Upon the invasion of Afghanistan by the US, Rohan's biological son, Jeo, and adopted son, Mikal, leave home to help wounded Afghans in the border town, Heer. When Rohan learns their departure, he also sets a journey to find and dissuade them. Their dislocations by neocolonial military interventions in Afghanistan force them to witness vandalism of the neocolonial space. Jeo dies in one of the camps raided by the US forces and Rohan becomes blind because of an explosion in one of those journeys. Mikal becomes the indicator of the neocolonial Middle East. He survives the raid in which Jeo has died and he is taken captive by fundamentalists, warlords and the US forces respectively. His physical deterritorialization

compels him to experience the violence performed by both fundamentalists and the US neocolonialism, which offers his identity to collect possibilities to form a subjectivity. Even though he kills two American soldiers in the initial part of his journey, he then transforms into a man who risks his life to save another American soldier at the end of the novel. Furthermore, Aslam also deals with the condition of Middle Eastern woman in the bigoted society through Sofia, Tara and Naheed. While Sofia represents women who become isolated since they object to the constructions of patriarchy and religion, Tara, Naheed's mother, stands for Middle Eastern women who resign themselves to the expectations and doctrines of bigotry and patriarchy. On the other hand, Naheed is an idealized woman whose figurative deterritorialization in the bigoted society urges her to build a subjectivity as a woman, and she functions to be a role model who finishes university, becomes a teacher and stands on her own feet. In *The Blind Man's Garden*, focusing on the political, economic, social and cultural retrogress in the contemporary Pakistan and Afghanistan, Aslam regards neither the US neocolonialism nor fundamentalism as salvation. However, he fictionalizes a neocolonial space where locals who have experienced the atrocity in the post 9/11 period attempt to put an end to vicious circle of death in the region and where local women object to the expectations of bigotry and patriarchy and stand on their feet.

Overall, defining the attempts to build political, economic and military hegemony over Middle Eastern countries, such as Pakistan and Afghanistan, with neocolonialism, the dissertation explores the impact of neocolonial methods, direct or indirect, on Middle Easterners and puts forward that those methods push them into a process of deterritorialization. While their deterritorialization refers to their physical dislocations due to the atrocity, it also implies the alterations their identities undergo through interactions with new territories or with neocolonial spaces. The dissertation examines neocolonial deterritorialization in two forms: migrations compelled by neocolonial policies and inland dislocations due to the neocolonial war. While it analyses Mohsin Hamid's novels, *The Reluctant Fundamentalist* and *Exit West*, through migrations as consequences of neocolonialism, it scrutinizes Nadeem Aslam's novels, *The Wasted Vigil* and *The Blind Man's Garden* through inland dislocations.

CHAPTER I
FROM COLONIALISM TO NEOCOLONIALISM

1.1 Colonialism

Colonialism is a political, economic, social and cultural phenomenon based on the manipulation and exploitation of a group of people. It is not a new term, but of long standing. Its history dates to the practices conducted by the early empires, such as the Roman, the Aztec, the Mongol, the Ottoman or the Moorish empires. Across the world, these empires, for various purposes such as religious, economic or military interests, embarked on expeditions to other beneficial lands to colonize them through annexation. Such practices led the way to European colonialism which began in the fifteenth century and reached its peak in the second half of the nineteenth century. Colonialism has been implemented by different imperial powers all over the world in different periods throughout the history, which has made the definition of the term more sophisticated.

To explain the term etymologically, Ania Loomba, referring to Oxford English Dictionary, states that Colonialism comes from the Roman 'colonia' which meant 'farm' or 'settlement' and quotes its lexical meaning:

> "a settlement in a new country[,] . . . a body of people who settle in a new locality, forming a new community subject to or connected with their parent state; the community so formed, consisting of the original settlers and their descendants and successors, as long as the connection with the parent state is kept up" (2005: 7).

However, she remarks this definition is problematic and insufficient because it ignores the crucial concepts of colonialism such as "conquest and domination" (2005: 8). She indicates that it cannot be just defined as an ordinary settlement because it is also a process of "re-forming" or "unforming" the natives. The process of "forming a community" is conducted with an "encounter" between "the natives" and "the newcomers" through "trade, plunder, negotiation, warfare, genocide, enslavement and rebellions" (Loomba, 2005: 8). These practices are the strategies which enable imperial powers to control a land with a direct rule. However, the implementations of the strategies and the reasons of colonization have varied in the course of the history since colonial practices have occurred in different regions in different ages and for different purposes, which resulted in such a concept encompassing variety of definitions and characteristics. Nevertheless, what is common in all implementations of colonialism is the cultural and economic exploitation of the natives by imperial powers.

Defining colonialism as “the conquest and control of other people’s land and goods,” Loomba argues that its definition cannot be confined to the European colonialism from the sixteenth century onward because “it has been a recurrent and widespread feature of human history” (2005: 8). For her, the history of colonialism begins with the Roman Empire which colonized large territories in the second century, and she exemplifies these colonial practices in the history, such as the Mongols that invaded most of the Asia and the Middle East in the thirteenth century, the Aztec and Inca Empires that controlled the American continent from the fourteenth to sixteenth centuries and the Ottoman Empire that conquered large part of Asia and the East of Europe in the seventeenth century (2005: 8). These early colonial practices were a source of inspiration and encouragement for the modern European colonial practices that started in the sixteenth century with industrialization. Furthermore, modern European imperial powers utilized the colonial attitude of the Roman Empire and referred it as “the moral justification” for their own imperialist practices (Young, 2016: 16).

One of the most significant factors which enabled European imperialists to reach remote and oversea lands was the technological developments of the sixteenth century which led to “ocean-going caravels” and “navigational aids” (Young, 2016: 16). Unlike early colonial practices, the sixteenth century imperialists could colonize the lands which had no territorial links to the motherland with the help of those enduring ships and “empires no longer had to be geographically coherent” (2016: 16). Here, the definition of colonialism should be revised because while early colonialism is defined as “a settlement in a new country” (Loomba, 2005: 7) or “settler colonialism” (Giuliani, 2012: 106), it, now, becomes a term which refers to the exploitation of the raw materials and human power of the natives in remote parts of the world.

This differentiation of the modern European colonialism from ‘settler colonialism’ is explained within a Marxist perspective by Loomba. She defines earlier colonialisms as “pre-capitalist” and the modern European colonialism that altered the fate of the whole world as “capitalist”. She remarks that modern colonialism did not only abuse the wealth of the colonies, but also built an economic system in which “there was a flow of human and natural resources between colonised and colonial countries” (2005: 8). Similarly, Young also makes the same distinction and names these two types as “the settled” and “the exploited” (2016: 16). What created inequality between the colonised and colonial countries and gave birth to capitalist soul in the colonies was that their

relationship was always regulated for the colonizers' benefit. Colonies became not only the sources of raw materials or labour force, but also colonizers' markets. Colonial countries exploited raw materials of the colonies and produced goods with them in the motherlands and then they merchandised those goods to the colonies. Thus, colonialism generated a commercial system which was working just for the profit of one side, the colonizer. It is crystal clear that it enriched the colonizer while it impoverished the colonized. Even though modern European colonialism exercised "variety of techniques and patterns of domination" in different parts of the world, "all of them produced the economic imbalance that was necessary for the growth of European capitalism and industry" (Loomba, 2005: 9). To highlight the relationship between colonialism and capitalism, Loomba argues that if colonialism had not appeared, "capitalism could not have taken place in Europe" (2005: 10).

Colonialism and capitalism meet on a common ground since not only the former brings about the occurrence of the latter, but also the latter empowers the former. The fact that colonialism and imperialism can be "used interchangeably" and capitalist modern colonialism is closely associated with imperialism has enabled critics to discuss these terms together. However, to define imperialism with capitalism can be "misleading" (2005: 10) because "some commentators place imperialism as prior to colonialism" (Boehmer, 1995: 3). Like colonialism, imperialism is also not a term that can be explained with "a single semantic meaning" since its meaning underwent some changes in the course of the history (Loomba, 2005: 10). To start with its lexical meaning, 'empire' means "command, or superior power" in English (Williams, 1976: 131). The term, imperialism, is derived from the Latin word 'imperium' which means "command, authority, rulership or more loosely power" (Colas, 2005: 17) and 'imperial' can be defined as "simply pertaining to empire" (Loomba, 2005: 10). Besides, for Ernest Barker, imperialism encapsulates a "hierarchical rule over a periphery from a metropolitan centre or motherland" (1951: 2). He identifies empire as "a large territory composed of different parts or provinces attached to a metropolitan centre and therefore composite, which was united under the control of a single person" (1951: 2).

Having a historical background as old as colonialism, imperialism inevitably experienced some alterations. Like the distinction between pre-capitalist and capitalist colonialisms, the long journey of imperialism can also be divided into two: the "classical-continental" and the "modern-maritime" (Baker, 1951: 11). While the former stands for

the geographically coherent empires, the latter implies the modern empires that could control the remote and oversea lands with the help of the enduring ships that enabled both the conquest and control of overseas. Thus, the modern-maritime imperialism was closely associated with the modern European colonialism which is defined as "the midwife that assisted at the birth of European capitalism" (Loomba, 2005: 10). In *Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism,* a new definition to imperialism was proposed by Vladimir Lenin who delineates it as "the highest stage of capitalism" (1999: 9). He remarks that the capitals of the industrialized European imperialists became "enormous," and since investing large amount of money in the motherland would not be much profitable, those European imperialists exported the capital to the "backward" countries where "profits are usually high, for capital is scarce, the price of land is relatively low, wages are low, raw materials are cheap" (1999: 71). Thus, there appeared a tendency to colonize the unindustrialized countries for economic growth, and that attempt was encouraged by these interactive concepts: imperialism, which "is driven by ideology" to persuade people to explore, earn more and rule (Young, 2016: 27); colonialism, which is profitable since it involves "the conquest and control of other people's land and goods" (Loomba, 2005: 8), and capitalism which is an economic system founded by the imperialist and colonialist to ensure exploitation. The close relationship among these concepts enables the argument of these terms together within the scope of the study.

However, even though colonialism and imperialism are described to be interchangeable terms, a few distinctions are mentioned by scholars to discuss these terms separately. In his *Beginning Postcolonialism*, John McLeod utters that colonialism can be referred "interchangeably with imperialism, but in truth the terms mean different things" (2000: 7). He remarks that while imperialism is an "ideological concept" which legitimates "the economic and military control of one nation by another," colonialism is defined as "only one form of practice which results from the ideology of imperialism" (2000: 7). He, moreover, commentates that colonialism "specifically concerns the settlement of one group of people in a new location"; however, "settlement" is not required for imperialism since it can reach its ultimate goals such as "trade and commerce under the protection of political, legal, and military controls" (2000: 8). He concludes that colonialism is "one historically specific experience of how imperialism can work through the act of settlement" (2000: 8). Similarly, Jürgen Osterhammel, who, in *Colonialism: A Theoretical Overview*, delineates imperialism as a comprehensive concept comprising

"all forces and activities contributing to the construction and the maintenance of transnational colonies," considers colonialism as "one special manifestation of imperialism" (1999: 22). Correspondingly, Edward Said, in *Culture and Imperialism*, emphasizes the distinction between the two concepts and characterizes imperialism as "the practice, the theory and the attitudes of a dominating metropolitan center ruling a distant territory" and colonialism as "the implanting of settlements on a distant territory" and "almost always a consequence of imperialism" (1994: 9). Within the lights of all definitions above, imperialism is considered as a mindset which theorizes, rationalizes and encourages the control of a distant territory while colonialism stands for the actualization of the mindset in the distant territory.

To build the mindset that would justify the expansionist and exploitative attitudes, imperialism and colonialism promote an ideological mindset which propagandizes that certain territories and people need to be ruled and developed. The mindset encompasses a vocabulary which implies the dichotomy between the colonizers and the colonized: "inferior" or "subject race", "subordinated peoples", "dependency", "expansion" and "authority" (Said, 1994: 9). While there was a flow of raw materials from the periphery to the centre such as "spices, sugar, slaves, rubber, cotton…, gold and silver," it was not difficult for them to persuade the "decent men and women" in the motherland for colonization. Said defends that there became a social commitment for those colonial attitudes:

> "There was a commitment to them over and above profit… which, on the one hand, allowed the decent men and women to accept the notion that distant territories and their native peoples should be subjugated, and, on the other, replenished metropolitan energies so that these people could think of the imperium as a protracted, almost metaphysical obligation to rule the subordinate, inferior or less advanced peoples" (1994: 10).

This commitment can also be clarified with the notion of "civilizing mission" which gained the meanings of "improvement," "betterment" and later on "moral and material progress" (Mann, 2004: 4). This mission, which became "the official doctrine" of the modern European imperialism, does not only lay an emphasis on the superiority of Europeans, but also declares the inferiority of the "colonial subjects" who "were too backward to govern themselves" and who "had to be uplifted" (2004: 4). Imperialists legitimated their existence in the colonies with a claim to develop colonies and enable them to benefit from modernity (2004: 5). Thus, the colonized countries and peoples

started to be determined from the perspectives of European cultures, religions and norms and to be matched with the derogatory ones in all binary oppositions.

Samir Amin identifies this imperial attempt as "Europeanization which is simply the diffusion of a superior model" and considers it as "a necessary law, imposed by the force of circumstances" for the colonized (2009: 180). For imperialists, this was a justified right because they protected the colonized from their "lethargy" and "the westernization of the world impose[d] on everyone the adaptation of the recipes of European superiority" (Amin, 2009: 180). Identically, Bill Ashcroft et al. argue that by the eighteenth century, European norms had been reflected as the indicators of the superiority, which led European cultural assumptions to be reckoned as "the normal, the natural and the universal" (2007: 84).

Moreover, James M. Blaut also deals with the process of Europeanization of the colonized and remarks that "Eurocentrism is a label for all the beliefs that postulate past or present superiority of Europeans over non-Europeans" (1993:10). For him, what made Europe a centre and a colony a periphery was the fact that Europe was very advanced in terms of industrialization, modernization and progress, and this created dichotomies between Europe and colonies: "an Inside and an Outside" (1993: 1). He implies that Europe, the 'Inside', could impose the industrial, scientific, religious, political and cultural knowledge on colonies, the 'Outside', because the former was more advanced and modernized than the latter. Writing explicitly that "[I]nside leads, Outside lags. Inside innovates; Outside imitates" (1993: 1), he delineates the imperious European effect on colonies as "Eurocentric Diffusionism" and declares that it is "quite simply the colonizer's model of the world" (1993: 10). Thus, the colonizer attempts to mould a model in which they can load all representations and perceptions about the colonized in order to secure their superiority over the inferiority of the colonized, which enables the occurrence of the colonial discourse.

Colonization can be conducted easily by "colonizing the minds" which is considered as a process to persuade the colonized to be ruled laying an emphasis on the backwardness of the colonized (McLeod, 2000: 18). To colonize the minds, language becomes a basic instrument which enables people "to internalize its logic and speak its language; to perpetuate the values and assumptions of the colonizers as regards the ways they perceive and represent the world" (2000: 18) because "language carries culture and culture carries, particularly through orature and literature, the entire body of values by

which we can perceive ourselves and our place in the world" (Wa Thiong'o, 1994: 16). Herewith, by means of the aforementioned effects of language, all derogatory characteristics attributed to the colonized from a European perspective constitute the colonial discourse emphasizing the binary oppositions which expedite the colonization because "colonial discourses form the intersections where language and power meet" (McLeod, 2000: 18).

Similarly, regarding Orientalism as a "Western style for dominating, restructuring, and having authority over the Orient," Edward Said, in his *Orientalism*, expounds that it is impossible to perceive "the enormously systematic discipline by which European culture was able to manage - and even produce- the Orient politically, sociologically, militarily, ideologically, scientifically and imaginatively during the post-Enlightenment period" (2003: 3). To clarify the production of the Orient in the colonial discourse by the European colonizers, he refers to the discourse notion of Michel Foucault whose thoughts on power and knowledge are beneficial to understand the logic of Orientalism (2003: 3). In *Discipline and Punish,* Foucault reveals his notion of discourse stating that "power produces knowledge," and then explains the relationship between them writing "power and knowledge directly imply one another" and "there is no power relation without correlative constitution of a field of knowledge, nor any knowledge that does not presuppose and constitute at the same time power relations" (1991: 27). There is a bidirectional relationship between power and knowledge because while power constructs knowledge to build superiority, knowledge also subserves the continuity of the superiority of power. Foucault clarifies the superior and advantageous position of the powerful in discourses referring to this relationship. Thus, taking inspiration from the notion of Foucauldian discourse, Said suggests that "[t]he relationship between Occident and Orient is a relationship of power, of domination, of varying degrees of complex hegemony" (2003: 5). For Said, such a relationship depending on the supremacy of the Occident over the Orient enables the former to determine the latter with fictional representations. Said underlines the fictiveness of the colonial discourse and identifies Orientalism as a "style of thought based upon an ontological and epistemological distinction made between the Orient and (most of the time) the Occident" (2003: 3). Furthermore, he also professes that the Occident needs such derogatory assumptions and representations of the Orient to prove the former's superiority over the latter and it defines the colonized as "a sort of surrogate and even underground self" (2003: 3). Thus, it is

apparent that Orientalism suggests that colonial discourse is full of assumptions and representations that lay bare a binary opposition between the colonizer and the colonized.

This binary opposition is constructed filling the concept of 'the other' with degrading characteristics such as "savage, tribal, mob behaviour, ill-educated, irrational, child-like, criminal, excessively sexual, filthy, amoral and irreligious" (Johnson, 2003: 93) while their opposites which prove superiority of Europeans are attributed to the West. Loomba also adds more characteristics into the stereotypes representing the colonized, such as "laziness, aggression, violence, greed, sexual promiscuity, bestiality, primitivism, innocence and irrationality" (Loomba, 2005: 93). That is to say, a derogatory adjective to determine the colonized is, in fact, used to imply its antonym for the colonizer, and Loomba explains this colonial attempt as follows:

> "[I]f colonised people are irrational, Europeans are rational; if the former are barbaric, sensual, and lazy, Europe is civilisation itself, with its sexual appetites under control and its dominant ethic that of hard work; if the Orient is static, Europe can be seen as developing and marching ahead; the Orient has to be feminine so that Europe can be masculine" (2005: 45).

Undoubtedly, these representations and attempts to construct stereotypes for the colonized subserve not only the glorification of the colonizer but also the justification of the colonization. In *The Location of Culture*, Homi Bhabha accentuates the ultimate objective of the colonial discourse and specifies that it aims to determine the colonized as "a population of degenerate types on basis of racial origin in order to justify conquest and to establish systems of administration and instruction" (1994: 70). Delineating it as a method of "governmentality" which "appropriates, directs and dominates" the colonized, Bhabha regards it as "a system of representation" which functions as an "apparatus of power" (1994: 70). Thus, the colonial discourse, by means of the authorization provided by the correlation between power and language, enables representations to become stereotypical and, undoubtedly, these representations become instruments to consolidate the inferiority of the colonized subjects.

In *Orientalism*, Said regards these stereotypical representations as "typical encapsulations" and argues that they are "the lenses through which the Orient is experienced, and they shape the language, perception, and form of the encounter between East and West" (2003: 58). These stereotypical representations are just Western perceptions attributed to the Easterners to emphasize their inferiority. In parallel with Said, Bhabha also stresses the fictiveness of these stereotypical representations and

asserts that a stereotype "is a false representation of a given reality," and "it is an arrested" and "fixed form of representations" since "the negation of the Other" denies "the play of difference" (1994: 75). These stereotypical representations are rigid, and they cannot transform because the otherization of the colonized is suspended with such a difference. Moreover, Bhabha suggests that such a resistance to change in the stereotypes creates "a problem for the representation of the subject in significations of psychic and social relations" and deduces that "the disavowal of difference turns the colonial subject into a misfit" which hints for the social, cultural and psychological problems experienced by the colonized (1994: 75).

The colonial discourse which highlights the superiority of Europeans over non-Europeans inevitably finds reflection in literature which renders service to colonization with colonialist language and stereotypical representations. To explain the occurrence of colonialist literature, Robert J. C. Young specifies that "the kinds of concepts and representations used in literary texts, travel writings, memoirs and academic studies across a range of disciplines in the humanities and social sciences could be analysed as a means for understanding the diverse ideological practices of colonialism" (2005: 151). Besides, Ashcroft et al. refer to the appearance of colonialist tradition stating that "[d]uring the imperial period writing in the language of the imperial centre is inevitably, of course, produced by a literate elite whose primary identification is with the colonizing power" (2002: 5). Even though those texts harbour detailed information about "landscape[s], custom[s] and language[s] of colonies," they are tended to lay an emphasis on the superiority of "the home over the native" and "the metropolitan over the provincial" (Ashcroft et al., 2002: 5).

However, Elleke Boehmer suggests that colonialist literature is difficult to provide a "precise definition," since "it is so heterogeneous" (2005: 2). She identifies colonial literature with the texts "reflecting a colonial ethos" and exemplifies those with the texts such as "King Solomon's Mines or Rudyard Kipling's poems which exhibit a tinge of local colonial color, or feature colonial motifs" (2005: 2). To clarify its heterogeneity, she divides those texts into two: "colonial and colonialist" (2005: 2). For her, colonial literature refers to the texts which was produced not only "by metropolitans," but also by "Creoles and indigenes" during the colonial period, and it focuses on "the colonial perceptions and experience" (2005: 2). However, she characterizes colonialist literature with the ones "written by and for colonizing Europeans about non-European lands

dominated by them" (2005: 3). Colonialist literary texts comprise of an imperialist viewpoint encouraging "the superiority of European culture and rightness of empire" (2005: 3). Similarly, Loomba declares that colonialist literature plays a fundamental role in imposing European values over non-Europeans' and in ensuring the superiority of European culture considering it as a means of human values. (2005: 76). To explain how colonialist literature helps maintain "colonial rule," she refers to Gauri Viswanathan's *Masks of Conquest* and commentates that "the book (like its title) suggests that English literary studies became a mask for economic and material exploitation and were an effective form of political control" (2005: 76). Hereby, one can suggest that colonialist literature setting in the colonies and full of stereotypical representations constructed by the colonizer to otherize the colonized becomes an instrument to ensure colonization. In short, colonialist literature refers to the texts which create a binary opposition between the Europeans and non-Europeans constructing representations which not only imply the superiority of the former, but also affirm the necessity of the latter's being ruled and dominated.

Travellers' narratives and adventure stories can be regarded as the forerunners of colonial literature. Even though those texts attempt to depict panoramas of newly discovered lands, it is apparent that they also subserve the imperialist ideology to justify their existence because "the colonial writer works with a barely adequate language to create a coherent ideational reality" (Tiffin, 1992: 1). For Chris Tiffin, there lie two impulses which encourage Europeans to sail to colonies: "the *curiosa* desire to explore and celebrate, and the *lexis*-desire to modify and control" (1992: 1). In this regard, *Robinson Crusoe* by Daniel Defoe is one of the predecessors of colonialist novels, and it harbours both desires. Defoe tells the adventures of Robinson Crusoe who is, in fact, the reflection of the colonizer. He is depicted to be zealous in the pursuit of exploration and as a European man who attempts to build a civilization on the island with his European, modern and developed capabilities. Tiffin clarifies the reason behind Robinson's ceaseless enthusiasm to colonize the island writing that "[t]he new lands were seen as wastes requiring to be put use and so colonists were urgently needed to work in it" (1992: 3). His ceaseless enthusiasm and dedication to colonize the island and to enhance the capital enable him to become a "central mythic expression of the modern system" because his efforts inspire the youth to discover the world and to enlarge the empire (Green, 1980: 83). Moreover, the novel also implies the binary opposition between the European and

non-European in colonial discourse with Robinson's attitude towards the native man, Friday, who is described with Robinson's colonialist representations.

Similarly, *Heart of Darkness* by Joseph Conrad is also one of the canonized English literary texts harboring the tenets of colonial discourse explicitly. It focuses on the dark side of colonialism with Marlow's trip to the jungles of Africa where Kurtz, a European colonialist, exploits the indigenous Africans both economically and physically. In *Image of Africa: Racism in Conrad's Heart of Darkness*, Chinua Achebe argues that the novel portrays "Africa as 'the other world', the antithesis of Europe and therefore of civilization, a place where man's vaunted intelligence and refinement are finally mocked by triumphant bestiality" (1977: 783). The novel sheds light on the defects of colonialism reflecting the barbarism it conducts over the natives. Besides, it encapsulates the abovementioned colonialist representations making a comparison between Europeans and non-Europeans and constructing binary oppositions such as the civilized and the savage, the developed and the primitive, the white and the black, human and unhuman, and the motherland and the colony.

Another prominent colonialist novel in English literature is *A Passage to India* by E. M. Forster. The novel handles the clashes of "the newcomers" and "the natives" in the colony where they need to live together (Loomba, 2005: 8). The encounter becomes chaotic in the novel because the colonialist representations of the natives, which are assumed as truths by the colonizers, cause the border between the two groups of peoples to be unexceedable. Mehmet Ali Çelikel argues that the natives, in *A Passage to India*, are reflected from "the imperial eyes as a distinct species whose characteristics depend on the climate," which enables the creation of a binary opposition between the members of these two groups because "the degrading of the land and the climate becomes the degrading of its people" (2021: 75-76). Thus, the novel focuses on colonialism putting emphasis on its destructive effect on the relationship between the newcomers and the natives. It is apparent that what deteriorates their relationship is the stereotypical representation of the natives, which is constructed by the spirit of colonialism and imperialism.

Consequently, colonial/ist literature can be considered as the product of Eurocentrism which attempts to put all European norms, values, cultures, belief systems and races at the centre while defining non-Europeans' as 'the other'. To achieve this, colonial discourse which always highlights the superiority of Europeans over non-

Europeans is constructed, and it is arranged with the stereotypical representations in which all derogatory characteristics are attributed to the colonized, such as savage, primitive, wild, violent and so on. These characteristics also subserve the justification of the colonization since those people should be improved and tamed by the Europeans. This creates the binary oppositions which not only underline the differences between two groups of people, but also result in the marginalization of the non-Europeans. Finally, colonialist literature encapsulates the texts in which non-Europeans are not only exploited economically, physically and materially, but also otherized and abused culturally and sociologically.

1.2 Postcolonialism

The history of colonialism, as examined in the previous section, dates to early empires which attempted to control lands which had territorial links to mainland. The sixteenth century was a milestone in the history of the world because it was perceived then those remote lands which were not "geographically coherent" could be colonized and exploited with the help of "ocean going caravels" and "navigation aids" (Young, 2016: 16). Those industrial and technological developments changed the fate of the world; thereby, creating a new world order in which modern European imperialists shared remote lands. Thus, until the mid of the twentieth century, European colonialism had become so powerful that it spread all around the world from Africa to India and from the Caribbean to the Middle East. However, the twentieth century was also the period when decolonization movements began, which led to the collapse of traditional practices of colonialism. Those decolonization movements were promoted by the nationalist movements appeared after the World War II, and the colonized started to wish for cultural and political self-determination. While political self-determination resulted in independence of the colonies, cultural self-determination encouraged the recognition and glorification of indigenous cultures with postcolonialism.

Through the end of the colonial period, both the natives who had been educated by colonial systems and the colonizers were producing literary texts in English, which enabled the emergence of the concept of literatures in English. John McLeod suggests that "Commonwealth literature was a term literary critics began to use from 1950s to describe literatures in English emerging from… countries with a history of colonialism" (McLeod, 2000: 10). Those texts, by native writers such as "R. K. Narayan (India), George Lamming (Barbados), Katherine Mansfield (New Zeland) and Chinua Achebe (Nigeria)," focused on the relationship between the colonizer and the colonized (2000: 10). Their aim was to approach the text through a comparative attitude and to deal with their characteristics (2000: 10). They, like colonial literature, put Eurocentric perspectives at the centre because Commonwealth literature "was really a sub-set of canonical English literature, evaluated in terms derived from the conventional study of English that stressed the values of timelessness and universality" (2000: 14). Then, in the 1970s, Commonwealth literature gave birth to a novel perspective which was against the superiority of the colonized and attempted to question the consequences of the colonial period. Even though that attempt might be regarded as "a liberal humanist enterprise,"

McLeod remarks that Commonwealth literature paved the way for establishing a basis for postcolonial criticism (2000: 16).

Tending to challenge all Eurocentric assumptions and stereotypes attributed to the natives, several authors and critics from former colonies attempted to identify themselves and their culture referring to their indigenous perspectives. Such a transition within the body of Commonwealth literature created a contemporary debate about the evaluation of those texts since it was not appropriate to examine them with existing approaches that had been constructed by the colonizers. It prepared the atmosphere for the occurrence of a new method independent from former stereotypical assumptions in the last quarter of the twentieth century. Ashcroft et al. clarify that "the idea of 'post-colonial literary theory' emerge[d] from the inability of European theory to deal adequately with the complexities and varied cultural province of post-colonial writing" (2002: 11).

Essentially, postcolonial theory stands for a reaction to colonialism and deconstructs the colonial discourse shedding light on its cultural heritage and constructed assumptions advocating colonialism and neo-colonialism. In addition to the focal point on consequences of colonial hegemony and exploitation, postcolonial criticism also re-examines the colonial discourse undermining the Eurocentric literary tradition: "Theories of style and genre, assumptions about the universal features of language, epistemologies and value systems are all radically questioned by the practices of postcolonial writing" (Ashcroft et al., 2002: 11). Thus, postcolonialism becomes prominent as a field of study which not only deals with effects of European colonization and imperialism in different parts of the world, but also with the social, cultural, economic and literary reactions emerged against colonialism.

What is confusing about the term, postcolonialism, is the prefix, 'post', and several critics discuss the term drawing attention to its hyphenated and unhyphenated usages. Robert Young suggests that many nations declared independence, and to imply the end of their colonial experience, the term, post-colonialism was preferred for political purposes: "Before postcolonial cultural critique was developed as a political practice, the term 'post-colonial' (usually in the hyphenated form) was used in the social sciences with a specific Marxist reference" (2016: 58). Similarly, John McLeod remarks that the hyphenated form of the term, post-colonialism, "denote[s] to a particular historical period or epoch… 'after colonialism', 'after independence' or 'after the end of Empire'" (2000: 5). Identically, Ashcroft associates "the emergence of the term 'post-colonial'" with "historians and political scientists" who use it to define the newly independent states

"after the second World War" and expresses that "post-colonial ha[s] a clearly chronological meaning, designating the post-independence period" (2001: 9). Furthermore, Elleke Boehmer regards the term, post-colonialism, as "a period term designating the post-Second World War era" and utters "the postcolonial must be distinguished from the more conventional hyphenated term post-colonial" (2005: 3). As seen, the hyphenated form of the term seems to be limited since it refers to the condition of the former colonies after independence.

However, the unhyphenated form of the term, postcolonialism, signifies much more than a historical period after colonialism since it refers to cultural, social and economic heritage of colonialism, dealing with the issues of race, identity, power, migration and language. In this regard, McLeod advocates the unhyphenated use of the term because its hyphenated form narrows down the term into historical periods, and explicitly writes that postcolonialism refers to "disparate forms of representations, reading practices and values" which "can circulate across the barrier between colonial rule and national independence" (2000: 5). Similarly, Boehmer also highlights that the term should encapsulate the cultural legacy of colonialism specifying that "[r]ather than simply being the writing which came after empire, postcolonial literature is generally defined as that which critically or subversively scrutinizes the colonial relationship" (2005: 3). Ania Loomba also touches upon the prefix, post, and indicates its complicatedness writing that "it implies 'an aftermath' in two senses- temporal, as in coming after, and ideological, as in supplanting" (2005: 12). She underlines that the prefix is confusing because it signifies both temporality and an end for colonialism; however, colonialism can function with an indirect method: "A country may be both postcolonial (in the sense of being formally independent) and neo colonial (in the sense of remaining economically and/or culturally dependent) at the same time" (2005: 12). She agrees that the hyphenated form of the term, post-colonialism, creates sophistication because she meets on a common ground with those who attribute temporality to the 'post-colonial'. Besides, Ashcroft, in his *Post-Colonial Transformation*, also mentions the hyphen issue of the term and explains the common trend to make a distinction between the two forms:

> "The hyphen puts an emphasis on the discursive and material effects of the historical 'fact' of colonialism, while the term 'postcolonialism' has come to represent an increasingly indiscriminate attention to cultural difference and marginality of all kinds, whether a consequence of the historical experience of colonialism or not" (2001: 10).

As seen, he accepts the temporality of post-colonialism and remarks that the usage of the hyphen can be problematic if it refers to the condition after colonialism (2001: 10). Yet, he also supports the idea that the term, post-colonial, in the course of time, has transformed into a term that can be substituted for the unhyphenated form stating that "the term has expanded to engage issues of cultural diversity, ethnic, racial and cultural difference and the power relations within them, as a consequence of an expanded and more subtle understanding of the dimensions of neo-colonial dominance" (2001:11). Therefore, even though the hyphenated post-colonialism emerged as a term signifying a historical period, it has then become a term which also refers to all consequences of colonial activities throughout the world till today. Similarly, in *The Empires Write Back: Theory and Practice in Post-Colonial Literatures*, Ashcroft et al. prefer the hyphenated form of the term, but enlarge its scope with the characteristics suggested by the abovementioned critics for the hyphenated form of the term: "We use the term 'post-colonial', however, to cover all the culture affected by the imperial process from the moment of colonization to the present day" (2002: 2). As mentioned above, Young implies the distinction between two forms of the term, emphasizing that the hyphenated form was utilized before the development of "postcolonial critique," which implies that the term has undergone an alteration. Then, to overcome the sophistication that the two forms create, he prefers to use the unhyphenated form of the term, postcolonialism, and enlarges its scope with the characteristics attributed to each of the form separately:

> "Many of the problems raised can be resolved if the postcolonial is defined as coming after colonialism and imperialism, in their original meaning of direct-rule domination, but still positioned within imperialism in its later sense of the global system of hegemonic economic power" (2016: 57-58).

The spelling of the term can be controversial since some critics make a distinction between its two forms. However, one can also suggest that most of the critics agree that the unhyphenated postcolonialism is more comprehensive since it does not only focus on the condition after independence, but also on the consequences of colonialism all over the world up to the present. In this regard, the unhyphenated form of the term will be preferred in this study because it will be appropriate to use the more comprehensive form of the term to examine the contemporary neo-colonial Middle East and analyze literary reflections of neo-colonial practices in the region.

The emergence of postcolonialism dates back to the political condition after the World War II, which resulted in the decolonization of nearly all colonies in the following

decades. This period also coincides with the liberation of literary texts produced in former colonies or in colonies which are in the process of independence because universal issues begin to be evaluated from the indigenous perspectives, and there emerges an opposition to the Eurocentric assumptions attributed to the local people. McLeod remarks that the emergence of postcolonial criticism begins when "literary critics start to distinguish a fast-growing body of literature written in English" by the indigenous writers, and he also explains that such a distinction is "an attempt to identify and locate this vigorous literary activity and to consider via a comparative approach the common concerns and attributes that these manifold literary voices might have" (2000: 10-11). Obviously, he specifies that colonised writers challenge the biased discourse of colonialism and take cognizance of their indigenous norms and values.

One of the early critical texts on European colonialism is *Discourse on Colonialism* which was published by Aimé Césaire in 1955. In the book, he regards the African's "encounter" with Europe as "misfortune" and the colonial practices conducted in Africa as "the great historical tragedy of Africa" (2000: 45). Expressing all inhumane actions and assumptions against the natives, he remarks that "Europe is responsible before the human community for the highest heap of corpses in history" (2000: 45). Furthermore, he also lays an emphasis on the "biased and unacceptable" European attitude towards the indigenous people, stating that European colonizers are "tools of their false objectivity, their chauvinism, their sly racism, their depraved passion for refusing to acknowledge any merit in the non-white races, especially the black-skinned races, their obsession with monopolizing all glory for their own race" (2000: 55-56). On the other hand, he does not only deal with the so-called superiority attributed to the European civilization in the colonial discourse, but he also lays bare the fictiveness of the assumptions ascribed to the natives, uttering that "[t]he idea of the barbaric Negro is a European invention" (2000: 53). Such a reaction from an indigenous critic finds reflection among other native critics and it becomes influential on them.

Another remarkable name dealing with the psychological consequences of colonialism is Frantz Fanon whose two notable works, *The Wretched of the Earth* (1961) and *Black Skin, White Masks* (1967), have had a great influence upon the development of postcolonialism. Fanon was born in a colony and educated in an imperial centre. When he turns back to the colony, he experiences the psychological results of colonialism at the first hand. He expresses in *The Wretched of the Earth* that colonization creates identity

problems for the colonized: “colonialism forces the colonized to constantly ask the question: “Who am I in reality?”” (2011: 182). Similarly, in *Black Skin, White Masks*, he highlights the identity problem posed by colonialism from his first-hand experience, telling an anecdote in which he explains how it brings psychological problems when he is called “negro” to his face:

> “On that day, completely dislocated, unable to be abroad with the other, the white man, who unmercifully imprisoned me, I took myself far off from my own presence, far indeed, and made myself an object. What else could it be for me but an amputation, an excision, a hemorrhage that spattered my whole body with black blood? [sic] (2008: 85).

Obviously, Fanon underlines the psychological problems that colonial prejudices trigger and lays bare the sense of inferiority imposed on the blacks. He also explains how colonialism ascribes inferiority to indigenous people with stereotypical assumptions: “Colonialism, little troubled by nuances, has always claimed that the nigger was a savage, not an Angolan or a Nigerian, but a nigger” (2011: 150). For him, colonizers unexceptionally overgeneralize savagery to the whole continent, remarking that “[f]or colonialism, this vast continent [is] the haunt of savages, a country riddled with superstitions and fanaticism, destined for contempt, weighed down by the curse of God, a country of cannibals —in short, the Negro’s country(2011: 150). Hence, Fanon is one of the earliest critics who opposes the Eurocentric prejudice against the blacks, and his ideas on the assumptions created by the whites have contributed much to the development of postcolonialism.

Furthermore, his contribution to postcolonialism is not limited to his opposition to the Eurocentric stereotypical assumptions, but he also encourages the blacks to stand against these derogatory attributions and to claim their right to be equal among otherr (2008: 85). However, for Fanon, neither the colonized nor the colonizer can act undogmatically because while the former is “enslaved by his inferiority,” the latter is “enslaved by his superiority” (2008: 10). As a psychiatrist, he focuses on the acts of individuals who attempt to set themselves free from that enslavement, and remarks that the colonized subjects who migrate to “metropolitan[s]” and stay there for a while become alienated because they “go home to be defied” (2008: 10). Specifying that the colonized subject whose original culture is marginalized tends to experience “an inferiority complex”, he declares that the colonized man imitates the colonizer and becomes “radically changed” because “his phenotype undergoes a definitive, an absolute mutation” (2008: 10). In short, witnessing the results of cultural interactions conducted

by colonialism at the first hand, Fanon handles the psychological consequences of this encounter, undermining the Eurocentric stereotypical assumptions ascribed to the blacks. Even though his ideas are not systematically theorized, they are of significance since they become inspirational for the subsequent critics who have theorized postcolonialism.

Taking inspiration from the aforementioned ideas, there emerged, through the end of the twentieth century, several notable non-European critics, such as Edward Said, Gayatri Spivak and Homi K. Bhabha, who concentrate on the consequences of cultural transformation created by colonialism and lay the postcolonial terminology, such as 'the orient, the other, mimicry, hybridity, ambivalence, the worlding and the Third World'.

To evaluate the heritage of colonialism, Edward Said deals with the cultural encounter between the colonizer and the colonized, and his ideas on the colonizer and the colonized become a touchstone in postcolonial studies. In *Orientalism* published in 1978, he essentially deprecates the stereotypical assumptions attributed to the natives and elucidates that the orient is just a fictive concept designed by the West to belittle the East. He delineates Orientalism as "a style of thought based upon an ontological and epistemological distinction made between "the Orient" and (most of the time) "the Occident" (2003: 3). This distinction generates cultural, social and economic polarization that is supported with the stereotypical assumptions underlying the superiority of the Occident over the Orient. Regarding colonialism as a discourse, he commentates that it is a prejudiced fiction of the West to control the East, and an "enormously systematic discipline by which European culture was able to manage-and even produce-the Orient politically, sociologically, militarily, ideologically, scientifically, and imaginatively" (2003: 3). He also clearly indicates that Eurocentric assumptions are abundant in the concept of the Orient writing that "what is circulated [by the colonial discourse] is not 'truth' but representations" (2003: 21). He, moreover, highlights their fictiveness stating that the image of the orient is "reconstructed, reassembled, crafted, in short born out of the Orientalists' efforts" (2003: 87). Besides, considering Orientalism as "a sign of European-Atlantic power over the Orient," he delineates it as "a structure of lies and myths" (2003: 6). For him, those representations are generated and maintained by the West and for the sake of the West since the Orient could not "represent itself" in the discourse constructed by the Occident (2003: 21).

Language, whether written or not, is crucial for the creation and spread of those representations because language is "a highly organized and encoded system, which

employs many devices to express, indicate, exchange massages and information, represent and so forth" (2003: 21). As examined above, Said refers to the Foucauldian discourse, which underlines the relationship between power and knowledge, to explain how the dichotomy between the Orient and the Occident is controlled by the language of the powerful. Power and knowledge influence each other, and power uses language, whether written or not, in order to create knowledge while knowledge works for power. Similarly, he explains the impulsion behind Eurocentric attributes from a similar perspective and implies that the binary oppositions between the Orient and the Occident are created by and for power and domination: "[t]he relationship between Occident and Orient is a relationship of power, of domination, of varying degrees of a complex hegemony" (2003: 5). Thus, Said lays bare the fact that the admissibility of assumptions creating knowledge depends on power because the powerful easily imposes assumptions on the weak to build superiority, which beckons the fundamentals of Orientalism.

Additionally, he declares that the inferiority of the Orient is a kind of requirement for the superiority of the Occident because "the Orient has helped to define Europe (or the West) as its contrasting image, idea, personality, experience" (2003: 1-2). In other words, the Occident needs the inferiority of the Orient to attribute superiority to its own culture, which can be regarded as another encouragement behind the Orientalist attitude. Thus, the Occident attributes stereotypical assumptions, such as savage, primitive, backward and so on, to the Orient and becomes the opposites of all those assumptions. However, the assumptions referring to the superiority of the West are also constructed because "the Orient is not an inert fact of nature. It is not merely there, just as the Occident itself is not just there either" whereas they are manufactured by men who "make their own history" and thus they "are man-made" (Said, 2003: 4-5). He also suggests that there is a bidirectional relationship depending on fictive assumptions working for the sake of colonial understanding between the Orient and the Occident:

> "…as much as the West itself. The Orient is an idea that has a history and a tradition of thought, imagery, and vocabulary that have given it reality and presence in and for the West. The two geographical entities thus support and to an extent reflect each other" (2003: 5).

Although he puts forward that these assumptions depend on the idea which subserve colonialism, they are closely related to realities experienced in colonies. For him, it is "wrong to conclude that the Orient [is] essentially an idea, or a creation with no corresponding reality" (2003: 5). However, those assumptions become realities because

the Occident takes "positional superiority" in all relationships with the Orient by means of the "European ascendancy from the late Renaissance to the present" (Said, 2003: 7). Besides, the Occident does not abstain from attributing stereotypical assumptions to the Orient to justify the act of colonialism since the Occident encounters with no opposition (Said, 2003: 7). Hereby, he lays bare "who or what [is] an Oriental" specifying that it is the product of the Occident's "desires, repressions, investments, and projections" and writes:

> "Under the general heading of knowledge of the Orient, and within the umbrella of Western hegemony over the Orient during the period from the end of the eighteenth century, there emerged a complex Orient suitable for study in the academy, for display in the museum, for reconstruction in the colonial office, for theoretical illustration in anthropological, biological, linguistic, racial, and historical theses about mankind and the universe, for instances of economic and sociological theories of development, revolution, cultural personality, national or religious character" (2003: 7-8).

In short, focusing on the consequences of cultural interaction between the colonizer and the colonized, Said explains the emergence of the Orient with the attitudes of the colonizer who evaluates non-European cultures from Eurocentric perspectives and attributes stereotypical assumptions to the indigenous people. Laying an emphasis on the fictiveness of the assumptions, he is of the opinion that they enable the justification of colonial practices since they underline the backwardness of the indigenous people. After Aimé Césaire and Frantz Fanon, Edward Said becomes a prominent theoretician who produces a systematic approach to the cultural results of colonialism, and his ideas constitute the fundamentals of postcolonial studies.

Robert J. C. Young is one of the critics who gives Said credit for the development of postcolonial theory. Although he emphasizes his prominence in the field, Young remarks that Said's analyses can be regarded as problematic by some critics. Acknowledging Said as the founder of postcolonialism, Young declares that his ideas are both "extraordinarily enabling and theoretically problematic" (2016: 383). Initially, Young focuses on Said's contribution to the field of postcolonialism and specifies that Said's Orientalism has enabled the appearance of "a general conceptual paradigm through which the cultural forms of colonial and imperial ideologies could be analyzed" and that he is the one who "establish[es] a whole new filed of academic inquiry (2016: 384). Then, he adopts a critical attitude towards Said's theorization of Orientalism because, for Young, the "colonial discourse analyses" conducted in Said's *Orientalism* "are analyses of representations rather than investigations that seek to deliver facts or appraise evidence

as such" (2016: 391). Young criticizes Said for focusing on certain literary pieces which comply with his definitions on Orientalism and underlines that Said's "Orientalist texts consist of representations as representations which by no means depict the truth of the Orient" (2016: 388). Moreover, Young clearly propounds that what decreases the credibility of the Orient is Said's tendency in choosing texts supporting representations within the frame of Orientalism:

> "The Orient is constructed in a representation that is then transmitted from text to text, with the result that Orientalist writing always reproduces its own unchanging stereotype of an unchanging Orient. Orientalism as a discourse constitutes a linguistic repetition structure of representations that draw their reality from the authority of textual repetition rather than any truth-value in relation to what they claim to represent" (2016: 388).

Yet, what Said does is similar to the attitudes of the colonizers who attribute all representations that work for colonialism to the colonized. Young considers Said's tendency as "misinterpretation of the real in a hegemonic power/knowledge structure," and he believes that "[t]his move from a concept of discourse to one of ideological representation in Said is at the centre of the theoretical problematic of his text" (2016: 388).

Like Young, Homi K. Bhabha, one of the remarkable theoreticians of postcolonialism, is also critical of the overgeneralization in Said's Orientalism. For Young, Bhabha expostulates Said's notion of discourse since it is "too determining and univocal" (Young, 2016: 392). However, what creates inconsistency in Said's Orientalism is that even though he "insists on the uniformity of the discursive regime of Orientalism," he negates, to some extent, his claim with "his own analysis of the complexity and range of positions taken up by the writers whom he discusses" (Young, 2016: 392). To explain the focal point of Bhabha's postcolonial understanding, Young refers to Said's inconsistency in analysing the Orient: "this forms the basis of revisionary model of colonial discourse by Bhabha, who has emphasized discourse's ambivalence and heterogeneity rather than its fixed homogeneity and always successfully realized intention" (2016: 392).

Similar to Said's understanding on colonial discourse, Homi Bhabha delineates it as an "apparatus of power" which "turns on the recognition and disavowal of racial/cultural/historical differences" (1994: 70). The main aim of colonial discourse, for Bhabha, is to depict the colonized "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" (1994: 70). Like Said, Bhabha suggests that colonial discourse embodies "a system of representation" and regards it as a "form of governmentality that in marking out a 'subject nation', appropriates, directs and dominates its various spheres of activity" (1994: 70-71).

Another common point between Said and Bhabha is that they underline the function of representation in the colonial discourse, specifying that representations help appear a hierarchic relationship between the colonizer and the colonized (1994: 70). However, Bhabha also implies the difference of his ideas on representations, writing that there are "the play of power within the colonial discourse and shifting positionalities of its subjects (for example, effects of class, gender, ideology, different social formations, varied systems of colonization and so on)" (1994: 70). Obviously, he refers to the concept of ambivalence that he utilizes to define the colonial discourse.

As a psychoanalyst, Bhabha prefers to clarify the complicated and troubled relationship between the colonizer and the colonized with the term, ambivalence which is used "to describe a continual fluctuation between wanting one thing and its opposite (also simultaneous attraction toward and repulsion from an object, person or action" (Young, 2016: 153). With the help of ambivalence, he undermines the totalizing attitude of Said towards the colonized in Orientalism and draws attention to different reactions given by the colonized subjects. In other words, ambivalence refers to variability of colonized subjects' resistance to the process and consequences of colonialism. It is inaccurate to generalize stereotypical characteristics to determine the relationship between the colonizer and the colonized since that relationship is ambivalent. This ambivalence also refers to "the complex mix of attraction and repulsion" performed by the colonized "in a fluctuating relation within the colonial subject" (Ashcroft et al., 2007: 10). Declaring that ambivalence lies "at the heart of [Bhabha's] analysis" of postcolonialism, Young professes that Bhabha exemplifies his ambivalence well: "He has exhibited through a series of analyses the ways in which European colonial discourse—whether it be governmental decree, district officers' reports or missionary accounts—is effectively decentred from its position of power and authority" (2016: 153). For Bhabha, what is problematic in Said's understanding is "a polarity or division at the centre of Orientalism" because Said determines it as a "static system of synchronic essentialism" or "a knowledge of signifiers of stability" (1994: 71). Yet, colonial discourse is consistently under the influence of "diachronic forms of history and narrative, signs of

instability" (Bhabha, 1994: 71). To clarify, Said divides the content of Orientalism into two: "latent Orientalism" which consists of "the unconscious repository of fantasy, imaginative writings and essential ideas" and "manifest Orientalism" which refers to "the historically and discursively determined, diachronic aspect" (Bhabha, 1994: 71-72). However, Bhabha considers the distinction problematic since even though those dividends introduce a "binarism with in the argument," they eventually become relevant as a "congruent system of representation that is unified through a political-ideological intention" (1994: 71). Bhabha considers Said's totalizing representations troubled because "without the attribution of ambivalence to relations of power/ knowledge," it is impossible to perceive the traumatic consequences that the colonized subjects experience when they encounter stereotypes which are the sources of "identification and alienation, scenes of fear and desire" (1994: 72). It is obvious that stereotypes attributed to the colonized are troublesome because the colonized experiences a dilemma between identification and alienation and hence act ambivalently.

For Bhabha, stereotype in the colonial discourse is not monolithic as suggested by Said in Orientalism but it "is a complex, ambivalent, contradictory mode of representation" (1994: 70). To clarify how he identifies stereotype in colonial discourse, he refers to fetishism which he defines as "the disavowal of difference" in his understanding (1994: 74). He implies that subjects become fetishist to what they believe since they are totally against differences. He expresses that the superiority which he verbalizes as "racial purity" or "cultural priority" is constructed "in relation to the colonial stereotype," and "the multiple beliefs and split subjects" are disavowed with the help of fetishism that the feeling of superiority creates (1994: 74). He also likens the function of fetishism to "a reactivation of the material of original fantasy- the anxiety of castration and sexual difference" and utters that a "fetish object as the substitute for the mother's penis" is found to normalize the difference and to overcome the disturbance created by this recognition (1994: 74). Thus, one can easily disavow the difference with the help of "the fixation on an object that masks that difference and restores original presence" (1994: 74). He makes an analogy between his approach and Freud's terms and remarks that if "all men have penises," "all men have the same skin/ race/ culture" and "if some do not have penises," "some do not have the same skin/race/culture" (1994: 74). Fetishism creates a prejudice against differences, and it becomes a problem for both the colonizer and the colonized when they encounter these differences because "[t]he disavowal of

difference turns the colonial subject into a misfit – a grotesque mimicry or 'doubling' that threatens to split the soul and whole, undifferentiated skin of the ego" (1994: 74). Bhabha emphasizes that fetishism encourages subjects to believe in superiority or lackness and to overcome these prejudices subjects attempt to build identifications. However, he stresses that those identifications enabling them to mimic others become fixations that they adopt to hide differences.

On the other hand, to explain the reason of the identification, Bhabha also refers to "Lacanian schema of Imaginary" which is defined as an alteration subjects undergo at "at the formative mirror phase" when it attempts to identify itself with "objects of the surrounding world" to complete the lackness. He writes that "[i]n the act of disavowal and fixation the colonial subject is returned to the narcissism of the Imaginary and its identification of an ideal ego that is white and whole" (1994: 76-77). However, this process is problematic because the identification made by the subject is "simultaneously alienating and hence potentially confrontational" (1994: 77). In this process, the subject creates an ideal ego and identifies with it; however, it is nothing more than a construction. To identify with a construction is clearly a kind of alienation for the subjects. Then, he concludes that the creation of the colonial discourse is not stable, but a "complex articulation of the tropes of fetishism- metaphor and metonymy- and the forms of narcissistic and aggressive identification available to the Imagery," which lays an emphasis on ambivalence of his understanding of postcolonialism (1994: 77).

Furthermore, Bhabha also explains his idea of ambivalence in colonial discourse shedding light on the colonizers' tendency to define the colonized:

> "It is recognizably true that the chain of stereotypical signification is curiously mixed and split, polymorphous and perverse, an articulation of multiple belief. The black is both savage (cannibal) and yet the most obedient and dignified of servants (the bearer of food); he is the embodiment of rampant sexuality and yet innocent as a child; he is mystical, primitive, simple-minded and yet the most worldly and accomplished liar, and manipulator of social forces" (1994: 82).

For him, the fact that colonial discourse includes such attributes to the natives proves its ambivalence because while it endeavours to otherize the natives with adjectives indicating their inferiority, it also reflects the attempt of colonial discourse to domesticate them. On the other hand, since this ambivalence of colonial discourse seems to be hazardous for its persistence, Bhabha underlines the significance of repetition of otherness as one of its remarkable characteristics, stating that "the stereotype requires, for

its successful signification, a continual and repetitive chain of other stereotypes" and "the same old stories of the Negro's animality, the Coolie's inscrutability or the stupidity of the Irish must be told (compulsively) again and afresh" (1994: 77). It is of significance for colonial discourse to repeat the inferiority of the colonized because colonial discourse overcomes the probable risks created by ambivalence attributes to the colonized with the help of ongoing repetitions. They, in fact, cover the positivity generated by ambivalence for the colonized. On the other hand, repetition of the inferiority of the colonized eventually works for ultimate goals of colonialism because stereotypes, which are defined by Bhabha with fetishism and feeling of lack, aim to designate the disadvantageous position of the colonized in the colonial relationship. One can also remark that these repetitions not only imprison the colonized in the otherness, but also encourage them to mimic the colonizer because of the lackness attributed to them.

The tendency to mimic the colonizer has a substantial significance in Bhabha's understanding of postcolonialism. To carry out its "epic intention of the civilizing mission," colonial discourse generates texts that are full of "irony, mimicry and repetition" (1994: 85). He suggests that implying the failure of colonial discourse in putting its civilizing mission into practice, it undergoes a transformation from "such high ideals of the colonial imagination to its low mimetic literary effects" (1994: 85). Hence, he implies that the number of the colonized subjects tending to imitate the colonizer increases: "mimicry emerges as one of the most elusive and effective strategies of colonial power and knowledge" (1994: 85). Even though he identifies the mimicry interiorized by the colonized in colonial discourse as "the desire for a reformed, recognizable Other," he suggests that the colonized subject becomes "a subject of a difference that is almost the same, but not quite" (1994: 86). He implies that the colonized subjects cannot become true copies of the colonizer through mimicry, which lays bare his idea that mimicry and ambivalence are also relevant. Stating that "the discourse of mimicry is constructed around an ambivalence," he remarks that the act of mimicry cannot be controlled by the colonizer because it "is the sign of a double articulation; a complex strategy of reform, regulation and discipline, which appropriates the Other as it visualizes power" (1994: 86). Obviously, Bhabha attributes freedom to the colonized subject in the process of mimicry because it designates "the other" on its own, focusing on the difference it perceives and adding new complexions on the concept of "the other". Thus, ambivalence of mimicry, referring to the famous quotation "almost the same, but not quite," also indicates that even

though the colonized subject attempts to imitate the colonizer, it "becomes transformed into an uncertainty which fixes the colonial subject as a partial presence" (1994: 86). To exemplify his ideas on ambivalence of mimicry, Bhabha refers to literary texts produced by Kipling, Orwell, Naipaul and Benedict Anderson and remarks that they have colonized subjects who show the effect of flawed colonial mimesis, in which "Anglicized is emphatically not to be English" (1994: 86). As seen, for him, colonial subjects cannot become identical with those with whom they build identifications through mimicry, but they represent a partial presence, which highlights their hybridity.

Hybridity is one of the most frequently referred terms in postcolonial theory and it fundamentally signifies "the creation of new transcultural forms within the contact zone produced by colonization" (Ashcroft et. al., 2007: 108). Even though the term, hybridity, has been utilized by many critics to determine cultural, political, and social consequences of cultural transformations conducted by colonialism, it "has been mostly associated with the work of Homi Bhabha, whose analysis of colonizer/colonized relations stresses the interdependence and the mutual construction of their subjectivity" (Ashcroft et. al., 2007: 108). Colonization enables people from different cultures to interact with each other and to build a cultural amalgamation which is "neither the one nor the other" (Bhabha, 1994: 25). To Robert Young, like Bakhtin who undermines the authority of language with his polyphony, implying the hybrid form of the texts, Bhabha centers upon "the dialo-gical situation of colonialism" and emphasizes the ambivalence of colonial interaction, stating that colonial texts have complex characteristics indicating the traces of language of the other traces of writing that (Young, 2005 :21). Emphasizing that hybridity undermines the domination of the colonial authority, Bhabha remarks that cultural interactions happening in colonial atmospheres enable "the possibility of a cultural hybridity" because hybridity appreciates "difference without an assumed or imposed hierarchy" (1994: 4). Thus, hybridity stands for a process in which colonial subjects get the chance of evaluating differences in spite of colonial domination. To exemplify how it achieves this, Bhabha refers to the hybridization of the Christianity in India and writes, "[when] the natives demand an Indianized Gospel, they are using the powers of hybridity to resist baptism and to put the project of conversion in an impossible position" (1994: 118). It is obvious, for Bhabha, that hybridity enables the natives to challenge "the boundaries of discourse" and to change "its terms by setting up another specifically colonial spaces of negotiations of cultural authority" (1994: 119). Furthermore, he specifies that the process

of hybridization is carried out "under the eye of power" and "through the production of partial knowledges and positionalities" (1994: 119). As seen above, Bhabha refers to a space where hybridity happens by means of cultural interactions between the colonizer and the colonized, and that space has an influence on the domination of colonial discourse because it undermines not only the authority of "the imposed imperialist culture," but also "its own claims to authenticity" (Young, 2005: 21). Bhabha names this space as a "Third Space" and suggests that "[h]ere the transformational value of change lies in the re-articulation, or translation, of elements that are neither the One…nor the Other… but something else besides which contests the terms and territories of both" (1994: 28). Identities formed with colonial interactions do not represent their own cultures anymore, but they become hybrid "conceptualizing an international culture, based not on the exoticism of multiculturalism or diversity of cultures, but on the inscription and articulation of culture's hybridity" (1994: 38). Thus, these cultural interactions carried out by colonial practices enable the appearance of hybrid subjects that do not belong to the so-called pure culture imposed by colonial understanding, but they become colonial subjects who cannot find a home culture representing the hybrid identity they adopt through ambivalent mimicry.

The term that Bhabha prefers to define those who find themselves in such a dilemma is "the unhomeliness" (1994: 9). Colonial subjects who become hybrid in the Third Space experience problems related to the sense of belonging since while they become estranged from their indigenous culture through hybridity, they do not also feel belonging to the so-called superior culture because of the otherness attributed to them. Eventually, they find themselves negating their indigenous culture while they endeavour to be the part of the colonizer's culture. To Bhabha, it is of significance for "subordinated peoples" to assert "their indigenous cultural traditions" and to retrieve "their repressed histories" because such a "negating activity" creates "a boundary" which creates "the estranging sense of the relocation of the home and the world" (1994: 9). Being displaced from the indigenous culture through negation, colonial subjects experience 'the unhomeliness" which refers to "the condition of extra-territorial and cross-cultural initiations" (1994: 9). The unhomeliness does not stand for physical "homeless[ness]", but for psychological discomfort that the colonized feels since "the borders between home and world become confused" because of the feeling of displacement triggered by negation of the indigenous culture (1994: 9). To explain the psychological discomfort that the

unhomeliness creates on colonial subjects, Bhabha likens its feeling to ones' own shadows that "creep up on [them] stealthily" and suggests that it suddenly emerges "in a state of incredulous terror" (1994: 9). As seen, Bhabha regards the unhomeliness as an inevitable consequence of hybridity and lays bare its psychological effects on the colonized.

Gayatri Spivak, who "constitute[s] the Holy Trinity of colonial-discourse analysis" with "Edward Said and Homi Bhabha", also draws attention to the relationship between the indigenous and the colonialist subjects (Young, 2007: 154). She "articulate[s] the relationship between feminism, post-structuralism and the discourse of post-coloniality" and prefers "the more inclusive term, subaltern" (Ashcroft et al., 198). By means of her notable essay, *Can the Subaltern Speak*?, she contributes much to the theorization of postcolonialism with the term, the subaltern, referring to the indigenous subjects who are repressed and ignored by colonial discourse. She problematizes the notion of postcolonialism because it is suggested and studied by native critics who have been educated either by European colonialist system or European universities. She suggests that "[c]ertain members of the Indian elite are of course native informants of first world intellectuals interested in the voice of the Other" (Spivak, 2010: 38). Those intellectual elites do not have much in common with the subaltern subjects who are the fundamental interests of postcolonial studies, thereby considering postcolonialism insufficient to examine the subaltern.

Moreover, Spivak tries "to offer ways of dismantling colonialism's signifying system and exposing its operation in the silencing and oppressing of the colonial subject" (Ashcroft et al. 2002: 175). Hence, since postcolonialism, for her, scrutinizes the indigenous from a European perspective, she asks her well-known rhetorical question, *Can the Subaltern Speak?* Then, she determines who the subaltern classes are and remarks that the elite having contributed much to the emergence of postcolonial studies are "dominant foreign groups and dominant indigenous groups at all-India and at the regional and local levels" (Spivak, 2010: 39). One the other hand, she identifies the subaltern as "social groups and elements" that represent "the demographic difference between the total Indian population and all those whom we have described as the elite" (Spivak, 2010: 39).

To put an emphasis on the difference of the subaltern from those constructing postcolonialism, she also includes a feminist perspective to her understanding where she examines the condition of native women:

> "Within the effaced itinerary of the subaltern subject, the track of sexual difference is doubly effaced. The question is not of female participation in insurgency, or the ground rules of the sexual division of labor, for both of which there is 'evidence'. It is, rather, that, both as object of colonialist historiography and as subject of insurgency, the ideological construction of gender keeps the male dominant. If, in the contest of colonial production, the subaltern has no history and cannot speak, the subaltern as female is even more deeply in shadow" (Spivak, 2010: 41).

In a way, she sheds light on the subaltern women who are regarded by colonialist and native critics as an object to write and argue about. However, what is problematic here is that the subaltern women are always evaluated by male critics, whether European or native, and the subaltern women are not allowed to form a discourse in which they express themselves. Benefiting from the condition of native women who experience a double colonization, she concludes that the subaltern cannot express themselves in postcolonialism since it is examined and studied by the native elite and foreign subjects who are under the influence of the Eurocentric perspective. Such condition of postcolonialism, for her, creates a requirement for the subaltern to rearrange the history, ignoring the accounts of the native ruling class, but drawing attention to experiences of the voiceless subaltern (Young, 2007: 154).

Spivak clearly underlines the Eurocentric hegemony of imperialists on postcolonialism as she coins the term, worlding, which refers to the colonized space as a construction of the West and wishes for a new narrative in which the subaltern can express themselves:

> "If . . . we concentrated on documenting and theorizing the itinerary of the consolidation of Europe as sovereign subject, indeed sovereign and subject, then we would produce an alternative historical narrative of the 'worlding' of what is today called 'the Third World"' (Spivak, 1985: 247).

To Spivak, worlding is a Eurocentric method that forces the subaltern groups to acquiesce the hegemony of the West through colonization. Through the worlding process, the West manipulates the knowledge in determining attributes to the subaltern groups and designates the subaltern nations, which creates the concept of the Third World. Stressing that the negligence of the subaltern does not only originate from the act of colonization, but also from the "continuing epistemic violence that is practiced in the exercise of Western forms of thought upon the East," Spivak clarifies the "cause of minority groups

excluded or neglected by contemporary academic, particularly feminist, practices" (Young, 2007: 154). Eventually, Spivak sheds light upon the physical and epistemological dominance of the West over the subaltern and remarks that such a hegemonic discourse otherizing the subaltern emerges due to the lack of opposition by the subaltern subjects (Ashcroft et al., 2002: 201). One can easily recognize her insistence on a new narrative enabling the subalterns to determine their own identities, which does not only encourage postcolonial, but also feminist studies.

Consequently, postcolonialism is an academic discipline concerned with the cultural legacy of colonialism, dealing with the people-oriented consequence of colonial hegemony and economic exploitation over the indigenous people. It underlines that colonial discourse that attributes inferiority to the indigenous is just the construct of the imperialist West because so-called inferiority of the indigenous works for the justification of colonialism. Emphasizing the fictiveness of colonial discourse, it attempts to deconstruct binary oppositions of colonial discourse, attaching great importance to the cultures, norms, languages and identities of the natives. Moreover, it lays an emphasis on the clashes of cultures, norms, languages and identities during and after colonization and indicates that both sides become hybrid through mimicry because of the ambivalence of their relationship. Even though postcolonialism becomes powerful in the aftermath of decolonization occurring in the second half of the twentieth century, it does not remain limited within that period because although colonialism seems to come to an end with decolonization of the ex-colonies, imperialist powers go on exploiting underdeveloped countries with an indirect method: Neocolonialism.

1.3 Neocolonialism

Colonialism is an inclusive concept that not only refers to the expansionist dominations of the early empires but also the exploitative and capitalist practices of the imperialists after the Industrial Revolution. Having a long history in which it was conducted by various imperialists in different parts of the world for diverse purposes, colonialism has been divided into groups in accordance with the reasons and consequences of the colonial practices. Loomba lays a Marxist emphasis upon colonial practices and names earlier colonial practices as "pre-capitalist" and the modern European ones "capitalist" (2005: 8). Robert Young underlines the same characteristics of those practices referring to the earlier ones as "the settled" and the latter as "the exploited" (2016: 16). Similarly, Marc Ferro differentiates expansionist practices from those subservient to "financial capitalism" and denominates the former "colonization of the old type" and the latter "colonization of the new type" (1997: 18). However, Ferro also mentions another type, "imperialism without colonization," and defines it as the one "without flag". He clarifies that colonization does not end even though colonialists are defeated or they allow for independence of the colonies. He explicitly remarks that the Western hegemony over ex-colonies "has survived, in one form or the other, either as neo-colonialism or as imperialism without colonialists" (1997: 18-19). Most of the colonies all over the world had become independent countries until the last quarter of the twentieth century, which enabled the occurrence of a new system. Young declares the transition from the old to the new referring to three factors: liberation movements in colonies, the incapability of war-torn European colonists to sustain the old system and the nascent hegemony of America over the world (2016: 44). These factors helped the appearance of the new colonialist system that "was in many ways a more subtle, indirect version of the old" (2016: 44). To clarify, the conjuncture after World War II necessitated the birth of the new system because the European colonialists, which lost power during world wars, were overwhelmed by the political and economic responsibilities of colonies. On the other hand, having successfully practised this new system in Latin American countries, the United States dictated a new global system consisting of "the formal withdrawal of European powers from the erstwhile colonies- a process called decolonisation by bourgeois media" and this "laid down the foundation for more intensified penetration of finance capital through neocolonisation" (James, 2015: 126).

This new world order has driven attention, and several critics have tended to define it in their own terms. Michael Hardt and Antonio Negri examine this new global order in their influential book, *Empire*, and name it as 'Empire'. The term refers to the political and economic changes after the fall of "colonial regimes" and the "Soviet barrier" and points out the emergence of "the new sovereign power that governs the world" (Hardt and Negri, 2001: xv). They remark that "the globalization of capitalist production" has weakened the sovereignty of nation-states because nation-states have not been able to control the flow of "the primary factors of production and exchange-money, technology, people, and goods-… across national boundaries" (2001: xv). However, Empire does not only refer to the liberation of capitalist productions, but also oppression and destruction it imposes to build the order because the "the practice of Empire is continually bathed in blood" (2001: xv). Since Empire considers itself as the saviour of humanity, it does not hesitate to declare "just wars" and to benefit from "the legitimacy of the military apparatus… to achieve the desired order and peace" (2001: 13). Hardt and Negri exemplify direct intervention of Empire with the Gulf War and implies that it may utilize military strength to provide continuance of the flow of capitalist production. In short, even though they prefer another name, they contribute much to identifying the characteristics of the new world order by means of the similarities between their understanding of Empire and neocolonialism.

The occurrence of the new world order has also problematized the use of postcolonialism to refer to the contemporary power relations throughout the neocolonial regions, especially in the Middle East. Elle Shohat, one of the early critics emphasizing the inadequacy of postcolonialism in identifying the circumstances in neocolonial regions, argues that postcolonialism lacks identifying economic and military domination conducted by neocolonial initiatives in today's world. She articulates that postcolonialism ignores the fact that the contemporary neocolonial domination performs strategies that are overtly different from colonial rule:

> "As a signifier of a new historical epoch, the term "post-colonial," when compared with neo-colonialism, comes equipped with little evocation of contemporary power relations; it lacks a political content which can account for the eighties and nineties-style U.S. militaristic involvements in Granada, Panama, and Kuwait-Iraq…" (1992: 105).

Here, for her, since the "colonial" in postcolonialism tends to confine the term in a "temporal border," postcolonialism becomes problematic to address the contemporary neocolonial practices and military interventions conducted in different parts of the world

after decolonization (1992: 106). She suggests that to identify all "hegemonic structures and conceptual frameworks generated over the last five hundred years" through postcolonialism is troublesome. The solution she proposes for this confusion is to address the contemporary exploitation in ex-colonies or Third world countries with neocolonialism because this new world order designed by capitalism to ensure exploitation through different means is not related to the methods of traditional colonialism (1992: 106). Thus, neocolonialism becomes prominent to examine and analyze the contemporary condition of the Third world countries that have been still exploited since decolonization.

Neocolonialism stands for all practices conducted by imperialists to exploit less developed countries, especially the Third World countries. To give an exact definition of neocolonialism can be controversial and problematic because imperialist practices conducted in different parts of the world after decolonization might relatively vary. Even though early definitions of the term underline indirect and subtle methods to control and exploit erstwhile colonies economically, the term takes on a new meaning with direct military interventions conducted in Asia and the Middle East, and it begins to encapsulate all direct and indirect imperialist practices to control and exploit less developed countries.

The first theoretician who mentions this new type of colonialism is the French philosopher, Jean-Paul Sartre. Even though he does not give an exact definition, he coins the term to refer to the French imperialism in Algeria. In one of his speeches, *Colonialism is a System*, he is critical of the French imperialist practices in this country, and he warns against the "neocolonialist mystification" stressing that neocolonial practices cannot be justified with reference to the wickedness of traditional colonialism (Sartre, 2005: 9). Moreover, in another speech, *The Political Thought of Patrice Lumumba*, he focuses on the political conditions of Third World countries and remarks that the economic crisis in Belgium "urged the Belgian Government to grant the Congo its dependence so abruptly, or in other words, to swap- with the approval of the large companies- the colonial regime for neocolonialism" (2005: 93). Obviously, he regards neocolonialism as a new exploitation system designed by the European imperialists who had difficulty in controlling their colonies politically and economically. Hence, the freedom movements in colonies prospered as long as the European imperialists sustained the continuation of exploitation. He also explains the details of the pseudo-independence of the Congo stressing that "the natives who would govern" were chosen by European imperialists and

"they all belonged to the class recruited and trained by the Administration" (2005: 93). Analysing the political and economic conditions in the Congo, he lays bare that the neocolonialists build a bourgeois and let them govern the country looking after imperialists' interests (2005: 93). As seen, although he does not attempt to give an exact definition of neocolonialism, his analysis of the Third World countries during and after decolonization involves the basic characteristics of neocolonialism that will be examined in the course of the study.

Even though neocolonialism, as a term, was introduced in 1961 at the All African People's Conference, Young considers Kwame Nkrumah as one of the first critics who increased the recognition of neocolonialism with his worldwide famous book, *Neo-Colonialism, The Last Stage of Imperialism* (Young, 2016: 46). In the book, Nkrumah performs an analysis of some African countries that are still exploited economically despite their independence and associates these new colonialist indirect and subtle methods with a new term: Neo-Colonialism. His book is regarded as one the most influential books on neocolonialism since "[m]uch of his analysis still provides the basic understanding of the term and defines the parameters of economic power in postcolonial theory" (Young, 2016: 46). He opens the book, remarking that traditional colonialism came to an end in the twentieth century, and so-called independent ex-colonies have still been exploited through neocolonialism which he considers as the "final" and "most dangerous stage" of imperialism (Nkrumah, 1966: ix). Nkrumah expresses that ex-colonies will not become colonies again. On the other hand, he also articulates that exploitation still goes on through neocolonialism, which he regards as "the main instrument of imperialism" (1966: ix). Then he gives his well-known definition of neocolonialism:

> "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 from outside" (1966: ix).

He differentiates neocolonialism from traditional colonialism, underlining that the so-called independent countries are still controlled and exploited by imperialists. He remarks that those newly independent countries are encompassed by imperialists through economic means. Having been overwhelmed by exploitative practices of colonialism for centuries, those countries have vulnerable economy, and this turns into an advantage for imperialists as economic means help imperialists penetrate their internal affairs. Neocolonialist practices are conducted with "economic and monetary means" and such

economic siege leads to a political atmosphere that "is directed from outside" (1966: ix). The economic siege is laid through direct "payments" to neocolonial states, appointments of "civil servants in positions" where they work for the benefits of imperialists, and "a banking system" that forces neocolonial states to carry out policies imposed by imperialists through the capability of controlling "foreign exchange" (1966: x).

As mentioned above, several factors are generating the shift from colonization to neocolonisation such as freedom movements in colonies, incapability of war-torn European colonialists and the hegemony of the US over the world (Young, 2016: 44). These factors also help comprehend the occurrence of neocolonialism in Nkrumah's terms. He suggests that neocolonialism aims at "breaking up former large united colonial territories into a number of small non-viable States which are incapable of independent development and must rely upon the former imperial power for defence and even internal security" (Nkrumah, 1966: xiii). When the conditions of colonies are considered, his remarks make sense because the administration of colonies began to be difficult since the two world wars tired the colonialists, which also accelerated liberty movements in colonies. On the other hand, after the world wars, the US became the most powerful country. Since most of the colonies in Africa, the Middle East and Asia were controlled by European imperialists, there appeared a necessity for a new method in which the US would be an effective coloniser. In short, neocolonialism occurred as a new method meeting these expectations: colonies wishing for liberty would become independent, exploitation would go on with indirect methods and the US would obtain a bigger share.

However, even though colonies are independent in theory, they are too valuable for imperialists to let them govern themselves. The indirect control in the neocolonial world order is provided by a local bourgeoisie or an elite group that designs policies in neocolonial countries by protecting imperialists' benefits. These ruling classes do not establish the "authority to govern" by "the will" of the natives, but by "the support" of neocolonialists who seep into the administration of countries through economic siege and aid (Nkrumah, 1966: xv). Hence, in contrast to the neocolonialist discourse that asserts newly independent countries can be improved with the "aid" of the Westerners, the primary objective of these neocolonial rulers is not to defend the rights of the natives working for "expatriate firms," not to improve education or not to take concrete steps to inconvenience neocolonialist policies (Nkrumah, 1966: xv). Inescapably, since neocolonial countries that are ruled by puppets of the Westerners are "unable to create a

large enough market to support industrialization," they remain "wholly subservient to neocolonial interests," and Nkrumah regards such a country as an "ideal neo-colonialist State" (1966: xiv).

These ruling classes are not permanent or indispensable for imperialists because if they do not look after imperialists' interests accomplishedly or if there occurs a revolt or strong opposition against them, they, without hesitation, designate another leader or a group of people as the ruling class in neocolonial countries (Nkrumah, 1966: xiv). Such power capable of changing leaders or ruling classes in neocolonial countries is also a message to other leaders and administrators in other underdeveloped countries because it helps them surrender to neocolonialism facilely lest they lose their chairs. (Nkrumah, 1966: xiv). In addition to monetary means enhancing the neocolonialist control over underdeveloped countries, local elites who are compelled to support policies protecting imperialists' benefits not only simplify imperialists' work, but also consolidate the neocolonial order.

What differentiates this new exploitative world order from traditional colonialism is the physical absence of imperialists in neocolonial countries. Nkrumah underlines that their absence enables them to exploit without taking responsibility for their practices while it means for neocolonial subjects an "exploitation without redress" (1966: xi). To clarify, what he wants to emphasize is that traditional colonialism required at least explanations or justifications at home for colonialist practices and protection of colonies from other probable enemies while "with neo-colonialism neither is the case" (1966: xi). Referring to these characteristics, he concludes, "[n]eo-colonialism is also the worst form of imperialism" because it enables imperialists to focus on their interests by laying a burden on the native ruling classes (1966: xi).

Like Sartre, who is critical of the attempts trying to show neocolonialism as if it were beneficial for the development of neocolonial states (2005: 9), Nkrumah specifies its hidden aims on neocolonial countries. He suggests that money brought to the country is not spent for development, but on exploitation, and enterprises in neocolonial states impoverish the poor Third World countries while enriching the rich imperialists (Nkrumah, 1966: x). Even though these aids and funds donated to the newly independent countries seem to facilitate their development, they, in fact, function to impoverish those countries since they are ensured with collusions that privilege the former oppressors to take economic and political control of those nominally independent countries.

Neocolonialism is known as a term used to identify the new indirect exploitation system conducted by monetary means in Africa; however, it also refers to all methods, whether indirect control or direct military intervention, to exploit underdeveloped or developing countries all over the world. Nkrumah articulates, "[n]eo-colonialism is by no means exclusively an African question. Long before it was practiced on any large scale in Africa it was an established system in other parts of the world" (1966: xii). Similarly, P. J. James suggests that the US practised the "policy of imperialism without colonies… in Latin America for over a century" before applying it as a new world order to underdeveloped countries all over the world (James, 2015: 89). In addition to the fact that neocolonialism can refer to new methods to exploit independent countries all over the world, it also involves the strategies performed with direct military actions.

Neocolonialism can employ different strategies in different regions in accordance with the needs of neo-colonialists. Nkrumah specifies that one of these methods is "military aid" and unfolds that neocolonialism creates chaos and urges neo-colonial subjects to revolts that are suppressed with the help of military aid supplied by neocolonialists. The aim of this strategy is, in fact, not to end the chaos, but to flare it up because neo-colonialists do not only equip those who want to suppress revolts, but also their opponents:

> "Military aid in fact marks the last stage of neo-colonialism and its effect is self-destructive. Sooner or later the weapons supplied pass into the hands of the opponents of neo-colonialist regime and the war itself increases the social misery which originally provoked it" (Nkrumah, 1966: xvi).

This neocolonial strategy will be the one referred to repeatedly in the course of the study because it has been performed in the Middle Easters countries. To clarify, in the region, imperialists helped terrorist groups to create chaos and then they not only give financial and military support to the governments, but also terrorist groups. Such chaotic atmospheres have become milestones in the Middle Eastern countries since they opened the gates to imperialists. Writing that "terrorism generates counterterrorism and the United States has long been a party to this deadly game, as perpetrator more often than victim," John Bellamy Foster implies that the US has generally manipulated terrorist groups for the sake of its own benefits (Foster, 2006: 20).

Furthermore, neocolonialism also encapsulates direct military interventions that can be regarded as "extreme case[s]" in which "imperial power may garrison the territory of the neo-colonial State and control the government of it" (Nkrumah, 1966: ix). Thus,

neocolonialism becomes a term that identifies the new capitalist exploitation imposed on undeveloped or developing countries through not only indirect means such as multinational corporations, monetary institutions such as IMF or the World Bank or comprador ruling classes, but also direct military interventions. Even though neocolonialism has generally been associated with the new exploitation method conducted in Africa after decolonization, it is obvious from the first critic examining indirect neocolonial methods that it also identifies the military interventions. In this regard, one can suggest that neocolonialism has transformed into the process of re-colonization in some regions where imperialists invade the underdeveloped countries physically with technologically well-equipped armies to exploit natural sources and to carry out the requirements of the capitalist system. This characteristic of the term is significant because it enables an analysis of the physical imperialist intervention in the Middle East through neocolonialism.

Another remarkable name who deciphers this new world order is Frantz Fanon. He examines how neocolonialism improved during and after decolonization. In one of his essays, which was published in *Toward the African Revolution*, Fanon underlines the significance of decolonization remarking that the twentieth century "will not only be remembered as the era of atomic discoveries and interplanetary explorations" but also with "the conquest of the peoples of the lands that belong to them" (Fanon, 1967: 120). He articulates that liberation movements in colonies were immense thereby, forcing colonialists to "loosen the stranglehold" and thus, colonies obtained their independence (1967: 120). However, that did not mean a complete retreat for colonialists because colonies, which remained underdeveloped due to colonialist practices imposed upon them, felt compelled to benefit from the power of the former colonialists during the nascent independence. Undoubtfully, for him, colonialists would not renounce the economic and political concession they had obtained until decolonization and be eager to abuse the destituteness of colonies after that period. In this regard, he lays bare the tendency of colonialists who were keen on preserving their own interests, stating that the colonial justifications, such as development, civilization, cultural improvement or even religion, lost their cogency because during "the negotiations on independence, the first matters at issue were the economic interests: banks, monetary areas, research permits, commercial concessions, inviolability of properties stolen from the peasants at the time of the conquest" (1967: 121). However, he also expresses that unfortunately, the natives

struggling for freedom could not perceive the real aim of their former oppressors, and such economic privileges and rights for imperialists were determined. For him, these privileges and rights given to former oppressors in the process of independence were caused by "indetermination" of the natives (1967: 121). Here, what he means by indetermination can be clarified with the natives' inconsistent behaviours during independence struggles because while they fight for freedom, they also privilege the former oppressors who appear to help colonies. On the other hand, he articulates that even though colonialists appear to provide the former colony with anything it needs, they build an economic system that ensures the dependence of colonies on the former oppressors through "aid and assistance" means. He identifies such a condition in a colony as "a nominal sovereignty" and associates this condition with neocolonialism (1967: 121).

On the other hand, he also sheds light on how neocolonialism is sustained in erstwhile colonies, examining the function of the national bourgeoisie created by imperialists on the neocolonial exploitation of ex-colonies. In his *The Wretched of the Earth*, he articulates that the mission of these groups of people is not to help improve the nation, but to "serve as a conveyor belt for capitalism" (Fanon, 2011: 100). To him, even though these countries seem to be independent after decolonization, imperialists maintain the control indirectly with the help of "the bourgeoisie it nurtures and the national army which is trained and supervised by its experts to trans-fix, immobilize and terrorize the people" (2011: 119). Fanon expresses that traditional colonization is over, but exploitation still goes on indirectly through the elite class educated and assigned to significant positions by imperialists. He describes these exploitative practices of the native bourgeoisie as services which "camouflage itself behind the mask of neocolonialism" (2011: 119). It is obvious that, like Sartre, Fanon is also aware that imperialists put a new method into practice to exploit the erstwhile colonies after decolonization. Even though Fanon does not attempt to give an exact definition of neocolonialism, he makes an analysis of the relationship between former colonies and former oppressors and utters the occurrence of the new exploitation order, emphasizing the indirect economic control of imperialists over former colonies after decolonization.

Such texts committed to paper by African intellectuals exerted an influence on Marxist intellectuals because of the relationship between neocolonialism and capitalism. One of those noteworthy critics is Vasily Vakhrushev, who, in *Neo-colonialism, Methods and Manoeuvres*, regards neocolonialism as a new exploitation strategy performed by

imperialists. He suggests that because of the change in world order after world wars, imperialists had to embark on a new strategy in which they could hide their real intentions. He refers neocolonialism as "the colonial policy of the era" to ensure another type of control over "the former and existing colonies by means of more subtle methods and manoeuvres so as to propagate and consolidate capitalism" (Vakhrushev, 1972: 47). He demonstrates that neocolonialism, as a new method, occurred after World War II, which created "the general crisis of capitalism" because of the "virtual collapse of the whole colonial system (1972: 47). Neocolonialism, which was created to maintain the economic benefits of imperialists after decolonization, aimed to hinder the improvement of freedom movements in those countries and to obtain the largest economic, political military and ideological benefits. Furthermore, he suggests that neocolonialists have utilized many methods to exploit those countries and then exemplifies them as "new forms for the export of capital…the creation of mixed societies and companies, international and private funds, corporations and consortiums, the securing of assurance against risks in connection with capital investment, loans and credits…etc." (1972: 47). Besides, imperialists consolidated the system with "aid and development programmes" or "trade practices" which in fact strengthened imperialists' hands in the intervention of those countries (1972: 48). For him, all of these enabled the creation of the neocolonial world order in which imperialists trapped the political independence of the target countries. On the other hand, like Nkrumah, Vakhrushev also implies that neocolonialism did not remain limited to those subtle methods, but it unhesitantly performed violent actions, which were triggered, supported or suppressed by military units such as "acts of aggression, police operations, the provocation of local wars, various forms of intervention in the internal affairs of the developing countries, including conspiracies, coups d'état and assassination of leaders" (1972: 119). Hence, it is obvious that Vakhrushev regards neocolonialism as a new exploitation method conducted by imperialists to consolidate capitalism all over the world. One can also easily perceive that it is not just a system which utilizes subtle methods to take economic control of target underdeveloped countries, but it can also transform into direct military interventions or actions which are organized by military elements.

Benefiting from the remarks by Nkrumah and Fanon, Ngugi Wa Thiongo also attempts to designate the term, neocolonialism, and identifies it as "the continued economic exploitation of Africa's total resources and of Africa's labour power by

international monopoly capitalism through continued creation and encouragement of subservient weak capitalistic economic structures, captained or overseered by a native ruling class" (Thiongo, 1981: 24). As seen, while he underlines that it is a kind of exploitation conducted by imperialists to maintain capitalism over Africa, he also sheds light on the natives who facilitate the imperialists' works. He also names neocolonialism as the period of "flag independence" and expresses that the independence of Africa is nominal because a native class, which he considers as "comprador class," governs and oppresses the natives on behalf of imperialists. This native class can become as cruel and violent as imperialists do because they do not hesitate to rule "by torture, fraud, imprisonment, military brutality, terror and so on to supress the people on behalf of their paymasters" (1981:121). For him, such a system functions as "a policeman of international capital and often mortgages a whole country for arms and crumbs of the masters' table" (1981: 119-120). Obviously, his focus is not only on subtle imperialist methods serving capitalism, but also on the native ruling classes that are subservient to capitalism. Thus, he offers Pan-Africanism as a remedy in order to dispose of neocolonialism trapping the whole Africa economically, politically, socially and ideologically.

Another remarkable name who makes a detailed analysis of neocolonialism by examining the exploitation of African countries, especially Kenya, is Ndirangu Mwaura. In his, *Kenya Today: Breaking the Yoke of Colonialism in Africa* (1976), he deals with the problem of exploitation in Africa and deciphers the reasons of neocolonialism, stating that foreign investment, liberalization, lack of leadership, lack of capital and underpopulation were the noteworthy factors facilitating neocolonialism. As other critics do, he, firstly, resolves the condition of Africa and articulates that even though African countries appeared to be independent, they were still controlled and exploited politically, economically and culturally since they were contingent upon the military, economic and political power of the former oppressors. He articulates that "[f]inancially, the dependence is seen in the form of loans and aid tied to the donor; culturally, in the practice and spread of European culture; militarily, through the permanent occupation of Africa by foreign armies" (Mwaura, 2005: 5). Because of this Western domination over Africa, its economy is inevitably subservient to the profits of imperialists. He remarks that there is a close relationship between colonialism and neocolonialism because the foundations of neocolonial conditions in Africa were laid during colonialism. In that period,

colonialists built "a system of organized exploitation through foreign investments," which enabled them to transfer the wealth of Africa into the West (2005: 6). The independence of the colonies with decolonization did not cause any change in their structures because exploitation continued with the help of "reliable" natives who "were selected to take over" the pseudo-independent African countries (2005: 6). Those native ruling classes, who were defined as "traitors" by Mwaura since they were assigned to significant positions by the former oppressors, paid their debts to them, ruining the benefits of natives for the sake of the neocolonialists' interests (2005: 6). Moreover, he stresses that even though Africa had true nationalist leaders, they were dethroned through subtle neocolonialist methods or through direct coups or assassinations, which created, in African countries, political atmospheres that were full of puppet political and academic natives subserving the benefits of imperialists.

By means of outward trapping of the economy of African countries and inward support of native rulers, neocolonialism secured imperialists' positions in underdeveloped countries even though they seemed to leave those countries physically. Such a structure enabled the continuation of the "master-slave relationship" in neocolonial countries because neocolonial circumstances forced Africans to be contingent upon the former oppressors. Mwaura grounds Africans' servitude to the West on neocolonialism and remarks "political independence is dependent of economic independence" (2005: 160). Besides, he also explains the ways which neocolonialists employed in order to suppress opposition against neocolonial practices writing that "the exploitative system of international foreign investment based capitalism is manifested in the economies of African countries in various ways: religion, education, cultural imperialism and military and political threats" (2005: 160). While religion, education and cultural imperialism function to comfort the natives for the admittance of neocolonial practices, a military threat is always on the table for those who resist against neocolonial policies of imperialists. His analysis of military power as means of sustaining neocolonialism is of significance since he is one of the early critics handling how imperialists use their military powers as a threat or direct intervention to force the natives to admit to neocolonial practices.

He obviously states that military threat is the "last resort" that neocolonialists prefer when there occurs a necessity to coerce "leaders or entire countries to bully them into accepting and implementing policies favourable to the industrialized nations but

harmful and detrimental to the impoverished nations" (2005: 207). In other words, a military threat is a neocolonial strategy to improve, sustain and consolidate the system. In neocolonial terms, a military threat does not only refer to "outright military invasion" of the target country, but also "civil wars, coups [and] assassinations… or a combination of the above" (2005: 207). It is clear that neocolonialism does not hesitate to perform direct military invasion to implement neocolonial practices when subtle economic methods are not enough. The neocolonial world order has set several examples of military invasions since World War II, such as the invasions of Korea (1950), Egypt (1956), Congo (1960) and Vietnam (1965). He also emphasizes the fact that neocolonialism is not just an African problem but involves all invasions happening around the world after decolonization, such as the invasions of Latin American and Middle Eastern countries (2005: 210). On the other hand, he is not pessimistic about the condition of Africa, but he holds the view that if each neocolonial country has "the will and authority" to resist the practices imposed by "international capitalism" and employs new improvement strategies "different from the one championed by the International Monetary Fund (IMF) and World Bank (WB)," emancipation from the clutches of neocolonialism may be probable (2005: 6). Obviously, he contributes much to the theorization of neocolonialism with his detailed analysis in which he examines not only the factors consolidating neocolonialism, but also the ways which may help the natives dispose of neocolonialism.

As one of the remarkable critics of postcolonial theory, Gayatri Spivak also deals with the theorization of the term, neocolonialism, in an interview with Robert Young and published under the title of *Neocolonialism and the Secret Agent of Knowledge*. Like previous critics, she also associates its occurrence with decolonization. She articulates that the development of "post-industrial capitalism" rendered "old territorial imperialisms which began with the rise of monopoly industrial capitalism" unnecessary because traditional colonialism became expensive (Spivak, 1991: 220). This, after World War II, encouraged new imperialists to organize a new system that "is more economic and less territorial" (1991: 221). Besides, she emphasizes that neocolonial countries are nominally independent and neocolonial subjects feel like they are independent because "neocolonial exploitation happens by remote control" (1991: 223). Stating that neocolonialism is "like a radiation" which destroys slowly without being seen, she not only refers to its devastating effect on natives, but also implies the subtle ways it conducts in order not to be detected. Such a structure enabled the appearance of "the idea of a Third World"

because “the global monetary policy,” which claimed to have different aims, such as economic development, cultural improvement, civilization, independence etc., became active in underdeveloped countries (1991: 221). Creating the concept of the Third World, neocolonialists built a new world order in which imperialists can continue exploiting the poor Third World countries with the claim of the development of natives.

However, she sheds light on the fact that neocolonialism is not static, but can change or incorporate various strategies or methods. She points out that the Gulf War remodelled the neocolonial methods. Here, it is obvious that she hints at the imperialists, who have targeted Asian and Middle Eastern poor countries with direct military interventions and invasions with the turn of the twentieth century. Referring to the Gulf War as a “hyperreal war” and the practices performed in the region as “the imperialist reshuffling,” she states, “neocolonialism is a very specific kind of thing, which is different from the old forms of colonialism and imperialism [and] which involves also political, military, ideological etc.- the whole paraphernalia” (1991: 221). She identifies neocolonialism as a new world order that can employ all strategies, whether indirect or direct, to exploit the Third World countries all over the world. For her, “[n]eocolonialism is not simply the continuation of colonialism” because the former differentiates from the latter with the new strategies (1991: 224). In other words, neocolonialism is not “territorial imperialism,” thereby requiring new exploitative methods to be carried out, and she designates this condition as “postcoloniality” since postcolonialism is unadaptable to identify the transformation to the new world order (1991: 224). Furthermore, for her, the methods performed by neocolonialists in different countries do not have to be “identical” because they are designed in accordance with the needs of the underdeveloped countries and with the justifications of neocolonialists. For instance, she states that the civilization mission of French imperialism in Algeria and Egypt were different from American imperialism in Vietnam. As seen, like previous critics, Spivak associates the new economic order designated to exploit underdeveloped countries with neocolonialism. Besides, she explains the transformation from colonialism to neocolonialism with the shift from industrial capitalism to post-industrial capitalism, which lays bare the relationship between capitalism and neocolonialism.

This interview seems to have a great influence on Robert Young because he, then, makes an elaborative analysis of neocolonialism in his *Postcolonialism: An Historical Introduction*. In the book, he not only provides definitions of the term, but also evaluates

how it has been implemented all over the world with specific examples. Initially, he comments on the occurrence of neocolonialism and indicates that world wars are the main reasons having forced imperialists to change the exploitation system because "[a]fter 1945, the form of direct domination employed by the European imperial powers was no longer tenable" (Young, 2016: 44). He suggests that it is paradoxical that decolonization and freedom movements enabled imperialists to abandon traditional colonialism and to organize a new system that perpetuates exploitation. Examining the period when the foundations of neocolonialism were laid, he remarks that there were three factors facilitating the process. Firstly, he refers to freedom movements that became prevalent in colonies after world wars. Secondly, he underlines the disruptive economic effect of world wars on the European imperialists who had difficulty in sustaining the old system. Thirdly, he argues for the resolution of the United States to take an effective position in the economic control of the world. Hence, these factors enabled the emergence of neocolonialism, which is "a more subtle, indirect version of the old" (2016: 44).

Young also emphasizes the necessity of neocolonialism as a term since the prefix, post, in postcolonialism can be problematic. Like Spivak who regards postcolonialism as inefficient to identify the new economic order and writes that neocolonialism is "a different thing" (1991: 224), he remarks the prefix, post, makes sense because "the postcolonial is post, that is, coming after, colonialism and imperial in its first sense of domination by direct rule" (2016: 44). On the other hand, the prefix becomes troublesome when it refers to "imperialism in its second sense, that is of a general system of power relation of economic and power domination" (2016: 44). To unconfuse, he refers to several terms, "neocolonialism, dependency theory and world systems theory" to explain the economic and political exploitation performed all over the world after World War II (2016: 44). He also suggests that this economic control can be clarified from a capitalist perspective with "Keynesianism, monetarism, neoliberalism" (2016: 44). As is seen, he lays bare that the economic and political exploitation performed in the underdeveloped countries after decolonization had better be analysed with neocolonialism.

All these terms referring to the economic and political exploitation after decolonization put the concept of development at the centre. The former oppressors deluded the newly independent natives, convincing them about the fact that development could be achieved with the methods conducted by the former oppressors. However, the concept of development claimed by imperialists was decidedly nominal since it was just

a means for neocolonialists to penetrate underdeveloped countries to practice their capitalist purposes. He also argues that independence obliged natives to rely on neocolonialists' economic power to carry out the long-awaited development. Examining the economic dependencies in Ghana and Nigeria after decolonization, he remarks "independence brought to light an apparently new form of subservience to the economic system of capitalist power" (2016: 45). Thus, this paradoxical relationship between independence and subservience, in fact, explains the doctrine of neocolonialism: colonies are allowed to obtain their liberty; however, since they do not have enough economic, industrial or political capacity to govern themselves, they paradoxically become subservient to imperialists. For him, neocolonialism stands for "a continuing economic hegemony that means that the postcolonial state remains in a situation of dependence on its former masters and that the former masters continue to act in a colonialist manner towards formerly colonized states" (2016: 45). That is to say, even though neocolonialism has colonialist aims, it differentiates from traditional colonialism concerning the methods and strategies performed in independent countries.

Young does not define neocolonialism but refers to the definitions provided by Nkrumah. He considers Nkrumah as the first critic giving an exact definition and analysis of the term, neocolonialism. Initially, he puts emphasis on the independence of a neocolonial country and declares that it is "a sham" because of outward economic and political control (2016: 46). Then, Young refers to other African critics, such as Fanon and Thiong'o, to mention the influence of "educational, legal and political institutions" founded during colonization on the maintenance of neocolonialism (2016: 48). That colonial heritage enables the occurrence of a "neocolonial elite" who are educated by the Western system, who are equipped with the Western style of aesthetics and who tend to serve the neocolonialists. These people, who seize power in neocolonial countries with the help of the former oppressors, expedite "the exploitative operations of western national and multinational companies" (2016: 48).

On the other hand, he deals with the influence of the US on the development of neocolonialism all over the world and regards neocolonialism as "the American stage of colonialism, that is an empire without colonies" (2016: 45). American neocolonial hegemony was constituted by "trade agreements, foreign aid (particularly military), the operation of international US-controlled organizations (the World Bank, the IMF),… over-ambitious and unnecessary industrial projects… or control of media" (2016: 47).

Furthermore, he clarifies all means of neocolonialism, stating that when these indirect methods are not efficient enough to dominate a neocolonial country, neocolonialists do not avoid utilizing military interventions through "the nation's own army and police force" or through direct "invasion" of the target country (2016: 46). At the turn of twenty-first century, neocolonialism, which was regarded as a new method benefiting from the abovementioned subtle methods for economic exploitation, changed and transformed into a new method that can be associated with the process of 'recolonization' practised by American imperialism. Young clearly articulates that neocolonialism "usefully describes continued forms of colonialist behaviours, such as the US invasion of Grenada in 1983, or the wests' apparent belief that it has the right to bomb deviant nations such as Afghanistan, Iraq, Libya, Serbia or Sudan, as and when it chooses" (2016: 49). Neocolonial practices involve the Western superpowers' direct military interventions and invasions, which have been performed in the Middle East under the cover of democracy, peace or fight against terrorism. In this regard, these extreme forms of neocolonial practices are of significance for this study since their effects on both the Middle Easterner natives and immigrants will be analysed in the course of the study.

1.4 Neocolonialism in the Middle East

The shift from colonialism to neocolonialism in the Middle East is not identical to its shift in Africa because their colonial histories are divergent. Bruce Gilley, in his remarkable essay, *The Case for Colonialism in the Middle East*, examines the colonial history of the Middle East and suggests that cautious analysts should abstain from "making any general statements about colonialism in the Middle East" since "[t]he circumstances and patterns of the colonial encounter vary so widely" (Gilley, 2017: 4). During the modern colonial period in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, eighteen of total twenty-three Middle Eastern countries, which are located in "an area stretching from Mauritania to Pakistan," were colonized by different imperial powers, such as British, French and Italian, in different periods (2017: 2). On the other hand, the region also involved five countries, Turkey, Saudi Arabia, Iran, Afghanistan and Yemen, which were "non-colonized" during those periods. Moreover, for him, one of the reasons why cautious analysts should abstain from making a general statement about the colonial history of the Middle East is that those eighteen countries were colonized in accordance with different circumstances:

> "[O]f the eighteen colonized cases, six (Israel, Palestine, Syria, Jordan and Lebanon) resulted from the collapse of Ottoman rule during World War I, while at the other spectrum, three (Oman, Algeria and Bahrain) predated the era of modern colonialism…" (2017: 4).

Thus, colonization in the Middle East is not a generalizable phenomenon since the region involves not only non-colonized countries, but also colonized countries where colonization resulted from different circumstances in different periods.

Yet, this does not mean that those non-colonized Middle Eastern countries have not been exploited. Gilley clarifies the circumstances in those countries with neocolonialism and underlines the political and economic hegemony of the West over those so-called non-colonized Middle Eastern countries (2017: 8). Additionally, he also deals with the contemporary condition of the region where the US took control of some countries, such as Afghanistan and Iraq, with direct military invasion in the first decade of the twenty first century. He remarks that these practices performed in the region should be examined differently because they cannot be associated with traditional colonialism, which implies that neocolonialism has occurred in the Middle East through both subtle ways and direct invasions (2017: 4). To clarify, while indirect mechanisms of neocolonialism were conducted in the region to sustain imperialists' benefits and to fight

against communism during the cold war, the US imperialism also conducted direct military invasions and interventions in the region. Hence, one can suggest that the Middle East has become a prominent region, which indicates the extreme condition that neocolonialism can reach with direct military invasions or bombings.

British colonialism, which had been the dominant power of the world until the first half of the twentieth century and shaped the Middle East politically and economically, left its place to the US imperialism which began to control the region with neocolonial practices after this date (İşler and Savaş, 2018: 762). Although the US, which had had an active position in World War I, returned to its continent at the end of the war, it became the centre of world politics with World War II and shaped the Middle East during the Cold War. It has had a serious influence on the formation of the economic, political and cultural character of the Middle East, employing its imperialist policy with indirect methods or direct military interventions of neocolonialism. The hegemony of the USA in the Middle East can also be explained by the neoliberal economic policies and since they have enabled the neocolonial understanding to take a global imperialist position both in the Middle East and in other parts of the world (İşler and Savaş, 2018: 762).

Neoliberalism can be identified as a model "derived from the economic system advocated by nineteenth century economic liberals who believed that free markets would operate most efficiently if governments did not intervene in and distort them" (Clark and Clark, 2016: 6). Neoliberalism utilizes various strategies and agents to carry out the economization of the target countries all over the world. Thus, it is regarded as a concept that "has no fixed or settled coordinates" since it involves "temporal and geographical variety in its discursive formulations, policy entailments, and material practices" (Brown, 2015: 20). That is to say, it does not only refer to a "precise economic policy" imposed upon a target country, but also all instruments that can serve the economization of that country, such as "large corporations, small businesses, non-profits, schools, consultancies, museums, scholars, performers, public agencies,… health providers, banks, and global legal and financial institutions" (2015: 10). Hence, since the end of modern European colonialism, neoliberalism has become prominent neocolonialist strategy that has been practised through various economic means that will be examined in the course of the study.

Like Africa, the history of neocolonialism began in the Middle East with the idea of independence. However, this idea did not stem from the benefits of the Middle Easterners, but the interests of the imperialists. At that point neocolonialism became prominent as a necessity since it enabled nominal independence for ex-colonies. Hence, neocolonialists "could claim to serve the interests of freedom and democracy in the Third World while instituting predatory economic and financial policies that had little regard for the local independent governments" (Belletto and Keith, 2019: 3). Putting itself in the centre of the fight against communism and European colonialism, the US became the world power that can maintain neocolonial practices easily with the claim of freedom and democracy. However, the notion of freedom and democracy was just a means of neocolonialism in the Middle East. The US performed many interventions through coups to overthrow the "democratically elected governments" just as "they were perceived as hostile to US business interests in the region" (Belletto and Keith, 2019: 4). One of the most well-known of these interventions is the one performed in Iran in 1953 when Mohammed Mossadegh forced "the British-owned Anglo Iranian Oil Company" to share half of the profit with the Iranian people (Belletto, 2019: 4). Moreover, such interventions that occurred in Syria (1949), Iraq (1960-1963) and Afghanistan (1979-1989) can be given as other explicit examples of neocolonial practices performed in the Middle East (Belletto and Keith, 2019: 4).

Even though the colonial history of the Middle East is troublesome to make general statements, neocolonial practices performed in the region have common characteristics. Initially, The Middle Eastern countries, which achieved the right to determine their destiny in the 1945 Atlantic Charter, seemed to dispose of colonialism. However, the Third World countries, which were freed from colonialism and became independent, transformed into the victims of neocolonialism during the cold war since they were not powerful enough to establish their own industries and control them (İşler and Savaş, 2018: 763). Like all Third World countries all over the world, the Atlantic Charter became a touchstone in establishing and sustaining neocolonialism in the Middle East. The Charter, which secured the US's position in organizing and leading the new world order, was announced in 1941 and had been signed by fifty countries until 1945. Its main terms were as follows:

"(i) a renunciation of territorial or other aggrandizement by Britain and the USA; (ii) opposition to territorial changes contrary to wishes of the people immediately concerned; (iii) support for the right of peoples to choose their own form of government; (iv) support

> for easing of restrictions of trade, and access to raw materials on equal terms; (v) full collaboration between nations in economic fields after the war; (vi) the future peace must ensure freedom from want and fear; (vii) the future peace must guarantee freedom of the seas; (viii) aggressor nations must be disarmed pending the establishment of a general security system" (James, 2015 :125).

As is seen, the Charter did not only underline the end of European colonialism, but also provided a basis for the foundation of the new world order, which is defined as "the continuation of colonialism in a camouflaged manner and … a new phase of imperialism called neocolonialism led by the USA after World War II" (James, 2015: 126).

In accordance with the terms in the Atlantic Charter, the US founded monetary institutions, such as the International Monetary Fund (IMF), the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development (IBRD) and the World Bank to penetrate the economy of the target countries. These institutions did not only aim to help needy countries pay their short-term debts, but also to reconstruct the "war-torn economies and developmental requirements of neocolonial countries" (James, 2015: 131). In addition to the Atlantic Charter, which provided the basis for economic exploitation, the US also secured the new global order, neocolonialism, through the United Nations System and Truman Doctrine. The United Nations System incorporated various agencies institutions and organizations, such as ILO, FAO, UNESCO, UNICEF, WHO, UNEP, UNIDO and WEP, which became instruments to spread and sustain the neocolonial process all over the world. These neocolonial practices were organized and ruled by the representatives who "were either experts recruited from imperialist countries themselves or [were] faithful compradors from neocolonial countries trained in imperialist institutions and schools, especially that of USA" (James, 2015: 135-136). Furthermore, having secured its dominance with the abovementioned institutions and treaties, the US announced, in 1947, the Truman Doctrine, which was identified as "the policy of the United States to support free people who are resisting attempted subjugation by armed minorities or by outside pressures" (James, 2015: 136). Hence, employing the Truman Doctrine, the US created its own justification to interfere in the internal affairs of the target countries and embraced that attitude as a policy during the Cold War. That is to say, when the abovementioned organizations, agencies or institutions could not meet the expectations, political and military interventions occurred to fight against communism. After organizing such a system, which has political, social, and economic dimensions, the US also created a military threat for the ones that can oppose the new global world order by establishing the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) in 1949. Briefly, the US entrenched the

neocolonial practices it performed all over the world after decolonization through the abovementioned organizations, agencies and treaties. The US imperialism, which adopted such offensive military, economic and political policies, designed the post-war neocolonial period named “Pax Americana” and it, since then, “has become the main supplier of military power and police action to keep as much of the world as possibly safe for finance capital” (James, 2015: 138).

The Middle East is one of the regions where US imperialism has been effective since the end of World War II. The region had not had any importance for the US by the time decolonization started; however, it centred on the US imperialism’s fight against communism during the Cold War. Besides, there were two more factors, which increased the significance of the region for the US: the region’s resources and Israel’s security (Farhang, 1993: 1). Thus, these factors encouraged the US to draw its attention to the region, and it has become the dominant power controlling the whole Middle East with all political, economic and humanitarian instruments characterized as neocolonial methods above.

On the other hand, the condition of the Middle East after the withdrawal of European colonialism and the downfall of the Ottoman Empire can be suggested as another factor, which expedited the US’s neocolonial control. In other words, the claims of freedom, democracy and development embraced by the US imperialism met on common grounds with the then condition of the region because “all Middle Eastern countries [were ruled] in an autocratic fashion. Leaders [came] to power- often through violence- without the consent of the governed. Lacking popular legitimacy, they [used] militant rhetoric and [appealed] to such transnational concepts as pan-Arabism and Islam in an attempt to gain domestic or region-wide support” (Farhang, 1993: 2). Thus, the US, which came to the region to fight against communism, could easily make other excuses, such as freedom and democracy, to sustain its existence in the region after the communist threat disappeared. Having been ruled by European colonialism or dictators and autocratic leaders, the Middle Eastern countries were neither ready for the maintenance of democracy nor equipped with its requirements. That mission would be carried out by the US, which regarded itself as the champion of freedom and democracy all around the world.

Even though the US claimed to bring democracy or freedom into the Middle East, its main aim was to penetrate the control of the countries in the region. To secure the oil

flow and to form a political structure based on the security of Israel, the US "was ready to collaborate with any regime that accommodated it" (Farhang, 1993: 1). What determined how the US treated a regime controlling a country or a region in the Middle East depended not on how the regime "treated its own people", but on its "serious resistance to United States expectations" (Farhang, 1993: 1). That is to say, what was of significance for the US imperialism was the profits that it could make with the claims of freedom and democracy. Farhang exemplifies that attitude with the US imperialism's changing opinion about Islamic fundamentalism because he suggests that even though it had been regarded as an obstacle before democratization, their image changed when "Islamic fundamentalists battled Soviet troops in Afghanistan," and they became "freedom fighters" (Farhang, 1993: 1). Furthermore, the US imperialism's interest in Islamic fundamentalists became stronger in the following years. Funding and arming the extremist groups, it created terrorist organizations and benefited from them to create chaos in the target countries. Hence, taking the road with the motto of freedom and democracy, the US imperialism, with the projects such as Clash of Civilizations, the Grand Chessboard, Pivotal States theories and the Greater Middle East Initiative, designed a region where the peoples of the Middle East were unable to continue their development since they always faced ethnic and sectarian crises (İşler and Savaş, 2018: 768).

On the other hand, the US imperialism was not the only dominant power after World War II. When the cold war began, the Middle East was the target of two great powers: "the United States at the head of NATO and the Soviet Union at the head of the Warsaw Pact" (Fahmy, 2021: 317). They performed a very competitive struggle against each other to make their ruling system dominant over the other. That led to an uneven period in which the Middle Eastern countries became the region where these great powers were struggling with each other (Fahmy, 2021: 317). During that period, the Middle East became the place where the US imperialism performed all neocolonial methods and agencies to take control of the region.

The tolerance of the Middle Eastern countries to the neocolonial methods or organizations led by the US imperialism can be clarified with the then condition of the countries in the region. They were in the middle of the fight between these imperialist powers, and they needed to consider their own security and improvement: "In essence, the key determinants were security and direct and indirect economic support" (Fahmy,

2021: 317). Such an atmosphere in the Middle East increased the hegemony of the US imperialism, which did not even consider leaving there after the communist threat disappeared. When the high quality and inexpensive price of the Middle Eastern oil and the security of Israel coalesced, the concern of the US imperialism towards the region became indispensable. That caused the US imperialism to assume a tougher attitude towards the region, which can be exemplified by the announcement of the Carter Doctrine in 1980. The Doctrine declared that "the United States would lead a military force, if necessary, to defend its national interest in the Persian Gulf" (Fahmy, 2021: 318). It was announced due to the oil embargo laid by the Arab Middle Eastern countries on the United States because of its explicit support for Israel in the 1973 War, which, in fact, foreshadowed the subsequent neocolonial practices performed by the US imperialism when there occurred a condition that could hinder their benefits in the following years (Fahmy, 2021: 318).

In *Naked Imperialism: The Pursuit of Global Dominance*, John Bellamy Foster argues that the US imperialism had no other choice than planning military interventions in the Middle East since they did not have another excuse to justify its presence in the region when the Cold War ended. (Foster, 2006: 21). For him, the US imperialism needed an enemy with the help of which it could vindicate all neocolonial practices, particularly the violent actions performed in remote lands. Since World War II, the US imperialism has benefited from military actions not only to perform imperialist purposes, but also to support and improve the economy with arm sales (Foster, 2006: 23). He gives clear examples of neocolonial military interventions until the turn of the twenty first century writing that the US neocolonialism:

> "sent military personnel and equipment to the Sinai as part of a multinational force in 1982 and marines to Lebanon in 1982; used AWACS electronic surveillance aircraft to aid Saudi Arabia in shooting down Iranian fighter jets in the Persian Gulf in 1984; escorted Kuwaiti oil tankers during the Iraq-Iran war; fought the Gulf War against Iraq in 1991; fired missiles and carried out bombing strikes against Iraq on numerous occasions in the last decade; carried out military exercises in Kuwait (aimed at Iraq) in 1992; fired sixty cruise missiles equipped with cluster bombs at Osama bin Laden in Afghanistan in 1998; commenced war operations in Afghanistan in 2001" (Foster, 2006: 22).

In this regard, he remarks that the US imperialism always had excuses to perform neocolonial practices in the Middle East. When the Cold War ended, it made alternative excuses such as "the struggle against "rogue states"; a clash of civilizations; a war on the global drug trade and humanitarian intervention" (Foster, 2006: 23). Yet, since those

excuses could not be convincing enough to be supported by public opinion, the US imperialism had to create more powerful and persuasive excuses. Even though it benefited from Saddam Hussein much to increase its hegemony in the region, he, alone, was not enough to justify the neocolonial military actions performed by the US all over the world (Foster, 2006: 23). Then, the US imperialism obtained what it needed with the 9/11 attacks, and Foster suggests that the US imperialism did not have to make excuses any longer, by stating that "the terrorist attacks on the World Trade Centre and the Pentagon have now changed all of that" (Foster, 2006: 23). That opportunity, which was not only a chance for justification of the then neocolonialist practices, but also for manipulating public opinion for the subsequent direct military invasions in the region, was not missed by the US imperialism. The rulers of the US took the advantage of these terrorist attacks, planning "a new global crusade" to the Middle East (Foster, 2006: 24). That campaign portrayed the terrorist group led by Osama Bin Laden and Afghanistan ruled by the Taliban as a target; however, the crusade was too extensive to be directed to just one underdeveloped Middle Eastern country. Forster lays bare the contemporary neocolonial aim of the US, quoting President Bush's speech in 2001:

> "[T]here are thousands of these terrorists in more than sixty countries. . . . Every nation in every region now has a decision to make. Either you are with us, or you are with the terrorists. From this day forward, any nation that continues to harbor or support terrorism will be regarded by the United States as a hostile regime" (2006: 24).

As one can perceive from the quotation above, the President's speech aimed to prepare the public opinion for the ensuing military interventions and invasion performed by the US imperialism in different parts of the world, especially the Middle East.

It is not wrong to remark that the foundations of the current battle-scattered condition of the Middle East were laid when the US imperialism changed its strategy in the region. Foster also underlines that alteration and specifies that "[n]othing in fact so reveals the new age of imperialism as the expansion of the U.S. Empire in the critical oil regions of the Middle East and the Caspian Sea Basin" (2006: 112). That alteration started with the collapse of the Soviet Union and the Gulf War because even though US imperialism was effective in the region after World War II, its power was not enough to control the whole region. Then, the downfall of the Soviet Union and the victory in the 1991 Gulf war cleared all obstacles before the US imperialism, which enabled it to become the only dominant power that could launch military operations or air strikes on any country with the claim of 'terrorist supporters'. That period can be associated with

the extreme form of neocolonialism. To clarify, more or less all critics, who contribute much to the theorization of neocolonialism, suggest that even though neocolonialism seems to refer to the economic hegemony of imperialists over independent Third World countries in indirect ways, it, in extreme forms, can transform into a method performing direct military interventions and invasions. That is to say, the study will regard the direct US imperialist control and invasions in the Middle East, which started in the 1980s and reached a peak after the 9/11, as an extreme form of neocolonialism and examine the consequences of those neocolonial practices on the local and immigrant Middle Easterners.

1.5 The Deterritorialization of the Middle Easterners through Neocolonialism

The above-stated period was a touchstone for the Middle Eastern countries because the new world order, which commenced with the Cold War, led to alterations in the "[p]reviously stable territorial formations" such as "nation-states, ideological blocs, global markets, or ethnonational communities" (Tuathail and Luke, 1994: 381). That did not only result in "unsettling chaos" all over the world, especially in the Middle East, but also created radical changes in "unstable territorial flows" such as "communication networks, trade agreements, cultural codes, or capital reserves" (Tuathail and Luke, 1994: 381). This neocolonial world order has utilized direct military invasions throughout the world since the Cold War, which has resulted in many political, economic and cultural alterations. In this regard, the turn of the twenty first century became the period of disintegration all around the world, especially in the Middle East. To clarify the political alterations triggered by neocolonial practices, one might mention the collapse of the Soviet Union, which made American imperialism the sole dominant power in the Middle East. With the claim of bringing democracy and freedom, the US imperialism penetrated the Middle East, and it not only designed regimes working for its profits, but also demolished the autocracy or governments that were against its capitalist purposes. Hence, that policy created many political alterations in support of neocolonialists' interests. These political alterations also found reflection in the field of the economy because the neocolonial world order involved a shift from modern European colonialism to neocolonial capitalism. Inevitably, those political and economic alterations generated a cultural echo in the regions where neocolonial practices were performed because neocolonialism was always undergirded with cultural imperialism to ensure its acceptableness[1]. Even though those alterations occurring differently in various regions were complex and contradictory, Tuathail and Luke clarify the consequences of the indirect and direct neocolonial practices, stating that the neocolonial world order has created a period of disintegration in Third World countries.

"The drift of these events is complex and contradictory. Nonetheless, there are shifts that can be seen as moving towards deterritorialization and reterritorialization at the same time and in the same space. The comfortable division of ideological blocks and nation states

[1] For further information about the political, economic and cultural alterations occurring during the period between the end of the World War II and of the Cold War, please see: Gearoid Q. Tuathail and Timothy W. Lake, "Present at the (Dis)integration: Deterritorialization and Reterritorialization in the New Wor(l)d Order," Annals of the Association of American Geographers, Vol. 84, No. 3, pp. 381-398. https://www.jstor.org/stable/2563774?seq=1

> set down territorially by the Cold War is being shredded, but also rewoven, in the uncomfortable reterritorialization of the old ethnicities and new economies… Out of the disintegrating certainties of the Cold War, then, comes both expressions of deterritorialization and projects of reterritorialization as the old world maps that guaranteed meaning and direction in the Cold War give way to emergent new word orders that seek to reweave the unravelling threads of the familiar into new maps of meaning" (1994: 382).

In other words, as "the sole remaining superpower," the US imperialism imposed political, economic and cultural deterritorialization upon the Third World countries by means of the neocolonial activities during the Cold War period. Then, such a condition enabled it to reterritorialize those countries politically, economically and culturally since it was a necessity for the new system to ensure the maintenance of the capitalist flow from the periphery to the centre. Briefly, those neocolonial practices conducted in the Middle East have caused a political, economic and cultural disintegration period and then there occurred an appropriate atmosphere to found the neocolonial world system, which will be regarded, in the course of the study, as the practices of 'deterritorialization' and 'reterritorialization'.

Deleuze and Guattari firstly coined the term, deterritorialization, to identify the phenomenon of alienation in language that many writers experience when they produce texts in a language apart from their mother tongue. To exemplify the concept of deterritorialization in language, they refer to the literary works of Franz Kafka, who was the son of a Jewish family living in Prague but speaking German. They regard his literary works as the pieces of "minor literature" and identify it as a style of writing which "does not come from a minor language; it is rather which a minority constructs within a major language" (Deleuze and Guattari, 2003: 16). One of the most remarkable characteristics of minor literature is that its language is heavily influenced by deterritorialization since they are written by the writers who defamiliarize the conventions of the language that they are forced to express themselves. For them, Kafka's literary pieces have this characteristic because he marks "the impasse that bars access to writing the Jews of Prague and turns literature into something impossible- the impossibility of not writing, the impossibility of writing in German, the impossibility of writing otherwise" (2003: 16). For them, minor literatures consist of texts with a tendency to undermine the traditions of the dominant language creating new spaces where those writers deterritorialize those conventions. This deterritorialization in Kafka's works has two facets: One of them is that since it becomes impossible for the Prague Jews to express

themselves apart from writing in German, it creates "the feeling of an irreducible distance from their primitive Czech territory" and it deterritorializes them (2003: 16). The other one is that, for such "an oppressive minority" writer, like Kafka, who "speaks a language cut off from the masses," it is impossible to write in German as a German writer does; however, his effective efforts enable "the deterritorialization of the German population itself" with his subversive attitude towards the dominant language (2003: 16). Hence, Deleuze and Guattari conclude that minor literatures are the reflections of such hybrid cultures, and they remark that deterritorialization, in literature, does not only occur among minority representatives who defamiliarize their own territory through using another language but also in the conventions of the dominant language which are under heavy influence of such powerful minority writers.

Besides, in *A Thousand Plateaus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia*, Deleuze and Guattari broaden the definition of deterritorialization to examine the nomadic identity of individuals who are always under the influence of outer factors in the society. They, in its simplest form, define it as "the movement by which one leaves territory" and "the operation of the line of flight" (Deleuze and Guattari, 2005: 508). The term stands for a process of perpetual movement, which hinders stability of being and fixation of identity. They also suggest that deterritorialization can occur through a process, which they name "reterritorialization" and explain, "[a]nything can serve as a reterritorialization, in other words, stand for the lost territory; one can reterritorialize on a being, an object, a book, an apparatus or system" (2005: 508). At the core of their idea lies the flux of being that is stimulated or forced by the external apparatus it encounters. To clarify how the process of deterritorialization functions, Claire Colebrook refers to their understanding of machine analogy:

> "The idea of deterritorialisation… is directly related to the thought of the machine. Because a machine has no subjectivity or organising centre it is nothing more than the connections and productions it makes. It therefore, has no home or ground; it is a constant process of deterritorialisation, or becoming other than itself" (Colebrook, 2002: 55-56).

As understood from the quotation above, in Deleuze and Guattari's understanding, identity is considered as an on-the-go machine, which tends to transform through the interaction with the environment. Similarly, Brown and Fleming specify that identity perpetually experiences transformations and alterations to oppose or to collaborate with the condition it encounters and regard deterritorialization as the process of becoming "in

which the conventional distinctions between inside and outside, actual and virtual, and even between self and other significantly blur" (Brown and Fleming; 2011: 276).

Nikos Papastergiadis, in *The Turbulence of Migration: Globalization, Deterritorialization and Hybridity*, examines Deleuze and Guattari's deterritorialization analysis on both Kafka and identities' relation to the territory. He suggests that deterritorialization in Kafka creates affluence in modes of thought because "his radical practice of defamiliarizing the everyday and his distanciation from the conventions of dominant language facilitate a creative vision even as they heighten the experience of exile" (Papastergiadis, 2000: 117). For him, Kafka creates identities and meanings that are deterritorialized from their conventional definitions "to produce an exilic effect in language" and this helps Kafka create "a mode of becoming which is open fluid and nomadic" (2000: 117). As it happens in language, the increasingly globalized world has also created cultural deterritorialization all over the world and Papastergiadis clarifies this as follows:

> "The deterritorialization of culture refers to the ways in which people now feel they belong to various communities despite the fact that they do not share a common territory with all the other members. It also refers to the way that a national or even a regional culture can no longer be conceived as reflecting a coherent and distinct identity. This attention to the way communities are connected, despite being spread across considerable distances, and redefined through exchange across multiple borders, has challenged ethnographic assumptions that cultures could be mapped into autonomous and bounded spaces" (2000: 115-116).

As understood from the quotation above, it is not wrong to suggest that current cultures all around the world are deterritorialized because of cultural interactions whose history started with early colonial practices, strengthened during the modern colonial period and has been still going on at a great pace within the neocolonial era.

In this regard, the study will examine how neocolonial practices performed in the Middle East have a deterritorializing effect on the Middle Easterners. The neocolonial period, which started after World War II in the Middle East, utilized subtle methods to build a new economic order with the help of which the US capitalism can ensure its benefits. However, through the end of the twentieth century and the first decade of the twenty first century, neocolonialism began to perform its extreme strategies through direct military interventions and invasions. Hence, the Middle East has become a region where several countries have been invaded, which indicates that neocolonialism has become a process of recolonization in the region. The physical existence of neocolonizers

who performed brutal practices in the region created both physically and spiritually deterritorialized identities. The effects of neocolonialism on the Middle Easterners vary: while some prefer to immigrate to safer places, some prefer to stay in the neocolonial Middle East where they disperse around the region because of the political condition. On the other hand, neocolonialist practices in the region also have effects on the Middle Easterner immigrants who have built new lives in the West. Obviously, even though the influence of neocolonialism on the Middle Easterners differs, the study will argue that what neocolonialism has created in the region is physically and spiritually deterritorialized individuals.

Initially, the study, with Mohsin Hamid's *The Reluctant Fundamentalist*, will deal with the influence of neocolonial practices performed in the region over the Middle Easterner immigrants who have designed a life in the West. The novel is the story of Changez, who, in fact, overcomes the difficulties that immigrants may encounter with his efforts and ambitions. His Middle Easterner identity does not create an obstacle for him in finding a prestigious position in the West. He demonstrates himself by graduating from one of the most prestigious universities in the USA, Princeton University, and obtaining a position in one of the most esteemed companies in the world of the novel. However, then, the 9/11, which expedites the transformation of neocolonialism to its extreme form, happens and Changez instantly becomes a potential terrorist. His Middle Easterner identity takes precedence over his successful career, and he returns to the Middle East where he supports terrorist organizations. Thus, the study will handle the influence of neocolonialism on Middle Easterner immigrants whose lives are influenced by the consequences of neocolonial practices in the Middle East through Changez, who becomes physically and spiritually deterritorialized. Besides, the study will also examine the deterritorialization of the Middle Easterners who immigrate to find safer places because of the extreme neocolonial practices performed in the region. *Exit West* tells the story of Nadia and Saeed who fall in love with each other when their unnamed city in the neocolonial Middle East starts to be bombed and invaded by terrorist groups and imperialists. They perceive that they cannot make a happy and safe life for themselves there anymore and then they take the road to an unknown home through magical doors. Displaced from their home, they experience the process of physical and spiritual deterritorialization on their way to an unknown home. Hence, the study will shed light on

the neocolonial immigration, which forces the Middle Easterners to experience the process of deterritorialization.

On the other hand, the study, with Nadeem Aslam's *The Wasted Vigil* and *The Blind Man's Garden*, will also analyse the deterritorialization of the locals who are greatly affected by the neocolonial atmosphere in the Middle East. These novels have similar characteristics since both of them reflect the contemporary neocolonial condition of the Middle East where people become deterritorialized because of the neocolonial practices that have been performed since the beginning of the Cold War. *The Wasted Vigil* reflects the turbulent lives of those whose paths cross through neocolonialism in the region. It tells the intertangled lives of neocolonial characters such as Marcus, an English doctor living in Afghanistan and married to an Afghan woman, Qatrina, David, an American spy, Lara, a Russian woman searching for her missing brother, Benedikt, who was sent as a soldier to the region and Casa, a local jihadist youth. In this regard, the study will examine how neocolonialism deterritorializes individuals who become neocolonial nomads not only by trying to find the people that neocolonialism steals from them, but also by their own identities which become deterritorialized in their struggle against neocolonialism. Similarly, the study will handle the neocolonial condition of the Middle East with *The Blind Man's Garden*, which tells the story of deterritorialized lives of the Middle Easterners in an imaginary town, Heer, in Afghanistan. The novel reflects the war-torn condition of the region after the 9/11 and sheds light on the deterritorializing effect of neocolonialism on the Middle Easterner locals. Essentially, it is the story of a local family: a father, Rohan, sons, Jeo and Mikail and Jeo's wife Naheed. Being caught in the middle of the neocolonial Middle East, they become deterritorialized. While Jeo and Mikail leave home secretly to fight against the US imperialism, Rohan follows them to dissuade. However, since the country is full of imperialist soldiers, warlords and terrorist groups, they are driven away throughout the country. Not only do they become physically deterritorialized since they scatter around the region or lose the ones they love because of neocolonial circumstances, but their identities also become deterritorialized in their struggle to keep the family together. Briefly, the study will refer to *The Wasted Vigil* and *The Blind Man's Garden* to analyse the Middle Easterners' deterritorialization, which is triggered by the neocolonial practices performed in the region.

CHAPTER II

THE RELUCTANT FUNDAMENTALIST AND *EXIT WEST*

2.1 Neocolonial Deterritorialization in *The Reluctant Fundamentalist*

This chapter aims to analyse how Middle Easterner immigrants become deterritorialized due to the consequences of indirect or direct means of neocolonialism in *The Reluctant Fundamentalist*. Initially, the chapter clarifies Changez's motivation to be an economic migrant with the neocolonial policies which lead to his family's impoverishment. Associating his dislocation from his family and country with neocolonialism, the chapter sheds light on the state of inbetweenness in his struggle to be part of the American society. Then, the chapter focuses on the effect of the Islamophobia in the USA after the 9/11 terrorist attacks and direct military invasion of Afghanistan on Middle Easterner immigrants and suggest that the terrorist attacks which promote direct neocolonial military interventions have a deterritorializing influence on them. The chapter clarifies their deterritorialization with the Islamophobia which breaks out in the USA after the attacks and the impact of the military operations in the Middle East on immigrants. Moreover, the chapter remarks that those neocolonial policies and their consequences compel Middle Easterner immigrants to a process of deterritorialization, which generates neocolonial nomads with a feeling of unbelongingness.

2.2 Mohsin Hamid as a Deterritorialized Writer

As a writer keen on reflecting political and sociological phenomena affecting not only his life but also the spaces where he has lived, Mohsin Hamid innately inclines to deal with the process of deterritorialization that Middle Easterners experience in the contemporary capitalist world. His inclination becomes denotative when his life is considered. He was born in Lahore but spent his childhood in California during his father's PhD. at Stanford University. After his father had completed his PhD, his family moved back to Lahore where he received high school education. Then, he went to the United States to matriculate at Princeton University where he attained great success. When he graduated, he returned to Lahore renewedly, but it was not a permanent settlement because he moved back to the United States againward to attend Harvard University. Upon finishing university, he returned to Lahore where he worked for four years until he moved to London. Obviously, the migrativity he experienced in his life has a great influence in his writings in which he deals with the consequences of deterritorialization because he calls Lahore, New York and London "all three home" while he regards himself as "a half-outsider" (Hamid, 2014: 13).

In addition to his sensibility to deterritorialization triggered by his own life, what urges him to focus on the deterritorializing effect of neocolonialism can be explained through the fact that he has been exposed to those consequences with first-hand experience. His elucidative explanations about what he witnessed are worth quoting at length:

> "I have lived in Pakistan during its recent years and most intense period of terrorist activity and drone strikes, in London during the years on either side of the 2005 public transport bombings, and in New York in the era that came to an end with the attacks on the World Trade Centre of 2001" (Hamid, 2014: 15).

Clearly, Hamid, as a Middle Easterner immigrant in the West, lived out the prejudices against Middle Easterners in the West, which emerged in the wake of the 9/11, and he focuses on how those neocolonial interventions have deterritorialized the Middle Easterner immigrants, compelling them to move back to the Middle East in *The Reluctant Fundamentalist*. Moreover, he, as a Middle Easterner living in the region during neocolonial military interventions and invasions, witnessed how these practices have caused a process of deterritorialization for the locals, forcing them to migrate to safer parts of the world, and he sheds light on the consequences of this process in *Exit West*.

2.3 Neocolonialism in *The Reluctant Fundamentalist*

Mohsin Hamid's *The Reluctant Fundamentalist* is a novel that lays bare the consequences of neocolonial policies performed in the region since the turn of the twenty-first century. It is the story of a Pakistani man, Changez, who, as an economic migrant, migrates to America to make a good life for himself because neocolonial policies that have been conducted in his country have precluded his dreams about the future. Changez, the protagonist narrator, narrates his experience of the failed American dream through flashbacks to a man whom he supposes to be American, and this dramatic monologue reveals that he associates his failure with neocolonialism which takes its ultimate and extreme form with the 9/11 attacks in New York in 2001. While the attacks pave the way for subsequent direct military interventions which expose Middle Easterners to deterritorialization, it also incites Islamophobia which compels Middle Easterner migrants, who gain a place in society with their efforts, as Changez does, to leave behind their dreams and to go back to their countries, which can be regarded as backward deterritorialization. The novel becomes prominent in describing the neocolonial atmosphere both in America through Islamophobia triggered by the 9/11attacks and in the Middle East through the narration drawing the contemporary picture of the Middle East where militarism has increased progressively after the attack.

The Reluctant Fundamentalist clues in the neocolonial relationship between the US and the Middle East through Changez's economic migration to the US and then his backward deterritorialization to the Middle East. As examined above, the US imperialism takes advantage of fundamentalist groups in the Middle East during its fight against communism in the Cold War and regards them as "freedom fighters" (Farhang, 1993: 1). This alliance opens the door of American dream for Middle Easterner economic migrants without facing xenophobic attitudes even though majority of students are white Americans, and Changez becomes one of those managing to be accepted at Princeton after proving himself with his success at "standardized tests, but painstakingly customized evaluations- interviews, essays" (Hamid, 2008: 4). His success ensuring employability in the capitalist system provides him with "visas and scholarships" and he becomes ready "to contribute [his] talents to [American] society" that he joins (Hamid, 2008: 4). Graduating with a first from Princeton, he gets a position at Underwood Samson & Company, which supplies investment consultancy revenues to the firms around the world. Thus, he becomes an economic migrant who works for neocolonialism because

neocolonialism does not only refer to the "US management of decolonization during the post-war," but also "the international affinities or interrelationships of capitalism with imperialism and colonial ideology underlying the modern and contemporary world system" (Belletto and Keith, 2019 :5). Since the focal point of this new global system is on finance, Underwood Samson becomes an instrument of neocolonialism with the help of which neocolonialism imposes economic control over firms around the world. Being a financier at such an influential company, Changez becomes a menservant of American capitalism and one of the representatives of transnational companies striving for designating the neocolonial hegemony of the US imperialism. He attains power to decide the value of a company in Philippines and to shape its future through the financial models that neoliberalism requires. He associates his function with neocolonialism that attempts to impose indirect economic control over target countries, confessing, "[he], indirectly of course, would help decide" the future of the company (Hamid, 2008: 66). However, his career at Underwood Samson does not last long because of the 9/11 attacks not only triggering Islamophobia, but also pushing him into a dilemma questioning his identity in the US neocolonialism.

The 9/11 attacks refer to the fundamental change in neocolonial policies performed in the Middle East because the US imperialism obtains the required excuse to obtain the common consent to carry out the devastation that direct neocolonial military interventions conducted in the region. In his *Discontent and Its Civilizations: Dispatches from Lahore, New York and Lahore*, Hamid remarks that the attacks do not only undermine the cosmopolitan structure of New York promoting Islamophobia, but also drag Middle Easterner migrants into the state of inbetweenness. He suggests that "the 9/11 attacks placed great strain on the hyphen bridging that identity called Muslim-American… It seemed two halves of [himself] were suddenly at war" (2014: 43). By means of his own experiences in the US, Hamid draws a picture of neocolonial circumstances there through depicting the bias transpiring for Muslims, and his opinions become concrete through Changez's experiences after the attacks in the novel. Changez's Middle Eastern identity is associated with fundamentalism because of Islamophobia promoted by the 9/11 attacks, and he begins to question his position in the capitalist system of the US, considering the economic exploitation and physical violence that the US imperialism imposes on the peoples of the Middle East. His narrative illustrates the bias for his Middle Eastern identity, which is associated with fundamentalism, through

his experiences at the airport. He is treated as if he was a terrorist and "subjected to additional inspections" since he is a member of "a suspect race" (Hamid, 2008: 157). It also reveals that Islamophobia raises political and social reactions to Muslims throughout the US by describing the climate of fear that Middle Easterners experience: "Pakistani cabdrivers [are] beaten to within an inch of their lives; the FBI [is] raiding mosques, shops, and even people's houses; Muslim men [are disappearing], perhaps into the shadowy detention centres or worse" (2008: 94). Thus, focusing on the factors forcing him to deterritorialization from the territory to which he has migrated voluntarily as an economic migrant, his dramatic monologue also lays bare the neocolonial condition of the USA where the attacks have created Islamophobia complicating Middle Easterner migrants' lives and moulding the public opinion to support direct neocolonial practices in the region.

Furthermore, the novel exemplifies the neocolonial Middle East that the US imperialism has created since the turn of the twenty-first century with Changez' narration. As examined above, neocolonialism is the new world order, which aims to exploit target countries economically through transnational corporations and companies, puppet regimes, local elites and direct military invasions. It tends to complicate the political structures in those countries, supporting separatists or ethnic minorities and then arming them to create the chaotic atmosphere, which requires its militaristic existence as a redeemer. Hamid refers to these characteristics of neocolonialism in the novel when Erica, who is the white American woman with whom Changez has a love affair and who becomes a mediator for him to adapt to New Yorker identity, invites him to her family house to introduce him to her family. Her father remarks on the political and economic deterioration of the region uttering, "[e]conomy's falling apart though, no? Corruption, dictatorship, the rich living like princes while everyone else suffers" and explains the reason of the depravation stating, "the elite has raped that place well and good, right? And fundamentalism. You guys have got some serious problems with fundamentalism" (2008: 54). Even though these remarks are denunciatory, Changez does not regard this indictment as objectionable; however, he gets angry because of the "typically American undercurrent of condescension" that Erica's father poses while speaking (2008: 54). Even though he does not find any argument to challenge this imputation highlighting the derogation of the region, he resents her father's accusing attitude that ignores the role of the US neocolonialism in the retrogression of the region. Erica's father's attitude toward

the Middle East represents Americans' perspective for the region because while the Middle East is the source of terrorism for Americans, the locals with beard are also potential terrorists. Changez regards this perspective as the prejudice that neocolonial policies have created and opens his narrative with his reaction to this perception: "EXCUSE ME, SIR, but may I be of assistance? Ah I see I have alarmed you. Do not be frightened by my beard: I am a lover of America" (2008: 1). He implies that the association of beard with terrorism can be considered as one of the neocolonial perceptions to represent the war against terrorism in the Middle East, a war that is based on ideologically constructed false images and ill-formed principles.

Changez is critical of the political, social and economic derogation in the region, and he considers direct and indirect neocolonial practices performed by the US imperialism as underlying causes of the deterioration, exemplifying direct military interventions conducted by the US in the region and indirect economic means such as reduction of local currencies or indirect aid organization. Following the 9/11 attacks, there appear several novels that contribute to consolidating the "view of Islam as a religion of violent fanatics" and to "win[ing] hearts and minds in either Iraq or Afghanistan" (Scanlan, 2010: 266). It has created a reaction among postcolonial writers such, as Mohsin Hamid, who attempt to position themselves "on the treacherous fault-line between the binaries of terrorist discourses, between, say, native and alien, or between Islam and the secular West" and to express "silenced thoughts" which help readers establish "empathy by reading a first-person narrative" (2010: 267). This positioning enables him to reflect synchronically both the pleasure that Middle Easterners may feel upon seeing America in despair and the political and economic interventions of the US neocolonialism causing thousands of deaths in the region. Changez is a member of the Middle Eastern family having lost the wealth they used to have because of political and economic alterations that have happened in the region lately, and he likens his family to "the old European aristocracy" that lost their prestigious positions because of political and economic developments in the nineteenth century (Hamid, 2008: 10). This loss reinforces his materialism that encourages him to move to America to compensate it. His materialism indicating itself in his dedication for American dream meets on common grounds with his nostalgia for those wealthy days about which he has listened stories from his parents, which helps readers perceive his pleasure about the 9/11 attacks. He explains the reason of his pleasure about the attacks with the symbolic meaning that they have, uttering that

they obviously "[bring] America to her knees" (2008: 73). His content with the collapse of the Twin Towers is not for civilian deaths, but it refers to Middle Easterners' silenced thoughts, which can be considered as pleasure about possible collapse of the US imperialism. Even though it is not unusual for postcolonial novels to reflect 'voices of others,' his pleasure that is clearly uttered in the narrative causes the novel to be considered as a terrorist discourse. However, his pleasure indicates that he faults the US neocolonialism for economic and political deterioration in the region, and he tries to justify his pleasure throughout the narrative, revealing the initiatives that the US neocolonialism takes in the region.

He initially foreshadows the devastation that the US neocolonialism brings about in the Middle East, drawing an analogy between skyscrapers and fortresses: "Gazing up at the soaring towers of the city, [he] wonder[s] what manner of host would sally forth from so grand a castle" (2008: 79). Preparing readers for subsequent militaristic operations through this analogy, his monologue with the silent American then lays bare the beginning of extreme form of neocolonialism through physical existence of the US army in the region, stating that "the mighty host that I had expected of your country was duly raised and dispatched- but homeward, towards my family" (2008: 94). His narrative does not only deal with the political consequences of the 9/11 attacks over his country, but also reveals how the attacks enable neocolonialists to conduct political and militaristic interventions in the whole Middle East. Initially, Changez elucidates the beginning of extreme form of neocolonialism in the region through the physical existence of military posture of neocolonialists. The army sent to the region to take the revenge of the 9/11 attacks begins direct neocolonial military operations through "the bombing of Afghanistan," and there happens a war between "the American bombers with their twenty first century weaponry and the ill-equipped and ill-fed Afghan tribesmen" (2008: 99). These bombings are not just revengeful operations that can soothe Americans who are furious about the 9/11 attacks but planned operations indicating the beginning of the new colonization period because the US imperialism aims at colonizing new territories in the region through sending an army and establishing a new system maintaining its interests. As Nkrumah states, in the extreme form of neocolonialism, imperialists builds military bases in the neocolonial countries (1966: ix), the narrative associates the militaristic initiatives that the US imperialism takes in the region with neocolonialism. Changez's narrative does not only depict the contemporary Afghanistan which has been invaded by

the US imperialism on the plea of war against terrorism, but also underlines that Afghanistan has become the garrison of the US imperialism in the region, and this has enabled the spread of the US neocolonialism in the whole Middle East. Then, he underlines that founding a military base in Afghanistan strengthens the domination of the US neocolonialism in the region, and neocolonialists do not hesitate to intervene in the countries in the region politically and militarily. Political interventions are mentioned through the political tension between Pakistan and India, and his narrative directly states that India acts "with America's connivance" and US imperialism seeks "through the threat of force to coerce [Pakistani] government into changing policies" (2008: 148-149). With the help of the military posture in the region, the US neocolonialism intimidates Pakistan with military support to India at a probable war and endeavours to design its policies. Changez is critical of the US neocolonialism that tries to design the region in accordance with the new world order. Even though his critical attitude toward the policies of US imperialism in the region can be regarded as justification for the satisfaction he feels for the 9/11 attacks, it is also of significance since it reveals the progressive hegemony of the US neocolonialism in the region. Concordantly, his narrative also exemplifies the neocolonial practices performed in other countries, such as Iraq, in the region. He clearly stresses that the extreme form of neocolonialism which is associated with direct military interventions becomes a common strategy through "the invasion of Iraq" and the US imperialism conducts direct military interventions against terrorism as a means to control the whole region (2008: 178). He implies that all political and military conflicts in the region are interrelated and there is one imperial power behind them, stating that "a common thread appear[s] to unite these conflicts" (2008: 178). As Forster remarks, the 9/11 attacks enabled the US neocolonialism to consider the Middle East as the source of terrorism and to declare a war against a country in the region (2006: 24), Changez underlines that neocolonial policies of the US circle around the war against terrorism, clarifying the reason why the US imperialism fights in the region is "the advancement of a small coterie's concept of American interests in the guise of the fight against terrorism" (Hamid, 2008: 178). Briefly, Changez's narrative is not limited to the political conflicts in Pakistan after the 9/11 attacks, but sheds light on the extreme form of neocolonialism conducted by the US imperialism through military interventions in the countries, such as Afghanistan, Pakistan and Iraq.

Furthermore, Changez implies the economic hegemony that neocolonialism has built in the region since the end of the Second World War. He underlines the gradual impoverishment that Middle Easterners have experienced in the last "half-century," comparing the purchasing power of his ancestors: "my grandfather could not afford what his father could, and my father could not afford what his father could" (Hamid, 2008: 10). Nkrumah remarks that economic control of the neocolonial country is provided by "monetary control over foreign exchange through the imposition of a banking system controlled by imperial power" (1966: x) and similarly Changez regards this banking system as the reason of impoverishment, stating that "salaries have not risen in line with inflation, the rupee has declined steadily against the dollar" (Hamid, 2008: 10). Changez underlines that the impoverishment of the Middle East stems from the systematic neocolonial methods which not only weaken the countries economically in the region, but also make them dependent on neocolonial aid organizations. Critics, such as Kwame Nkrumah, Frantz Fanon and Robert Young, accentuate that charities that are ruled by foreigners are the instruments which enable neocolonialists to leach into target countries and to militate their policies through financial aids (Nkrumah, 1966: xv, ;Fanon, 1967: 121, ;Young, 2016: 47). Analogically, Changez likens his country to a beggar who is in need of foreigners' help to survive and questions the function of charities ironically. When the beggar approaches them and the silent American recommends him not to give money to the beggar, but to donate money to charities, Changez acknowledges him to be right, uttering: "Very wise; one ought not to encourage beggars, and yes, you are right, it is far better to donate to charities that address the causes of poverty rather than him, a creature who is merely its symptom" (Hamid, 2008: 40). However, he does otherwise and gives money to the beggar, which indicates that his abovementioned opinions on charities are ironic, and he knows charities are dysfunctional. Furthermore, he clearly utters that there is an aid organization that is ruled by "a coordinator" appointed by the US, and it allegedly tries "to deliver development assistance to [his country's] rural poor" (2008: 181). His critical attitude toward the helpless condition of his country is consistently emphasized throughout his narrative. He does not concede the current neocolonial condition of his country and considers it as the consequence of neocolonialism, comparing the current neocolonial circumstances with the past:

"For we were not always burdened by debt, dependent on foreign aid and handouts; in the stories we tell of ourselves we were not the crazed and destitute radicals you see on your television channels but rather saints and poets and—yes—conquering kings. We

built the Royal Mosque and the Shalimar Gardens in this city, and we built the Lahore Fort with its mighty walls and wide ramp for our battle-elephants" (2008: 101-102).

In brief, his narrative informs readers that economy of his country has become weak due to neocolonial policies, especially banking system and control of currencies, and this economic deterioration has enabled neocolonialists to utilize aid organizations to pretend to work for locals while militating internal policies.

Consequently, *The Reluctant Fundamentalist* becomes prominent as a novel which lays bare the consequences of neocolonial practices both in the Middle East and the USA. In his dramatic monologue, Changez considers the 9/11 attacks as the beginning of extreme form of neocolonialism and delineates the political, social and economic chaos that neocolonialism has created in the Middle East. He sheds light on the destruction carried out by the US neocolonialism with a critical tone. Besides, he also emphasizes that the attacks create Islamophobia which associates Muslim migrants with terrorism and reveals the difficulties they experience in such a xenophobic society. Referring to the political stance that Changez acquires against the US neocolonialism due to the destruction it causes in the whole Middle East and against the Islamophobia which considers him a potential terrorist, his narrative highlights the identity problems that Muslim migrants in the US experience through the feeling of inbetweenness and unbelongingness, implying that those neocolonial consequences deterritorialize them both physically and literally.

2.4 Unbelongingness of Middle Easterner Migrants and Neocolonial Deterritorialization in *The Reluctant Fundamentalist*

In *The Reluctant Fundamentalist*, Mohsin Hamid deals with the effects of neocolonialism on Middle Easterner immigrants who are otherized by the neocolonial atmosphere which emerges as a consequence of the 9/11 attacks. While the novel lays bare the collapse of Changez's American dream, it also indicates that xenophobia which transpires in the West because of neocolonial policies performed in the Middle East does not allow Muslim immigrants to achieve their goals but deterritorializes them, questioning their identities and pushing them into dilemmas, ambivalence and inbetweenness. Changez is an economic immigrant who voluntarily leaves his country to regain the wealth his family has lost because of the economic alterations in the country. As an ambitious immigrant, he graduates from Princeton University and works at one of the most prestigious finance companies in the USA. He enjoys pretending to be American and experiencing the comfort his new life offers until the 9/11 attacks deterritorialize him from the society where he tries to adapt. Thus, he returns to his country and works at a university where he tries to inform students about American imperialism. In the novel, Hamid lays bare how neocolonialism deterritorializes Middle Easterners by initially promising them a future in cosmopolitan America where immigrants can establish hopeful lives and then otherizing them as potential terrorists due to the 9/11 attacks.

In *The Reluctant Fundamentalist*, neocolonial deterritorialization begins with Changez's migration to the USA because there is a direct relationship between the economic downturn caused by neocolonial exploitation in his country and his family's impoverishment in that new economic structure. Changez regards his archetypal journey to the USA as "a dream" which "come[s] true" with his acceptance to Princeton because this does not only enable him to become a global citizen of cosmopolitan society but also to regain the wealth his family has lost (Hamid, 2008: 3). The US capitalism measures his employability through difficult tests and interviews, and then he becomes the manservant of the neocolonial economic hegemony of the US. His main motivation in this archetypal journey stems from economic disadvantages that he and his family experience in his country. He focuses on the economic decline in his country, comparing the opportunities that his great grandfather, grandfather and father used to have with his economic impotency. He exemplifies that his ancestors used to be so rich that his great-grand father could "endow a school" and both his grandfather and father could afford to

"[attend] university in England" (2008: 9). His family house is in "one of the most expensive districts of this city" and there are "several servants including a driver and a gardener" (2008: 9-10). However, then, he remarks that they are not rich anymore even though all members of the family "are working people, professionals" (2008: 10). He associates the impoverishment of his family with the economic decline in his country and regards inflation and significant depreciation in the rupee as the main factors of this impoverishment, which implies the "banking system" and "foreign exchange" that Nkrumah underlines as indirect neocolonial methods utilized to control the economy of target countries (1966: x). He obviously illustrates the economic decline of his family with "a growing inability to purchase what [they] previously could" and remarks, this economic turndown caused by neocolonial policies forces locals to oscillate between two options: "[to] pretend all is well or work hard to restore things to what they were" (Hamid, 2008: 11). Hamid's characterization which highlights Changez's fondness on money and luxury meets on common grounds with Changez's deterritorialization because he implies that he does not have an option to regain the economic loss of his family apart from leaving his country. Hence, his migration to the USA indicates that the neocolonial economic decline in his country deterritorializes him and encourages him to migrate to overtake the dead end that neocolonialism has created in the region.

Changez's physical dislocation ascribes nomadism to his identity that attempts to adapt new characteristics in his archetypal journey. During deterritorialization, identity is defined as a process of becoming in which subjects undergo alterations through the interactions in new territories. While this nomadism hinders stability of identity, it also pushes subjects into a state of inbetweenness (Deleuze and Guattari, 2005: 293). His nomadism begins with his volunteer exile to the USA and his physical dislocation coincides with his divergence from Middle Eastern roots, which does not only push him into a state of inbetweenness but also transform his identity into a nomad. His nomadic identity is perceived through his willingness to adapt to the American society because Deleuzian nomadic identity occurs through "the cultivation of the self" and it pushes subjects into a state of inbetweenness, which does not only provide those with "subjectivity," but also prevents them from "the notion of fixed identity" (Oladi and Portelli, 2017: 666). As Deleuze and Guattari remarks, "the nomad reterritorializes on deterritorialization itself," nomadic subjects get rid of boundaries of fixed identity and struggle for subjectivity through possibilities that new territories offer. In the novel,

Changez's migration to the USA and his struggle for new possibilities to settle in his new territory can be associated with nomadism that is subsequent to deterritorialization. He confesses that his reterritorialization is not problematic because he has the capability that the US capitalism requires and he is eager to be a part of it, stating that he is "expected to contribute [his] talents to [the American] society [he is] joining. And for the most part [he is] very happy to do so" (Hamid, 2008: 4). As a hungry economic migrant, Changez finds a position at Underwood Samson Company, which has "the potential to transform [his] life" and his reterritorialization into both a new territory and identity begins. (2008: 14). His first day at the company betokens his transformation because he confesses that he does not "think of [himself] as Pakistani" and he, "as an Underwood Samson trainee," feels prideful about "[his] firm's impressive offices" (2008: 34). His pride indicates that he does not only start to feel as if he were an American, but he also considers himself as a part of the firm symbolizing the US neoliberalism. What enables him to feel belongingness to the firm can be clarified with the cosmopolitan structure of the firm where financiers from various races work, and Changez underlines this characteristic of the firm, expressing that they are "marvellously diverse… and yet [they are] not" (2008: 38). While the diversity of the trainees stresses the hybridity of the company, their similarity implies the fundamental characteristics they need to establish economic hegemony of neocolonialism. The hybrid structure of the company meets on common grounds with New York where various migrants maintain their cultures, which helps Changez reterritorialize into the new territory. When he wears "a starched white kurta of delicately worked cotton over a pair of jeans," he feels "completely comfortable" on the streets of New York, and he remarks that what ensures that comfort is the "cosmopolitan nature of New York in those days" (2008: 48). Moreover, the facilitative effect of the cosmopolitan structure of New York in his adaptation can be perceived through the process of reterritorialization because Deleuze and Guattari remark that reterritorialization is not "a return to a primitive or older territoriality" but it may involve in "a set of artifices by which one element, itself deterritorialized, serves as a new territoriality for another" (2005: 174). They underline the function of similarities between territories in reterritorialization process and suggest that subjects tend to reterritorialize into similar territories. Similarly, Changez regards the similarity between Lahore and New York as a facilitative factor in reterritorialization, stating that the similarity is "one of the reasons why for [him] moving to New York [feels], so unexpectedly, like coming home" (Hamid, 2008: 32). Having been deterritorialized from his country since he does

not have an option to compensate his family's economic loss, he becomes a volunteer nomad whose identity is open to alterations triggered by possibilities around him, and his reterritorialization in the new territory is encouraged by the cosmopolitan structure of New York and by Underwood Samson which provides him with the economic power and prestige that he wishes.

These new territories promote him to experience new possibilities for subjectivity and Changez's nomadic identity undergoes a process of adaptation to new territories. Deleuzian deterritorialized identity is regarded as a process of becoming which refers to permanent constitution of self through experiencing various possibilities to adapt to new subjectivities (Oladi and Portelli, 2017: 666). Changez's deterritorialization from his country and his volunteer migration to the USA also brings about such an adaptation process in which his identity undergoes alterations. He regards his deterritorialization as an American dream, endeavours to feel like a New Yorker and glories in both his company and his new identity. He expeditiously begins to obtain what his American dream promises, and he utters his jouissance, saying that he feels "bathed in a warm sense of accomplishment. Nothing trouble[s him; he is] a young New Yorker with the city at [his] feet" (Hamid, 2008: 45). He is besotted with his dream to be recognized as a New Yorker because when he is on holiday in Greece, he regards the ancient castle in Rhodes as a wall separating the East from the West and indicates the alteration in his identity, uttering that "How strange it is for [him] to think [he] grew up on the other side" (2008: 23). He is aware of "how soon [his life] would change" and he is ready to experience the possibilities that those changes will bring (2008: 45). When he flies to Malina for his first duty at the company, he underlines the possibilities for subjectivity and his reterritorialization into New Yorker identity through one of the most popular idol American characters:

> "When I arrived in the Philippines at the start of my first Underwood Samson assignment, I was terribly excited. We had flown first-class, and I will never forget the feeling of reclining in my seat, clad in my suit, as I was served champagne by an attractive and—yes, I was indeed so brazen as to allow myself to believe—*flirtatious* flight attendant. I was, in my own eyes, a veritable James Bond—only younger, darker, and possibly better paid" (2008: 63-64).

He confesses that he feels like a New Yorker and experiences the possibilities his job offers with amazement. Since he is a materialist immigrant who abandons his country for a wealthier life, New Yorker identity promising luxury and prestigious life initially pushes him into state of inbetweenness and then transforms him into a younger and darker

version of James Bond. Besides, New York, the new territory he endeavours to reterritorialize, offers him new possibilities to form subjectivity to delineate the concept of home. When he visits Erica's family's penthouse, he associates the flat "with luxury" and he has "a peculiar feeling; [he feels] at home" (2008: 49-50). Even though he cannot perceive the reason why he feels so for their penthouse, readers can easily perceive that what enables him to feel at home is its reference to wealthy and luxury American way of life. Furthermore, not only do his feelings manifest the transformation of his identity in his reterritorialization process, but also his behaviours indicate that his reterritorialization transpires through mimicry. Homi Bhabha delineates mimicry as "the desire for a reformed, recognizable Other" (1994: 86) and Changez attempts to imitate his colleagues to be recognized and begins to pretend to be American:

> "I did something in Manila I had never done before: I attempted to act and speak, as much as my dignity would permit, more like an American. The Filipinos we worked with seemed to look up to my American colleagues, accepting them almost instinctively as members of the officer class of global business—and I wanted my share of that respect as well" (Hamid, 2008: 65).

The alterations that his identity undergoes become concrete through his such behaviours, and it becomes clear that his nomadic identity attempts to reterritorialize into Americanness to be recognized. He also takes his attitude a step further and proves that he has embraced his new identity and is ready to fight for it. To illustrate, when he is stuck in traffic in a limousine in Manila, he gazes out of the window and notices that a Filipino driver is glaring at him. As a reaction, he "stare[s] back at him, getting angry [himself]… and [he maintains] eye contact until [the driver is] obliged by the movement of the car in front to return his attention to road" (2008: 67). He remarks that he does not know why he has behaved so because they have not met before and will probably not meet again. Even though Changez narrates this anecdote to emphasize the anger neocolonial subjects feel for Americans who have impoverished their countries, his reaction also hints for his identification with Americanness because he reacts to the driver as if he was American. Hence, Changez's volunteer deterritorialization paves the way for his reterritorialization into new territories where his nomadic identity experiences a state of inbetweenness and undergoes alterations while endeavouring to adapt to new territories.

In addition to the cosmopolitan structure of New York and the prestige that Underwood Samson promises, another factor which catalyses Changez's

reterritorialization into a new identity is Erica, a white American woman. Scanlan remarks that Erica is a metaphor for America and "Erica is the best of America" since she is "open to cultural difference" and "welcomes Changez into her home and shares with him her insider's world-the chich heart of New York City" (2010: 274). She is not only the woman whom he falls in love with, but she also enables him to coalesce his new identity with her white Americanness and her prestigious life. She has everything what his reterritorializing identity demands; she is white American and his relationship with her doubtlessly contributes much to his recognition in the society. She also introduces him to the high society in New York, inviting him to the parties and they visit art exhibitions together, which enables him to experience the possibilities that his transforming identity promises. What she means for Changez is more than a woman because she does not only stand for Changez's missing parts in adapting to new possibilities for subjectivity in his reterritorialization, but also for a catalyser which introduces him prestigious and luxury American way of life about which he dreams.

However, Changez's reterritorialization does not refer to a permanent accommodation because Deleuzian nomadic identity is always in a state of betweenness and ongoingness endowing it with subjectivity which prevents it from fixed identity. Deleuze and Guattari clarify the idea of nomadology through their well-known term, rhizome, referring to the wild plants which, unlike trees growing upwardly, enlarge laterally and whose beginning and extreme points are not accurately known; thereby, gaining them characteristics of having decentred and multiple structures. They define it as "a system" which "subtract[s] the unique from the multiplicity to be constituted" (2005: 6) because a rhizome is a "subterranean root" that "ceaselessly establishes connections" which causes difference in "roots and radicles" (Miller, 1993: 11). The rhizomic perspective enables delineation of identity not as a being, but as a process of becoming because it accumulates possibilities "while it passes between points," and it "is not defined by points it connects, or by points that compose it" because "it comes up through the middle" (Deleuze and Guattari, 2005: 293). At the core of Deleuzian nomadic identity lies the multiplicity that subjects acquire during reterritorialization into new territories and Changez's reterritorialization shows such characteristics of multiplicity promoted by state of inbetweenness. In the initial part of his narrative, he does not overtly confess that he experiences inbetweenness, but hints for the fact that he experiences dilemmas in his reterritorialization. He admits that even though the New Yorker identity that he tries to

adapt promises him everything he dreams about, there is something missing because he cannot "forget such things as how much [he] enjoy[s] the tea in this, the city of [his] birth" (Hamid, 2008: 19-20). His state of inbetweenness can also be perceived through his ambivalence in his reterritorialization process. He considers himself odd among his colleagues and he explains the reason why Erica smiles at him on their first acquaintance with his being "oddly anachronistic" (2008: 17). On the other hand, he defines the Rhodes castle as the frontier separating the East from the West and regards his birth on the Eastern side of the wall as "strange" (2008: 23). His ambivalence about his belongingness proves that his nomadic identity accumulates the possibilities during his reterritorialization and becomes rhizomic since it transforms his root.

Even though Changez, in the initial parts of his narrative, avoids confessing his ambivalence and inbetweenness since he blames the US neocolonialism for his failed American dream, he also prepares readers for his ultimate transformation through Erica, whose character analysis on Changez underlines his state of inbetweenness. To demonstrate, even though Changez and Erica do not spend much time together, she, on the second day of their acquaintance, makes his character analysis:

> "You give off this strong sense of home, she said. "You know that? This I'm-from-a-big-family vibe. It's nice. It makes you feel solid." I was pleased—even though I was not sure I fully understood—and said thank you for want of anything better to say." (2008: 19-20).

While Changez endeavours to adapt to his new identity in the West, she implies that he is an Easterner who has strong family bonds indicating his belongingness. His pleasure for her remarks proves that he is aware of his inbetweenness because while he pretends to be an American, he is also content with his characteristics stemming from his traditional Middle Easterner identity. Peter Morey specifies that Changez's narrative in *The Reluctant Fundamentalist* is a "hoax confessed" which "effectively parodies the cultural certainties the reader's identification through hyperbole, strategic exoticisation, allegorical layering and unreliable narration" (2011, 136). When Changez's unreliable narrative is taken into consideration, one can enunciate that Erica's abovementioned character analysis on Changez can be his intentional strategy because Changez regards the US neocolonialism as the reason of his failed American dream, and this may direct him to reflect his inbetweenness through her character analysis.

Although Changez admires the system and power of the US in the initial part of his narrative, his ideas and tone for the US neocolonialism undergo radical alterations

during his archetypal journey. In Deleuzian terms, his nomadic identity acquires new perspectives from outer spaces he reterritorializes, and the dissatisfaction that he feels for his country's wretchedness created by the US neocolonialism leaves him in a state of inbetweenness when he compares his country with the US. Even though he voluntarily endeavours to reterritorialize into his new identity which promises anything he desires, he feels dissatisfied for the inequality between the US and his economically, politically and socially wretched country, uttering:

> "Often, during my stay in your country, such comparisons troubled me. In fact, they did more than trouble me: they made me resentful. Four thousand years ago, we, the people of the Indus River basin, had cities that were laid out on grids and boasted underground sewers, while the ancestors of those who would invade and colonize America were illiterate barbarians. Now our cities were largely unplanned, unsanitary affairs, and America had universities with individual endowments greater than our national budget for education. To be reminded of this vast disparity was, for me, to be ashamed" (Hamid, 2008: 34).

This comparison makes a breach in his American dream because his admiration for the US begins to transform into a critical perspective to the US neocolonialism, which will deterritorialize him again. Moreover, this breach becomes larger with his first business visit to Malina, in the Philippines, because he expects to "find a city like Lahore-or perhaps Karachi," but "what [he finds] instead [is] a place of skyscrapers and superhighways" (2008: 64). This comparison associates his countries wretchedness with the US neocolonialism and paves the way for his radical transformation through the end of his American dream.

His business trip to Manila becomes more of an issue since it not only specifies how his country's wretchedness promotes him to pretend to be American, but it also sheds light on the state of inbetweenness he experiences during his reterritorialization into Americanness. In his trip, he observes that there may be countries which are socially, economically, and politically in better conditions than his country, and this increases his dissatisfaction. He questions himself, stating that he feels "like a distance runner who thinks he is not doing too badly until he glances over his shoulder and sees that the fellow who is lapping him is not the leader of the pack, but one of the laggards" (2008: 64). With the help of this runner metaphor, he implies that his country's condition is worse than other countries that he considers inferior to his country. This creates an inferiority complex, and he begins to embrace his Americanness more tightly, stating that he has done something he has never done before, and he pretends to be "more like an American"

(2008: 65). The inferiority complex triggered by his country's wretchedness urges him to assume the American attitude which lays bare his state of inbetweenness:

> "So I learned to tell executives my father's age, "I need it now"; I learned to cut to the front of lines with an extraterritorial smile; and I learned to answer, when asked where I was from, that I was from New York. Did these things trouble me, you ask? Certainly, sir; I was often ashamed. But outwardly I gave no sign of this. In any case, there was much for me to be proud of: my genuine aptitude for our work, for example, and the glowing reviews my performance received from my peers" (2008: 65).

Even though his inferiority complex induces him to behave like his American colleagues, he also unburdens that he hides his shame since he behaves so. On the other hand, he is also proud of his capacity to do the duty professionally. Briefly, he thinks that he is the right person to do the job, but he also feels self-conscious about what he is doing. Furthermore, he narrates another incident which underlines that his inferiority complex makes him lay claim to the hostility felt for Americans in neocolonial countries. When he is in a luxury car which is stuck in traffic, he notices that a driver of a jeepney looks at him angrily. Proving that he has embraced his New Yorker identity in the luxury car, he glares at him till the car moves (2008: 66-67). His reaction to the driver demonstrates that he even embraces the hatred felt for Americans, and his nomadic identity embarks on all possibilities he encounters in his reterritorialization. On the other hand, his exposure to such hostility in Manila forces him to question his identity because he perceives that the driver is angry with the US neocolonialism that he represents in the limousine. He clarifies the probable reasons behind the driver's hostility, uttering that "perhaps [the driver] resents [him] for the privileges implied by [his] suit and expensive car; perhaps he does not like Americans" (2008:67). These reasons imply the economic hegemony that the US neocolonialism has established all around the world, and Changez builds a juxtaposition with the limousine which represents the wealth his American dream promises and the jeepney which stands for the poverty that neocolonialism causes in the Third World countries. This juxtaposition enables him to question his existence, as a neocolonial nomad, in the limousine, and he notices his unbelongingness to the group in the limousine when a question by one of his colleagues draws his attention to his colleagues in the car. He suddenly realizes that he is "so foreign" in that luxurious car, and he should be out of the car and walking towards his home (2008:67). The driver's hostility results in his awakening on his unbelongingness because even though he is in the limousine and has all the power and prestige that his position vows, he becomes aware of the fact that he does not belong there, but he should be one of those neocolonial subjects who react to

neocolonialists exposing poverty to them, as the driver has done. Changez underlines the impact of this incident on him, stressing that it becomes an internal feud for him, and it is difficult for him "to sleep that night" (2008:67). Hence, his business trip to Manila becomes a turning point in his reterritorialization into Americanness because the fact that Manila is economically and socially better than his country causes him to feel uncomfortable about his existence as a representative of the US neocolonialism and encourages him to adhere to congener hostility towards the practices and consequences of the US neocolonialism.

Changez proves to be a true nomad, converting his admiration for the US into hostility through the possibilities he encounters in his archetypal journey. Making an analogy between nomadic identity and "a stream without beginning or end that undermines its banks and picks up speed in the middle," Deleuze and Guattari regard it as a process of becoming which comprises of through interactions with outer spaces (2005: 25). Changez's physical dislocation from his country due to the lack of economic opportunity that he needs to achieve his goals requires him to experience a process of adaptation in which he develops an identity at Underwood Samson. His effort for adaptation refers to his nomadic identity that is defined not as a being, but becoming because new possibilities that he collects through interactions with territories result in transformations in his behaviours and ideas. However, as Deleuze and Guattari remarks, "a becoming is neither the one nor two, nor the relation of the two; it is the in-between" (2005: 293). Changez's becoming harbours characteristics which indicate that he is in between his Middle Eastern and New Yorker identities. Even though he determinedly endeavours to embark on opportunities and requirements that his position at Underwood Samson demands, his narrative unfolds that his identification with the driver enables him not only to perceive the reason of the hostility the driver feels, but also to incite him to act, as a neocolonial subject. Briefly, while his business trip to Manila reveals that his nomadic identity accumulates new possibilities which create a state of inbetweenness through his interactions with new territories, it also sheds light on his awakening to the impoverishing effect of the US neocolonialism which will deterritorialize him again.

Furthermore, his trip to Manila drags him into a more intense state of inbetweenness with the pleasure that he feels for the 9/11 attacks, and he finds himself in a dilemma between his adaptation desire and hostility for the US neocolonialism. His pleasure with the 9/11 attacks indicates the internal conflict he experiences because even

though he endeavours to be a part of the system in the US, he feels delighted with the attacks to the system. He clarifies that even though he is "not indifferent to the suffering of" innocent people, what makes him feel pleased with the attacks is "the symbolism" they represent because he is very pleased to see America in despair (Hamid, 2008:72-73). His pleasure urges him to question his existence because although he is "the product of an American university," earns "a lucrative American salary" and is "infatuated with an American woman," he "desire[s] to see America harmed" (2008:73). His realization about the immiseration impact of the US imperialism on neocolonial countries through the incident he experiences with the local driver meets on common grounds with his pleasure with the attacks, and these incidents intensify his state of inbetweenness because they enable him to perceive new possibilities to build for subjectivity during reterritorialization.

His subjectivity process is directly influenced by the consequences of the 9/11 attacks which enable the US neocolonialism not only to utilize direct and indirect means to maintain the exploitation in the Middle East, but also to form public opinion to support direct military operations in the region. As Forster remarks that the 9/11 attacks ensure the required excuses that the US imperialism needs to launch a military operation in the Middle East for the sake of war against terrorism (2006: 23), Changez frankly mentions the political tensions triggered by the US neocolonialism which inspirits the countries in the region to wage war with each other and the direct military operations performed by the US neocolonialism. Besides, he also underlines the Islamophobia which attracts supporters in the US after the terrorist attacks and regards both the military campaigns in the region and Islamophobia rising in the US as significant factors which create a state of inbetweenness and deterritorialize him from his American dream. To demonstrate, he rakes together the influence of "the mighty host" that is sent "towards [his] family in Pakistan" and "the rumours" he hears about beaten "Pakistani cab drivers," raids organized by the FBI to "mosques, shops and even people's houses" and "Muslim men" who are disappearing in the city (2008:94). He regards the 9/11 attacks as a catalyser which expedites direct military interventions of the US neocolonialism with the help of the astroturfing which is formed by glorifying Islamophobia in the US. This political landscape, both in the US and in the Middle East after the 9/11 attacks, influences his nomadic identity, causing him to experience Islamophobia and to feel discontent with the US neocolonialism in the region. He lays bare his state of inbetweenness in his

reterritorialization into his New Yorker identity by asking a question to himself and answering it as follows:

> "I wonder now, sir, whether I believed at all in the firmness of the foundations of the new life I was attempting to construct for myself in New York. Certainly I wanted to believe; at least I wanted not to disbelieve with such an intensity that I prevented myself as much as was possible from making the obvious connection between the crumbling of the world around me and the impending destruction of- my personal American dream" (2008:93).

He confesses that he is eager to be recognized as a New Yorker even though he feels discontent with the social and political consequences of the attacks both in the US and the Middle East. He reveals that the power and prestige that his position at Underwood Samson protects him from Islamophobic prejudices and enables him to maintain his adaptation process because he remarks that he is a Princeton graduate who earns "eighty thousand dollars a year" and "such things [happen], in America as in all countries, to the hapless poor" (2008:93). Although he is in between his desire for American dream and his political stance for his country and neighbours, he attempts to ignore the political landscape with the help of his "armour of denial," and focuses on his job where he climbs up the ranks of meritocracy (2008:95). Hence, even though the consequences of the attacks begin to disturb him, pushing him into a state of inbetweenness, he ignores them and holds on his American dream.

His state of inbetweenness which is formed by his American dream that makes him a representative of the US neocolonialism and by his political stance for direct military invasions becomes more intense in the course of his narrative. In addition to his abovementioned denial, Jim, his supervisor at the company, consistently tries to persuade him to admit the alterations that his corporate identity promises. Jim remarks that time requires alterations, uttering that "times only moves in one direction. Remember that. Things always change" and recommends him not to be demotivated by potential obstacles before his transformation (2008:95). Jim, in fact, advises him about the workers at the firm that he inspects because they undervalue the significance of alterations and try to dissuade Changez from working on alterations that he will recommend helping the firm solve economic problems. However, Jim associates the workers' resistance against alterations with the political and economic change that started with appearance of neoliberalism in the history of the world and tells an anecdote which refers to neoliberalism:

> ""When I was in college," he went on, "the economy was in bad shape. It was the seventies. Stagflation. But you could just smell the opportunity. America was shifting from manufacturing to services, a huge shift, bigger than anything we'd ever seen. My father had lived and died making things with his hands, so I knew from up close that that time was past"" (2008:96).

Jim warns Changez that those who are against alterations cannot survive and he should comply with the alterations. Brown suggests that neoliberalism changes "the focal point of capitalism from labour to finance (2015: 75), and similarly Jim states that "the economy is an animal" which "evolves," and its evolution ascribes great significance to "finance" (Hamid, 2008: 96-97). Jim underlines that he has embarked on the alteration neoliberalism requires and encourages Changez to do the same because he is in "the coordination business" and in the right position to utilize the power that the US neocolonialism ensures (2008:97). Jim tries to help Changez notice that his American dream will come true if he goes on, and even though Changez thinks that there is "a certain ring of truth to [Jim's] words," he is discontent with "the idea that the place [he comes] from [is] condemned to atrophy" (2008:97). In in spite of Jim's persuasion and Changez's desire for American dream, Changez's inbetweenness deepens, as the US neocolonialism becomes more violent in the Middle East. His zeal to be a part of the US neocolonialism is precluded by direct neocolonial invasions in the region. Even though he endeavours to "focus on the fundamentals" and to fulfil his duty at the company, as Jim recommends, his concentration is broken by the news which broadcasts bombings of the region ebulliently. He reveals what he feels when he witnesses the US neocolonialism ruins the region:

> "What left me shaken, however, occurred when I turned on the television myself. I had reached home from New Jersey after midnight and was flipping through the channels, looking for a soothing sitcom, when I chanced upon a newscast with ghostly night-vision images of American troops dropping into Afghanistan for what was described as a daring raid on a Taliban command post. My reaction caught me by surprise; Afghanistan was Pakistan's neighbor, our friend, and a fellow Muslim nation besides, and the sight of what I took to be the beginning of its invasion by your countrymen caused me to tremble with fury. I had to sit down to calm myself, and I remember polishing off a third of a bottle of whiskey before I was able to fall asleep" (2008:99).

Watching live the invasion of the Middle Eastern countries transforms his dissatisfaction into wrath, and he can no longer pretend to ignore what is happening in the region and he becomes "aware of the embers glowing within [him]" (2008:100). Çelikel remarks that "US becomes the source of [Changez's] Occidentalist reconstruction of America's political history after 9/11 attacks which [makes] him realise his non-western identity and

his cultural refrain from the western ideological dominance" (2020: 880). Changez recognizes that he feels "treacherous" in the "fictitious" atmosphere created by the US neocolonialism after the attacks because while he does not feel the same emotions that Americans do, he also pretends to be a Westerner and goes on being a representative of the US neocolonialism which ruins his country and its neighbours. Thus, Changez's inbetweenness deepens due to the increasing social and political tensions both in the US and in the Middle East.

Although Changez endeavours to cover his inbetweenness, focusing on the fundamentals of his job and savouring the prestige his position ensures, the incident that he experiences with two men who shout at him "Fucking Arab" demesmerizes him from his assiduous ignorance and pushes him into a questioning of his belongingness. He is aware of what they mean; he is "not, of course, an Arab," but he perceives that they condemn him as a terrorist (Hamid, 2008:117). While their imputation exasperates him, it also urges him to overhold his fellow citizens who are overgeneralized as terrorists by neocolonial discourse, and he finds himself on the way to his country. His journey also lays bare his unbelongingness because he perceives that he does not belong the Western identity he tries to adapt due to terrorism ascribed to his nationality. On the other hand, he also notices that his nomadic identity has accumulated possibilities through interactions with outer factors during reterritorialization and he has obtained an American perspective. Upon seeing "how shabby [his] house appear[s]," he compares it with the luxury dwellings he has seen in the US, and he becomes both "saddened" and "ashamed" (2008:124). However, then, he regards the characteristics his nomadic identity has obtained as alienation:

> "But as I reacclimatized and my surroundings once again became familiar, it occurred to me that the house had not changed in my absence. *I* had changed; I was looking about me with the eyes of a foreigner, and not just any foreigner, but that particular type of entitled and unsympathetic American who so annoyed me when I encountered him in the classrooms and workplaces of your country's elite" (2008:124).

Perceiving his alienation through introspection stimulates him to form belonginess to his country, and he decides to extirpate his Americanised view and strikes an attitude that takes a stand against the US neocolonialism. As an indicator of his belongingness to his country, he grows beard and feels ready to fight against the neocolonial discourse regarding him as a terrorist due to his religion and nationality. Enabling him to perceive his alienation and to observe the destructive effect of extreme form of neocolonialism on

his family and country, his journey amplifies his state of inbetweenness. He begins to regard himself as "a traitor" who ignores the wretchedness of his family and country, and he questions his existence in America where he is treated as a potential terrorist and his relationship with Erica, who does not love him (2008:128). His journey has a great significance on his subjectivity because it offers new possibilities creating unbelongingness for him, and the period which begins with two men's imputation considering him a terrorist comes to an end with his journey. During this journey, his nomadic identity accumulates new possibilities which do not only underline his unbelongingness to the West, but also his tendency to stand against the US neocolonialism, and his subjectivity is formed by the adjustments he makes within the light of these possibilities.

The alterations that his nomadic identity undergoes can easily be discerned by comparing the difference of his overview on the US after his first and second journeys to the US. His first journey provides him with the opportunity to compensate the wealth his family has lost. He regards his Princeton acceptance as "a dream" that "come[s] true," and while it enables him to live in a beautiful country, it also provides him with the opportunity to be educated by "professors who are titans in their fields" and to spend time with "fellow students who are philosopher-kings in the making" (2008:3). This dream also gives him the chance to feel as if he were at home due to the cosmopolitan structure of New York where taxi drivers speak Urdu or where he can eat traditional food of his country (2008:32-33). The professional opportunities that Princeton promises, and the cosmopolitan structure of New York expedite his adaptation, helping him feel "a young New Yorker with the city at [his] feet" (2008:45). Besides, his dream renders possible his marriage to a white American woman, Erica, with the help of whom he supposes that his adaptation to the cosmopolitan New York will be completed. However, the 9/11 attacks, which are not only the consequences of the US neocolonialism in the Middle East, but also triggering factors of neocolonial invasions in the region, transform the meaning of his existence in the US, and Changez, who is an economic migrant dreaming about being a part of the cosmopolitan New York, becomes an individual who does not maintain either western or non-western identities. The attacks have a great impact on Middle Easterner migrants in the West because "the destruction of twin towers of the World Trade Centre also topple[s] the twin towers of Islam and the West" and it pushes them into a state of inbetweenness resulting in alterations in their identities (Nishat Haider, 2012: 205). On

his return plane to the US, there sits utterly different Changez who regards his desire for American dream as treachery, and his hatred for his selfishness is so strong that he does not want to speak or eat (2008:129). Even though he used to feel as if he endenizened in cosmopolitan New York, it becomes the centre of Islamophobia where he is "subjected to verbal abuse by complete strangers" on the subway due to his beard after the attacks, (2008:130). Direct military invasions of the US neocolonialism in the Middle East increases his sensibility for his family and country, and he is "no longer excited by the luxuries" that his position at Underwood Samson ensures and he regrets accepting his last duty in Chile (2008:140). Thus, due to consequences of the US neocolonialism, Changez transforms from a volunteer and ambitious economic migrant into an individual who questions his existence in the US.

Like his journey to Manila, his business trip to Chile promotes his nomadic identity to undergo alterations which will result in his ultimate deterritorialization. His reterritorialization is efformed by the abovementioned outer factors, and he has undergone a metamorphosis. Even though he used to be an ambitious migrant doing his utmost to reach his goal, he begins to expostulate the sedulity of the vice president of the publishing company that he inspects:

> "I could not respect how he functioned so completely immersed in the structures of his professional micro-universe. Yes, I too had previously derived comfort from my firm's exhortations to focus intensely on work, but now I saw that in this constant striving to realize a financial future, no thought was given to the critical personal and political issues that affect one's emotional present. In other words, my blinders were coming off, and I was dazzled and rendered immobile by the sudden broadening of my arc of vision" (2008:145).

Changez is critical of the vice president because he supposes that the vice president sets the interest of the company before personal and political issues, and Changez's attitude does not only imply that he is guilt ridden, but he is also aware of his transformation. Nevertheless, he cannot dare to abandon his American dream, but despondingly waits for it. Although he knows he is "on the threshold of great change," he needs a "final catalyst" which prompts him to take an action for his personal and political sensibilities (2008:150). What prompts him takes the form of an old man, Juan-Bautista, the manager of the company supervised by the Underwood Samson. Bautista completely opens the eyes of Changez through his analogy of janissaries, by proving that he is one of the representatives of the US neocolonialism that does not only exploit the Third World countries economically, but also ruins them physically:

> ""They were Christian boys," he explained, "captured by the Ottomans and trained to be soldiers in a Muslim army, at that time the greatest army in the world. They were ferocious and utterly loyal: they had fought to erase their own civilizations, so they had nothing else to turn to" (2008:151).

Bautista's portrayal of Changez's function at Underwood Samson thrusts through Changez's armour of denial which has so far enabled him to keep on working even though he experiences inbetweenness. He acutely questions his existence in the mechanism of the US neocolonialism through "a deep bout of introspection" provoked by Bautista's words and concludes that he has metamorphosed into an agent of the US neocolonialism:

> "I spent that night considering what I had become. There really could be no doubt: I was a modern-day janissary, a servant of the American empire at a time when it was invading a country with a kinship to mine and was perhaps even colluding to ensure that my own country faced the threat of war" (2008:152).

Even though he feels dissatisfied with the US neocolonialism that has been destroying the Middle East with the military invasions that have been performed since the 9/11 attacks, he, for the first time, perceives his contribution to the US neocolonialism through Bautista's analogy of janissary. He illustrates the financiers at Underwood Samson as "the officers of the empire" and feels "torn" (2008:152). Briefly, his final business trip to Chile as a representative of the US neocolonialism results in emergence of the new characteristics that his nomadic identity accumulates with the help of Bautista who procures "considerable momentum to [his] inflictive journey" (2008:146). Hence, his American dream comes to an end due to the transformation in his feelings and thoughts about the US neocolonialism during his journeys, and he returns to Pakistan where he organizes the youth at the university where he works against the US neocolonialism.

However, his return to his county does not refer to an unproblematic adaptation to his country after those journeys during which he accumulates new characteristics. It underlines the impact of the changes that his nomadic identity experiences on his roots because he feels unbelongingness to his country where he has returned. His transformation can also be perceived from the rhizomic perspective of the Deleuzian understanding because while it consists of the alterations his nomadic identity undergoes during his reterritorialization; it also embodies the mutation his root undergoes in that process. As a system that Deleuze and Guattari employ to clarify nomadology, rhizomic perspective refers to multiplicity that also occurs through alterations of root due to perpetual connections. Similarly, Changez's deterritorialization from his country enables him to establish connections which will result in mutation in his root, and he perceives

that he belongs to “a no-man’s land” that is “nonlocalizable” for him due to the transformation he has undergone (Deleuze and Guattari, 2005: 293). This transformation creates a state of inbetweenness which makes him a neocolonial nomad with the feeling of unbelongingness, and he confesses what he feels, uttering that he “lack[s] a stable core. [He is] not certain where [he] belong[s]-in New York, in Lahore, in both, in neither” (2008:148). Besides, when Changez explains to the unknown man how he feels aftermath of his departure, he reveals his inner uneasiness which indicates his inbetweenness and unbelongingness, expressing that he has “returned to Pakistan, but his inhabitation of [the unknown man’s country has] not entirely ceased” and he is “unable to relocate in the city of [his] birth” (Hamid, 2008:172). His country becomes nonlocalizable for him because his transformation creates differences on his self, and he stresses the influence of such archetypal journeys on people, stating that “we cannot constitute ourselves as the autonomous beings we previously imagined ourselves to be. Something of us now outside, and something of the outside is now within us” (2008:174). Changez finds himself in his country with the feeling of unbelongingness because his journeys result in big differences, and he is not the same man anymore.

Changez regards Erica as the reason of his failure at adapting to his country because he remarks that he has a love affair with her, and this makes his reterritorialization into his country difficult. He confesses that he has “remained emotionally entwined with Erica, and [he has] brought something of her with [him] to Lahore-or perhaps it would be more accurate to say that [he has] lost something of [himself] to her” (2008:172). Like several critics, Lindsay Anne Balfour remarks that Erica is the metaphor of America, and Changez’s unsuccessful relationship with her represents his failed American dream (2017: 214). His relationship with her corresponds to his adaptation to non-Western identity, and America’s moderate foreign policy for immigrants before the 9/11 attacks takes shape of a woman with Erica who ignores cultural differences and takes him in her house where he feels like he is at home. However, their relationship breaks with the attacks because she is caught with a nostalgia of past which reminds him of her ex-boyfriend, Chris. She becomes estranged from Changez as the US does through the Islamophobia that emerges after the attacks. Despite his efforts to keep with her, he cannot manage to maintain his relationship with her, which, in fact, implies his failed American dream. Through his love story with Erica, Changez’s

narrative underlines that his emotional bond with the US, which can be defined as an unfinished romance for both Erica and America, beclouds his adaptation to his country.

Consequently, *The Reluctant Fundamentalist* becomes prominent as a post 9/11 novel which does not only reveal the consequences of the 9/11 attacks both in the US and the Middle East, but also lays bare the deterritorializing impact of the attacks on Middle Easterner migrants in the West. Initially, the novel reflects through the story of Changez that Middle Easterners becomes deterritorialized voluntarily by following their own American dream since the US neocolonialism has disposed them off the chance to live the life they dream about in their countries. Changez is one of those Middle Easterners migrating to the US to realize his dream and his migration becomes an archetypal journey in which he quests for a true identity and a sense of belonging in the territories that he is dragged by neocolonialism. Changez's journeys, which start with his initial deterritorialization by neocolonialism forcing him to migrate to the US to regain the wealth that his family has lost due to the new world order, and which continue with his business trips that help him perceive he has become an agent of the US neocolonialism, result in fundamental alterations in his identity. These alterations that he undergoes during his adaptation process meet on common grounds with Deleuzian nomadology which regards identity not as a being but becoming that harbours alterations due to the interactions with outer spaces. His deterritorialization is followed by a process of reterritorialization during which he both voluntarily and involuntarily creates subjectivities through his experiences in new territories. Even though he is keen on cultivating a self to adapt to the Western identity that his position at the company ensures, the Islamophobic atmosphere in the US and the ongoing and upcoming military invasions by the US neocolonialism subvert his alacrity to become a citizen of cosmopolitan New York. He transforms from an economic migrant ready to do utmost to be recognized into a neocolonial subject who stands against the neocolonial hegemony ruining his country. The social and political atmosphere in the US and the Middle East that have been designed by neocolonialist policies dislocates him from the US, and his return to his country gives birth to a deterritorialized neocolonial nomad who is an in-between citizen to 'a no-man's land' where he is not a native, but a nomad.

2.5 Neocolonial Deterritorialization in *Exit West*

This chapter aims to analyse how neocolonialism performed in the Middle East compels locals to deterritorialization and how their physical nomadism coincides with alterations in their identities. Firstly, the chapter starts with a short part that lays an emphasis on Mohsin Hamid's tendency to deal with the refugee crisis taking place in the first quarter of the twenty-first century. Regarding his life as deterritorialized because of the consistent migrations he has experienced, the part remarks that he, as a Middle Easterner witnessing the contemporary refugee crisis with first-hand experience, inclines to deal with the consequences of migrations. Secondly, the chapter examines the neocolonial circumstances in *Exit West* and considers them as the factors subjecting locals to migrate to safer parts of the world because extreme form of neocolonialism destroys political, social, and economic structures of life in the region. It closely examines how those structures are destroyed by an extreme form of neocolonialism and they do not leave any options for locals apart from abandoning their countries, underlining the similarities between the unnamed city in the novel and the Middle Eastern cities that have been ruined by neocolonialism. Thirdly, the chapter deals with the consequences of neocolonial deterritorialization on the protagonists, Nadia, and Saeed, who become neocolonial nomads in their search for a home. It also examines their archetypal journeys in which their identities indicate alterations and how their nomadic identities influence their adaptations to new territories. Consequently, focusing on the circumstances created by neocolonialism in the unnamed city, this chapter analyses the effects of deterritorialization on contemporary neocolonial migrants.

2.6 The Extreme Form of Neocolonialism in the Middle East in *Exit West*

Mohsin Hamid, who has closely observed the contemporary migration waves from the Middle East to the West in both his own homeland and in other Middle East countries since the beginning of the twenty-first century, focuses on how imperialists' military practices in the region compel locals to migrate to safer territories in *Exit West* (2017). The novel revolves around a young couple, Nadia and Saeed, who decide to migrate through magical doors to the West since they discern that they cannot live in the city of their birth due to the increase of war and terrorism. Hamid is of the opinion that "migration is a fundamental right" and he reflects his opinion in *Exit West*, benefiting from magical realism "to defamiliarize our prior knowledge of illegal crossing" (Asaad, 2020: 77-78). He avoids delineating difficulties experienced by refugees on the way to safer lives or tragic voyages that end with refugees' corpses on the shores, but he utilises magical doors enabling them to pass borders easily. His attitude sounds logical because he thinks that migration is a substantive right and borders should not take away refugees' right to migrate. Thus, he, in *Exit West,* fictionalizes a world where refugees can cross borders through magical doors and dilutes the effect of borders on migration, which helps him ignore the most rigid obstacle before the right to migrate. In this regard, the utilization of magical realism is also opportune since it is a literary mode, which enables writers to look for alternative answers to the questions that cannot be solved with empirical attitudes (Faris, 2004: 7). That is to say, refugees' journeys that are full of challenges, arduousness, catastrophes and tragedies are too problematic to be solved with empirical methods. Thus, Hamid needs an alternative method to offer a solution to the contemporary refugee problem happening in the twenty-first century, and he employs magical realism through magical doors, which enables him to focus more on the deterritorializing consequences of neocolonial practices on refugees, instead of drawing attention on difficulties experienced by refugees on boats, buses, or trucks.

By means of magical doors that keep refugees from hardships of illegal migration, Hamid designs the novel as eleven chapters five of which depicture the neocolonial circumstances in Nadia and Saeed's city of birth while six remaining chapters focus on the deterritorializing consequences of those circumstances. Hamid fictionalizes the story in an unnamed city, yet readers can effortlessly perceive that it represents the cities that have become chaotic with imperialists' interventions and invasions since the beginning of the twenty first century in such Middle Eastern countries as Iraq, Afghanistan,

Pakistan, and Syria. In his interview with Alex Preston in *The Guardian*, Hamid frankly stresses that the city Nadia and Saeed flee is Lahore, but he could not give it that name since he could not stand writing about Pakistan's collapse[2]. Nevertheless, in his *Exit West* review in *The New York Times*, Viet Thanh Nguyen elucidates that the violence, terrorism and atrocity narrated in the novel evoke the events experienced in other Middle Eastern cities, such as Mosul and Aleppo. In his writing, Hamid attempts to promote "the blurring of boundaries: not just between civilizations or people of different groups, but also between writer and reader" (Hamid, 2014: 17). Concordantly, letting the city be unnamed in the novel, he blurs cities' boundaries, sets readers free, and enables readers to associate the city with other Middle Eastern cities that have experienced the same atrocities.

Exit West, published in 2017, is one of the earliest literary responses to the contemporary migration waves from the Middle East to the West, and Hamid deals with the "political and humanitarian crisis" that a number of "displaced people" have caused in neighbouring countries and Europe (Perfect, 2019: 2). On the other hand, to read *Exit West* as a novel which just depicts the challenges that refugees experience in their search for new homes can be deficient because five chapters of the novel lay bare the circumstances that obligate locals to migrate to safer spaces. In this regard, the novel can also be read to analyse the neocolonial circumstances that have triggered the deterritorialization of locals.

As examined in the initial chapter of the study, US imperialism began to show interest in the Middle East with the Cold War. It came to the region to fight against communism and supported the Middle Eastern countries with international aid organizations and direct military aids. During the Cold War, the US imperialism conducted all neocolonial methods and agencies to control the region, which increased the US hegemony throughout the Middle East. When the Cold War ended, the US imperialism had to make a new excuse to stay in the region and it conducted new strategies such as "the struggle against "rogue states"; a clash of civilizations; a war on the global drug trade and humanitarian intervention" (Foster, 2006: 23). These strategies helped the US imperialism increase its hegemony in the region, performing direct military interventions in the region, and then with the 9/11, the US imperialism began to perform

[2] For further information, visit the link: https://www.theguardian.com/books/2018/aug/11/mohsin-hamid-exit-west-interview

the extreme form of neocolonialism in the Middle Eastern countries. Concordantly, *Exit West* is a contemporary novel, which summarizes the devastation and deterritorialization experienced by locals in such Middle Eastern countries as Iraq, Afghanistan, Pakistan, and Syria.

The novel opens with a description of a city that allows irregular immigrants and is becoming chaotic: "[I]n a city swollen by refugees but still mostly at peace, or at least not yet openly at a war" (Hamid, 2017: 1). This first sentence not only foreshadows the war waiting at the door, but also hints for the function of refugees in creating chaos in the hosting territory. Even though Hamid regards migration as "a fundamental right," he is also aware of the problems that refugees may create, implying that the city is swollen by refugees who have come irregularly. This striking beginning sentence of the novel has drawn the academic circle's attention. It may seem to be "pejorative" since it blames just them for the current "debilitating ailment" in the hosting territory (Perfect, 2019: 7). Yet, it sounds to be logical when the novel's approach to refugees is taken into consideration because they are depictured throughout the novel as outsiders who may subvert the order in the hosting territory. Furthermore, Perfect suggests that with the help of such a beginning sentence in which there are "no adjectives or other descriptions assigned to" refugees, Hamid deprives them of their individuality and treats them as "a collective" (2019:7). This also explains the overgeneralization that functions throughout the novel to regard refugees as the cause of deterioration in territories. Even though it seems to be paradoxical for Hamid, as an advocate of migration, to draw such an image for refugees, he opens the novel with such a sentence on purpose to underline the falsity of overgeneralization about refugees. The authorial voice of Hamid reflects the inner voice of locals, whether in neighbouring countries or in Western cities, whose territories are captured by refugees dislocated by neocolonial practices. Those locals are indifferent, and they do not empathize with refugees. Thus, he fictionalizes two characters, Nadia and Saeed, who behave indifferently towards refugees in the early parts of the novel and who become refugees in the course of the novel, to enable readers to feel empathy with refugees. That is to say, Hamid endeavours to imply that migration is not an abnormal phenomenon when it becomes an option to leave or die and, he normalizes it through Nadia and Saeed, who become neocolonial nomads in the course of the novel.

In addition to his effort to arouse empathy for refugees, Hamid is also adamant on depicturing the neocolonial circumstances compelling them to abandon their home. To

unfold how neocolonialism functions in third world countries, especially in the Middle East, he begins the story with a description of an unnamed city that is exposed to irregular migration. Even though he does not clarify where those refugees have come from, readers can make an inference that they come from a neighbouring country or from another city where neocolonial military interventions have already begun. Obviously, such a beginning helps readers associate the city with other Middle Eastern cities, such as Aleppo, Mosul or Lahore, which not only become vulnerable because of those irregular migrations, but also new targets of neocolonialists since fundamentalist terrorists blend into the refugees. This evocation enables readers to acquiesce to the subsequent atrocities experienced in that unnamed city since similar ferocity has been conducted by neocolonialism in the abovementioned cities.

Since the turn of the twenty-first century, neocolonialism has manifested itself through its ultimity: deterritorialization. Hamid, in this context, accomplishedly portraits how neocolonialism begins, proceeds and completes its mission through the collapse of the target country where locals, both the ones preferring to migrate and stay, undergo a process of deterritorialization. The beginning of neocolonialism in Hamid's unnamed city, in fact, indicates the end for a neighbouring country where locals are obliged to flee to survive. Fictionalizing such a city pouring refugees, Hamid not only provides readers with an opportunity to observe the beginning and ultimate end of neocolonialism together, but also foreshadows the dramatic future waiting for Nadia and Saeed. Herewith, Hamid makes the protagonists live in the city swallowed by refugees and enriches the text with descriptions evoking the contemporary refugee crisis in the second decade of the twenty first century. To clarify, the circumstances he reflects in the novel evoke the 2010s, which "witnessed a hot-debated global migration crisis following the civil war in the Middle East" (Salahudheen, 2017: 381). During that period, a vast number of Middle Eastern peoples, inferentially 11 million, were forced to migrate to find a safe shelter since their homes were ruined by neocolonial military interventions (2017: 381). Undoubtfully, being influenced by what those refugees experienced to clutch onto life in their search of new homes, Hamid mirrors this contemporary migration crisis in the novel.

In addition to the opening sentence examined above, Hamid's authorial voice portrays the condition of neighbouring cities that let in a great number of immigrants during this flow of refugees through the description of the unnamed city in the novel. Initially, the narrator frankly states that a great number of refugees who try to set a new

life occupy the city, by setting up tents or building unsound structures all around the city (Hamid, 2017: 25). Then, he depictures the tragedies refugees experience in new territories, writing that they sleep "rough on pavements and in the margins of streets" and try to hold onto life in hovels they build with "a sheet of plastic propped up with branches and a few chipped bricks" (2017: 25). These descriptions evoke refugees' photographs seen on the social media or newspapers during the abovementioned migration crisis.

However, Hamid's objective is not just to arouse sympathy through these descriptions, but he attempts to dive into the minds of readers through his authorial remarks to enable them to feel empathy with both locals and refugees. To clarify, he opens the paragraph likening the condition in the unnamed city to an 'occupation' carried out by refugees who, like soldiers in invasions, set up tents or build sheds. The disarray of the city is similar to the one that is exposed to the flux of soldiers because of an invasion. Here, it is obvious that he narrates from the point of locals who speculate that refugees are invading the countries without firing a gun. On the other hand, the narrator does not maintain consistency to make propaganda on an idea, but shifts perspectives, leaving readers with a question in their minds whether to feel empathy with locals or refugees who are regarded as opposites throughout the novel. To clarify, in the same paragraph, in which the narrator considers refugees' arrival as an occupation, the narrator alters the former perspective with the one that induces readers to query refugees' living conditions. For instance, the narrator explicitly delineates that refugees sleep on "pavements and in the margins of streets" and they struggle to lead a life in hovels made from "a sheet of plastic", "branches" and "a few chipped bricks" (2017: 25). Here, the perspective shifts from locals to refugees and the narration enables readers to empathize with refugees who make an effort to lead a normal life in such hovels or tents "as if it were completely normal" (2017: 25). Having induced to question the normality submitted to refugee's harsh living standards, readers also penetrate refugees' minds through the narrator's explanation on their feelings for the locals. Refugees are subjected to live under these circumstances as if it were normal and they feel "anger, or surprise, or supplication or envy" (2017: 25). In the novel, the sentence including these words clarifying refugees' feelings follows the one that underlines that such a life in the periphery is regarded as if it were normal, and this encourages readers to feel a stronger empathy with refugees. Hence, even though Hamid is aware of the fact that irregular migration brings problems,

he produces a narrative in which changing perspectives urges readers to superimpose themselves on both refugees and locals.

On the other hand, his attitude towards neocolonial migration can be considered paradoxical since his narrative consists of both pejorative adjectives and authorial comments arousing empathy for refugees. This can also be perceived through Hamid's postcolonial identity because he is a writer who spent his childhood in the US, his teenage in Lahore, his young adulthood in the US and his adulthood both in the US and London. Besides, even though he also has British citizenship and produces novels in English, he has decided to live in Lahore and observed the contemporary migration crisis triggered by neocolonial military interventions. Thus, as a postcolonial writer whose literary works have references to his own experiences and observations, his hesitant attitude towards neocolonial migration can be perceived through the concept of ambivalence. The term refers to the complicated relationship between the colonizer and colonized and objects to stereotypical representations since that relationship involves "complex mix of attraction and repulsion" (Ashcroft et al., 2007: 10). Hamid's authorial voice bears the stamp of ambivalence through its attitude towards neocolonial migration because readers discern that while the narrative seems to be critical of refugees and accuse them of occupying the city, it also harbours the feeling of pity for refugees, as the colonizer feels for the colonized. Moreover, the narrator's ambivalence manifests itself through the adjectives utilized to illustrate how refugees react emotionally to the normality attributed to their living conditions: "[refugees] stared at the city with what looked like anger, or surprise, or supplication, or envy" (Hamid, 2017: 25). The narrator implies that refugees are angry with locals, but at the same time, they are also jealous of them. Refugees wish to change places with locals with whom they are angry. In other words, while they are angry with them, they also want to be like them. Furthermore, the narrator remarks that refugees are surprised since locals allow them in their country, but at the same time, refugees are ready to beg locals to let them in or to supply their requirements. Refugees are ready to beg for an attitude that is surprising for them. These two examples indicate that Hamid's narrator is ambivalent in depicting neocolonial migrants' emotions for locals because, as Bhabha suggests, their attitudes toward locals embody "an articulation of multiple belief" (1994: 82). Even though the unnamed city is not in the West and locals are not Westerners, neocolonial migrant's inconsistent feelings towards locals are of significance because while the narrative attempts to portray how neocolonialism starts in a neighbouring

country in the Middle East through irregular migration, it also implies the concept of ambivalence experienced during this migration.

Hamid, in *Exit West*, does not only aim to foreshadow the unfortunate future waiting for Nadia and Saeed through depicting such an unnamed Middle Eastern city exposed to irregular refugee flow, but he also endeavours to lay bare how direct and indirect neocolonial means overpower social, economic and political structures in target territories. As analysed before, the refugee crisis delineated in the early chapters of the novel evokes the contemporary refugee crisis that have happened since the beginning of twenty first century. While these parts recall the neighbouring Middle Eastern cities that have been exposed to irregular refugee flows, they can also be read to comprehend how neocolonialism benefits from these flows to spread to the whole region. In *Discontent and Its Civilizations: Dispatches from Lahore, New York and Lahore*, Hamid argues that the US imperialism started the war against terrorism, launching a "military intervention in Afghanistan in 2001" and terminated the threat of al-Qaeda, but "the US troops" in the region have conducted many "counterinsurgency operations" not only in Afghanistan but also in Pakistan (2014: 164). Hamid explicitly underlines that the US imperialism did not hesitate to launch military operations in the neighbouring countries on the plea of war against terrorism. While such military interventions enable neocolonialism to spread to neighbouring countries, they also create internal disturbance that becomes an excuse for neocolonialism to intervene in that country in the long term. Hamid remarks that these military interventions do not count for the war against terrorism but "[undermine] counterterrorism in Pakistan (2014: 164) because they do not distinguish between locals and terrorist and aim at both of them to clear the area, which results in more than four hundred civilian deaths including more than one hundred and sixty children (2014: 162). He emphasizes that these military interventions are not supported by locals but force local people to take side with extremists, and this becomes an opportunity for neocolonialism to interfere with the region. Based on his own witnesses and experiences in his own country, Hamid, in the novel, reflects such an atmosphere in which the government allies to neocolonialists who provide the government with military aids to fight against terrorists. However, this alliance does not succeed because of inefficacy in the war against terrorism, and it does not restrain neocolonialists from intervening in the target country because of the sympathy or support to fundamentalists. Hamid tacitly states that such unsuccessful military operations causing many civilian deaths do not only increase the

domestic disturbance in the country but also the sympathy with fundamentalists. He underlines that terrorists do not organize terrorist actions, such as bombings or shootings, anymore, but take over "territories" such as a "building" or "an entire neighbourhood" (Hamid, 2017: 48). Then, he clarifies that even though terrorists' expansion is a mystery, it can be perceived with the support from locals, writing that "the militants were well known to have sympathizers within" the city (2017: 48). Fictionalizing such a city where terrorists and the government in alliance with neocolonialists create a war-torn city, he accomplishedly ensures a snapshot of a Middle Eastern city that not only depictures how neocolonialism ruins the city through violence, but also lays bare how it undermines the target territories socially, economically and politically.

Extremist terrorist groups have always been tools for the US imperialism that it has employed for its interest. During the Cold War, the US imperialism took advantage of Islamic fundamentalists and equipped them with armament in their fight against the Soviets in Afghanistan (Farhang, 1993: 1). Similarly, Hamid is of opinion that the US imperialism is responsible for the neocolonial Middle East. He articulates that the US formed an alliance with Islamic fundamentalists in the war against the Soviets in Afghanistan and it created "a dramatic process of social engineering called Islamization" (2014: 110). Then with the fall of the Soviets, the US withdrew from the region, "wash[ing] its hands of its militant co-creations" and left behind the armed fundamentalists who would cause bloody civil war in the region (2014: 139). Those who had been regarded as freedom fighters in the war against the Soviets became terrorists when the US imperialism needed an excuse to justify its existence in the region. That is to say, terrorist groups equipped with Western weapons became enemies. In fact, this is a strategy utilized by neocolonialists and Nkrumah clarifies this writing "sooner or later the weapons supplied pass into the hands of the opponents of neo-colonialist regime and the war itself increases the social misery which originally provoked it" (1966: xvi). Similarly, in *Exit West*, there happens a war between a government in alliance with neocolonialists and terrorist groups equipped with neocolonialists' weapons. Hamid reflects the neocolonial condition that has been affecting the countries in the Middle East. He creates the unnamed city where soldiers and terrorists equipped with Western armament prove how extreme form of neocolonialism deterritorialize locals, destroying all dimensions of life and leaving no safe territory to live.

The narrative consists of plenty of descriptions reflecting the neocolonial atmosphere in the unnamed city where the level of violence is increasing incrementally. Initially, the novel opens with a paragraph that describes the setting as the city "swollen by refugees" (Hamid, 2017: 1). Even though the paragraph does not refer to any direct violence experienced by the two characters of the novel Saeed and Nadia, it signals the destiny of the city will change in the course of the novel. Stating that the city is "at least not yet openly at war," the narrator foreshadows the subsequent war including great deal of physical violence. Besides, this paragraph also underlines the psychological violence resorted to locals, stating that on those days when Nadia and Saeed meet, they "enjoy the luxury of wearing more or less what they [want] to wear, clothing and hair wise" (2017: 1). While the nostalgia for those days emphasizes the retrogressive alteration in social life, it also prepares readers for the psychological violence that emerges in the course of the novel. Briefly, in the first paragraph where the narrator introduces the setting and protagonists, Nadia and Saeed, readers become aware of the fact that neocolonial militarism, which is created by the government in alliance with neocolonialists and terrorist groups once equipped by neocolonialists, will inflict physical and psychological violence on locals. Furthermore, the narrator explicitly delineates the city as the one "teetering at the edge of abyss" and indicates that violent days are soon. Meanwhile, the city is not completely secure because even though it does not "experience any major fighting" but "just some shootings and the odd car bombing," violent terrorist actions regarded as minor happen there (2017: 2). Though they seem to be minor when the subsequent violence in the novel is considered, Hamid fictionalizes such a gradual political deterioration on purpose because he accomplishedly lays an emphasis on how neocolonialism edgingly penetrates the Middle East on the plea of war against terrorism.

The violence in *Exit West* is not limited to terrorist actions such as shootings or car bombings, but it encapsulates all kinds of actions leading up the neocolonial military intervention to support the allied government. In this context, in addition to mentioning those actions signalling the political deterioration in the city, the narrator, through the end of the first chapter, frankly, states that the city will be demolished by either terrorists who want to advance or government forces who want to stop them. The destruction of the city is narrated through the house where Saeed's family live with a feeling of nostalgia for the old days before the neocolonial period. The house is described to be "a once handsome building" which is "a once upscale" and has a "view that command a slight premium

during gentler, more prosperous times" (2017: 9). Then, the narrator explicitly stresses that the house which used to have an advantageous location and remarkable beauty "would be squarely in the path of heavy machine gun and rocket fire as fighters advanced in this part of the city" (2017: 9). Furthermore, the narrator informs that the city, which is told to be not in the war yet, will soon face the war triggered by neocolonialism and underlines that the destruction would be swift (2017: 9). Having prepared readers for the forthcoming war, the narrator allows them to hear its converging voice and lays an emphasis on the closeness of the war through the end of the first chapter, writing that "in the distance Saeed's family heard the sound of automatic gunfire, flat cracks that were not loud yet carried to them cleanly" (2017: 15). Thus, the narrator, through such a beginning, increases an expectancy for militaristic violence, which helps depicture the extreme form of neocolonialism.

In pursuit of the first chapter functioning as a medium that enables readers to perceive how neocolonialism spreads to neighbouring territories and how it progresses there through incremental violence, the narrator provides readers with several violent occasions which indicate that neocolonialism creates an atmosphere that compels locals to hover between staying in their homeland or migrating to a safer home. The spiral of violence around Nadia and Saeed starts with the death of Nadia's cousin in a suicide blast (2017: 29). The narrator does not name her cousin because he stands for numerous Middle Eastern men who have lost their lives in such bombings. In the novel, his function is not limited to an emphasis on those numerous nameless locals who have died in terrorist attacks, but he refers to the uneasiness that induces refugees to flee the territory of their birth. The narrator clarifies this inducement, writing "[i]n times of violence, there is always that first acquaintance or intimate of ours, who, when they are touched, makes what had seemed like a bad dream suddenly, evisceratingly real" (2017: 28). For Nadia, who leaves home for her freedom and who wants to stand on her own feet (2017: 18), choosing one of the family members to be killed in a terrorist attack is not appropriate because she is not a lady whose family bonds are strong. Yet, fictionalizing such a tragic end for her cousin who seems to have achieved Nadia's goal, to make a new life for herself, the narrator reflects what can induce Nadia to extricate herself from the spiral of violence. On the other hand, Hamid chooses Saeed's mother as the victim of violence, and she is murdered by "a stray heavy-calibre round passing through the windscreen of her family's car" (2017: 72). This choice makes sense because Saeed is a patriarchal man

who is described to have strong family bonds. Thus, losing his mother through unfortunate violence creates the uneasiness which induces him flee his homeland. Moreover, the narrative increases their anxiety through terrorists' moving in their neighbourhoods. To clarify, terrorists' subjugation of their neighbourhoods refers to a threat to the concept of home Nadia and Saeed create: while Nadia, as a single woman in such a patriarchal society, loses her home where she stands on her own feet, Saeed, as a passionate member of patriarchy, loses his home where he wishes to start his family and to be their keeper. When their dreams are shaken with terrorists' moving in their neighbourhoods, the narrator, through an omniscient third person narration, reveals their anxiety triggered by neocolonial violence practiced in the city. While Nadia wants to leave home since she "acknowledge[s] that this [is] no longer a city where the risks facing a young woman living independently could be manageable" (2017: 72), Saeed "desperately want[s] to leave the city" since he loses the opportunity to be the protector of his family there (2017: 89). In short, to depicture how neocolonialism creates spiral of violence compelling individuals to deterritorialization, the narrator equips the text with clear examples indicating that neocolonial violence surrounds Nadia and Saeed with the deaths of those from immediate surroundings and the loss of homes where they experience their true identities.

However, *Exit West* does not remain limited to the violence surrounding their individual lives but lays bare how neocolonial violence affects the whole city socially, culturally and economically. One of the first violent incident affecting the whole city is terrorists' seizure of the stock exchange. Hamid artfully initiates this far-reaching violence in the stock exchange, which is one of the most strategically significant units that neocolonialists utilize to control target countries politically through indirect economic means. Neocolonialism has utilized neoliberalism that "ushers in a new order of economic reason, a new governing rationality, new modes and venues of commodification"; thereby changing the focal point of capitalism from labour to finance (Brown, 2015: 75). Stock markets have become indispensable institutions with the help of which neocolonialists can manipulate the target country economically. In this regard, its seizure stands for an attack to neocolonialism, and the reaction of neocolonialists in alliance with the government is considerably acute. To underline the severity of seizure for neocolonialists, the narrator writes that it is terminated "by afternoon" (2017: 40). Besides, the narrative implies that the stock exchange is inviolable in the neocolonial

world order because it functions as a means ensuring continuity of neoliberal economic exploitation in target countries. The narrator tacitly suggests that the significance attributed to the lives of hostages is "less than" the seizure (2017: 40) and points out that this problem is solved at all costs, writing that "the building [is] stormed with maximum force, and the militants [are] terminated, and initial estimates put the number of dead workers at probably less than a hundred" (2017: 40). "[T]he army" considers the seizure as a threat to "national security" and launces a bloody operation resulting in not only deaths of terrorists but also innocent hostages (2017: 40). Yet, to associate the seizure with national security seems to be paradoxical because the city fails to have the characteristics of national security with flows of irregular refugees, suicide attacks, sounds of gunfire and bombs. The fact that whether this violence is conducted by the army to fight against terrorism and ensure national security or it is a reaction for the attack to the instrument of neocolonialism indicates that neocolonialism creates a chaotic atmosphere through violence. Hence, depicturing such a violent incident in the stock exchange, Hamid not only reflects neocolonial violence transpiring in neocolonial Middle Eastern countries, but also stresses on the role of neocolonialism to create chaos in such countries.

In the Middle Eastern city, Hamid creates in the novel, the level of violence in the war between terrorists and the government increases day-by-day, representing the fervent period that the region has experienced since the turn of the twenty first century. Instead of organizing terror rampages, terrorists start to carry out military actions such as capturing a neighbourhood as if they are regular forces and controlled by professionals (2017: 48). Even though the government declares a curfew to stop the terrorists' advancement in the city, it fails because of the support enlisted by locals to terrorists and the number of the neighbourhoods terrorists control increases one by one. They advance through the inner parts of the city and at last, they take control of the neighbourhoods where Nadia and Saeed live (2017: 76-77). The change in the balance of power in the city enables the government to become more aggressive, which reflects the war-torn Middle East countries becoming war zones where terrorists and governments supported by the West fight cruelly. In the novel, Hamid reflects the poignant experiences of Middle Easterners who find themselves in the middle of horrors of war. Locals begin to face perils of war with first hand experiences. For instance, Saeed incurs the wrath of an air strike when he is in the bath (2017: 48). Furthermore, the narrator depicts the night when

terrorists launch raid on the flat where Saeed and Nadia live. Terrorists examine the family's identity cards to check whether they are members of the sect that is identified as infidel and enemy. Their names are not associated with the sect; however, their neighbours are not as lucky as they are because the man is beheaded. As many Middle Easterner locals do, Saeed and Nadia closely experience the harshness of war, which induces them to migrate, and the narrator writes:

> "The dead neighbour bled through a crack in the floor, his blood appearing as a stain in the high corner of Saeed's sitting room, and Saeed and Nadia, who had heard the family's screams, went up to collect and bury him, as soon as they dared, but his body was gone, presumably taken by his executioners, and his blood was already fairly dry a patch like a painted puddle in his apartment" (2017: 79-80).

In the world of the novel, such violence becomes ordinary, which, in fact, reflects the contemporary condition the Middle East. The unnamed city becomes uninhabitable because of extreme violence that any local can encounter on an ordinary day. One of the most striking examples, which indicates the extreme point that violence can reach, is teenager's playing football with a head removed from a body. While Saeed's father returns from the graveyard, he sees young boys playing football. When he comes closer to the group, he firstly likens the ball to a goat head, but then notices that it is a human head. He also discerns that those playing football are not young boys but just teenagers (2017: 82). This incident enables reader to perceive the extreme point that violence reaches in the region. Letting teenagers play football with the human head, the narrator portrays a city, which reflects savage incidents that have been occurring in such Middle Eastern countries as Iraq, Pakistan, Afghanistan and Syria. Furthermore, this incident clues in the anxiety that forces locals to migrate. It accentuates that the unnamed city, where savagery becomes mundane even among teenagers, becomes undwellable. Through the depiction of such a scene in which teenagers play football with the human head having "beard" which can be the indicator of its local identity, the narrator also implies that being subjected to such violence becomes ordinary for locals and their city of birth are not safe anymore.

The insecure condition of the city does not only stem from terrorists' brutal actions, but also from military operations launched by government forces without making distinction between locals and terrorists. This evokes Hamid's remarks on military operations supported by the US in the war against terrorism. He is critical of the civilian deaths caused by those campaigns under cover of war against terrorism. Referring to the

reports indicating civilian deaths caused by those campaigns in Afghanistan, he questions the "legality of US drone strikes" which also kill those who live in territories under control of terrorists without making distinction between locals and terrorists (2014: 162). *Exit West* clearly reflects his ideas on this neocolonial attitude towards locals. In the novel, locals who are exposed to savagery during terrorists' advance through their neighbourhoods begin to experience the ravage of technologically well-equipped military operation when terrorists take control of the whole neighbourhood:

> "As the militants secured the city, extinguishing the large salients of resistance, a partial calm descended, broken by the activities of drones and aircraft that bombed from the heavens,…, and by the public and private executions that now took place almost continuously, bodies hanging from street lamps and billboards like a form of festival seasonal decoration." (2017: 81).

As is seen, locals are caught in the savage grip of violence. They may be beheaded since they do not support terrorists, or they are not members of the same sect with terrorist. Or they may be executed randomly or be killed by heavy bombings just because they live in a neighbourhood under the control of terrorists. Hamid's authorial voice remarks that executions and punishments, whether from terrorists or the government, in the city are "alleged with a degree of randomness" and provides a snapshot of the region clarifying that both sides jointly create a neocolonial hell that promotes locals to migrate (2017: 81).

Delineating the neocolonial atmosphere in the city that is full of severity, *Exit West* also reveals its consequences on social, economic and cultural spheres. All forms of violence examined above deteriorate every aspect of life in the city, and such impairment closens readers to feel an empathy with Hamid's idea that migration is a fundamental right. To support his idea and enable readers to comprehend the anxiety refugees feel to stay or migrate, he enriches the narrative through violent examples that indicate the breakdown of social life in the city. Hamid opens the novel with the chapter underlining that locals used to have normal and sociable lives in the city where the social life begins to deteriorate because of violence and refugee flow both of which are, in fact, consequences of neocolonialism. To emphasize the effect of neocolonialism on social life, the narrator articulates that Saeed and Nadia are not as lucky as Saeed's parents who used to have the opportunity to enjoy the social life in the city that is now on the edge of war (2017: 11). The narrator also shares the love story of Saeed's parents who meet at the cinema, who come together at bookshops to argue about different ideas, who spend time reading together at cafes and restaurants after marriage (2017: 10-11). Then, the narrator

frankly expresses that the city has undergone many differences, and places, such as cinemas, bookstores, restaurants and cafes, where people used to socialize are not accessible anymore. Besides, the narrator exemplifies the closures in the city with a Chinese restaurant where Saeed and Nadia meet and informs that the family who used to run the restaurant has "sold up and emigrated to Canada" (2017: 19). The narrator reveals that the family turn up the city after the Second World War and live there for three generations and implies that they, then, are obliged to leave the city because of the breakdown in social life (2017: 19). On the other hand, in addition to implications for deterioration of social life, the narrator, in the course of the novel, specifies in a plain language that one of the places where they meet for lunch is shut down: "Saeed [goes] to their usual burger joint at lunchtime, but Nadia [does not] show, and the day after that, when he [goes] again, the restaurant [is] shuttered, its owner perhaps having fled, or simply disappeared" (2017: 57). Here, the narrator obviously emphasizes that the reason of shuttering is nothing but neocolonial violence that forces people to flee or sweeps them off. Briefly, in *Exit West*, Hamid fictionalizes the unnamed city where he not only depictures the violence neocolonial practices cause, but also how they leave no place for locals to socialize.

While these shutdowns refer to the impairment of social life for those who socialize there, they also point out the breakdown of economic structure for those who own those places. In the unnamed city, neocolonial atmosphere leaves a room neither for residents who need those places to enjoy life nor for owners who finance their lives through those places. Even though the narrative stresses the general economic disruption in the city through the seizure of the stock exchange at the beginning of the novel, it also sheds light on the influence of economic deterioration on individuals through these shutdowns. Moreover, the narrator dwells on the influence of economic disruption created by neocolonialism on individuals, depicting the deterioration that Nadia and Saeed experience in their workplaces. In the novel, the narrator explicitly articulates that the unnamed city experiences economic recession and attributes it to "mounting unrest," which is examined as the consequence of neocolonial policies performed in the city (2017: 4). Saeed works in advertising and his sector becomes one of the earliest ones that is easily influenced from such a political unrest. Since locals face such political impasse, they do not want to spend money on advertising (2017: 4). Similarly, the neocolonial unrest influences Nadia's job adversely. She works in an insurance company, and her

office, as might be expected, becomes one of the early sectors to be shut down because an insurance company is of no use in the city where shootings and bombings are normalized. While Saeed's boss explains lachrymosely that he has to close the company, Nadia's disappears without any explanation and stops paying workers (2017: 67). Thus, both Nadia and Saeed's offices are shuttered, and they lose the opportunity to finance their lives. Briefly, the novel accomplishedly depictures how economic recession created by neocolonial policies has an adverse economic effect on locals and imposes the anxiety inducing them to migrate.

Moreover, indirect or direct neocolonial practices performed in the Middle East have not only deteriorated countries in the region socially and economically, but they have also created countries where Islam has potentiated its power to intervene in shaping all dimensions of life. After the 1970s, political Islam, "provoked by the West as an ideological antithesis," became a "potent force" in the Middle East (Soherwordi, 2013: 21). Yet, it was not only an antithesis to "a modernizing world" representing norms of the West, but also became a regional formula to the "problems of economic turmoil and political repression" in the region (Soherwordi, 2013: 21). Hence, political Islam created the turbulent Middle East where "people began to transfer their allegiance from heads of states… to militant revolutionary organizations" (Kepel, 1995: 21). Such an atmosphere enabled designation of neocolonial Middle East where those militant organizations did not only weaken the countries in the region politically, but also imposed cultural changes which were grounded on Islamic doctrines. Similarly, Hamid underlines the rise of political Islam during the Cold war and considers it as "a process of social engineering" which was designed by the US for its own interests in the war against communism (2014: 110). In *Exit West*, he deals with Islamization of the Middle East through the domination of fundamentalist groups in the unnamed city and attempts to reflect the cultural consequences of the rise of political Islam in the region. To illustrate, while describing the setting and protagonists of the novel in the first chapter, the narrator foreshadows the prospective cultural shift, writing that on those days when Nadia and Saeed meet, "people [continue] to enjoy the luxury of wearing more or less what they [want] to wear, clothing and hair wise" (Hamid, 2017: 1). Such a beginning hints for the cultural shift that will occur in the course of the novel, and it also underlines that the cultural retrogress creates an atmosphere that constrains people from behaving by their own will. Besides, with the help of ironic usage 'luxury' and the critical remark of the narrator suggesting that "these

choices" have a meaning for locals, readers can perceive that Hamid reflects his critical perspective to Islamization of the region in the novel (Hamid, 2017: 1). Additionally, the narrator alludes the cultural shift, comparing love stories between Saeed and Nadia and Saeed's parents through virginity. The narrator explicitly states, "Saeed's parents [do] not have sex until wedding night" and explains its reason with her timidity, writing that she considers it as "uncomfortable", which indicates the domination of patriarchy on women. To clarify, they do not have sex since Saeed's mother feels uncomfortable due to pejorative adjectives attributed by patriarchy to those women having sex before marriage. Similarly, Saeed and Nadia do not have sex throughout the novel. Even though they frequently have physical approach and give sexual pleasure to each other, they do not experience sexual intercourse. The narrator explains the reason why they do not have sexual intercourse in Saeed's religious ideas on the issue that "they should not have sex before they [are] married, that doing otherwise was against his beliefs" (Hamid, 2017: 61). While these different perspectives of two generations allude the cultural shift from patriarchy to religion-based approach, they also signal the social engineering project, Islamization, which Hamid regards as the neocolonial method to re-design the Middle East.

In addition to these implications, the novel explicitly exemplifies the increasing influence of fundamentalist Islamic groups, which have become dominant with the help of neocolonialists' support, on culture in the Middle East. Political Islam has created many fundamentalist groups that have achieved dominance in several parts of the region. They have also intervened in lives of locals on the plea of religious doctrines because they have promoted the idea that they can overcome "the general corruption and degradation of society" through religion which they have manipulated (Soherwordi, 2013: 21). In the novel, Hamid makes an analogy between the unnamed city and the neocolonial Middle East where fundamentalist groups intervene in all dimensions of life. To illustrate, the narrator displays the dominance of fundamentalists through an incident in which Nadia is insulted just because she rides a scooter. When she waits at the red light, a man swears and yells at her that it is "obscene for a woman" to ride a motorbike because it is an activity that only a "whore" can do (Hamid, 2017: 39). She cannot give any reaction to him while he is "swearing with such ferocity" (2017: 39). Her unresponsiveness implies that regulation of life under cover of religion becomes a cultural sphere that locals cannot oppose. Thus, this incident obviously demonstrates the

contemporary condition in the Middle East where locals are exposed to intervention in their daily life, which leads to cultural shift in the long term, as it has happened in the region.

Furthermore, the intervention in cultural elements regarded the oppression to designate Islam-based culture to overcome the corruption of society can be exemplified with terrorists' prohibition of music in the unnamed city. To illustrate, when terrorists begin to raid houses, Nadia hides Saeed's record player and records because "music [is] forbidden by the militants" (Hamid, 2017: 79). Hence, the unnamed city becomes a territory where religious centred culture is imposed by fundamentalists. In short, Hamid attempts to lay an emphasis on the influence of neocolonial policies over the culture of the Middle East, enriching the narrative with specific examples that reveal the cultural shifts compelled by the dominance of political Islam in the region.

To conclude, Hamid's narrative in *Exit West* succeeds in rendering the neocolonial Middle East where extreme form of neocolonialism has been conducted since the turn of the twenty first century. Through the opening paragraph depicting the literal invasion of the unnamed city by refugees, the narrative alludes the vicious circle of migration that Middle Easterners have experienced in the region. While it exemplifies the spread of neocolonialism to neighbouring territories through such refugee crisis, it also foreshadows the nomadic future waiting for Middle Easterners through Nadia and Saeed. Moreover, it provides remarkable examples that reveal how extreme form of neocolonialism ruins the territory and compels locals to flee their homelands through the depiction of ferocious violence in the unnamed city. Fictionalising such violence in the unnamed city is not Hamid's sole aim, but he also attempts to uncover the social, cultural and economic influence of this neocolonial violence on locals. Consequently, he, in *Exit West*, accomplishedly reveals all factors, such as refugee crisis and social, economic and cultural deterioration, which pave the way for deterritorialization of Middle Easterners.

2.7 Forced Emigration and Neocolonial Deterritorialization in *Exit West*

Mohsin Hamid regards migration as unexceptional phenomena, and in *Exit West*, he lays an emphasis on its mundaneness, not only by narrating Nadia and Saeed's migration story which is an example of those transpiring since the turn of the twenty first century, but also fragmenting the text frequently with the stories which focus on characters who have become displaced with former migrations. Even though he attempts to draw attention to "the global image of the whole planet being on the move" (Asaad, 2020: 82) and enriches the narrative with the vignettes, telling stories of migrants from all over the world, his main objective is to focus on Nadia and Saeed's migration and to shed light on its influence on their identities. Taking inspiration from the contemporary refugee crisis, he "vividly manifests the universality of migration and the psychology of exile, loss, dislocation and unbelonging in a foreign land through different occasions and imagery sprinkled throughout the novel" (Bağlama, 2019: 150). Furthermore, *Exit West* paves the way for examining the factors leading to migration from the Middle East to the West due to the detailed descriptions of the unnamed city where Nadia and Saeed flee because he fictionalizes the unnamed city as the territory where neocolonial practices demolish all dimensions of life, compelling locals to deterritorialization. The unnamed city becomes uninhabitable because of physical and cultural violence imposed on locals. While neocolonial military policies create physical violence in the city, neocolonialists' support to fundamentalists conduces to cultural violence through enforcement of strict religion-centred lifestyle.

Being trapped by means of direct and indirect means of neocolonialism has dislocated Middle Easterners and forced them to live in strange territories. This neocolonial deterritorialization does not only refer to the physical movement to a new territory, but also the cultural reproduction there because neocolonialism has been one of the factors creating a globalized world in which "both points of departure and points of arrival are in cultural flux, and thus the search for steady points of reference…, can be difficult" (Appadurai, 2005: 44). Deterritorialized neocolonial subjects experience identity problems in "the intervention of tradition (and of ethnicity, kinship, and other identity markers)" because their struggle for "certainties is regularly frustrated by the fluidities of transnational communication" (2005: 44). Being torn between those fluidities and the nostalgia for past, they attempt to reproduce culture which becomes "an arena for conscious choice, justifications and representations, the latter often to multiple and

spatially dislocated audiences" (2005: 44). Since they become active in this reproduction process, their preferences become "politicized", and they are "exposed to the traumas of deterritorialization" when they "negotiate their mutual understandings and aspirations in sometimes fractured spatial arrangements" (2005: 44). Briefly, conducting indirect and direct methods to control and exploit the Middle East, neocolonialism has ruined the region physically and culturally and created masses of deterritorialized Middle Easterners who have to reproduce culture in new territories.

In the novel, Hamid throws together two opposite characters, Nadia and Saeed, and allows them to migrate together to reflect what Middle Easterners with diverse characteristics experience during deterritorialization. While Nadia stands for those who free themselves from boundaries of the society where they live, Saeed reflects the ones who are contingent upon their families, religions and norms. Their relationship becomes the embodiment of the traumas that neocolonial deterritorialization triggers, and it also lays bare what Middle Easterners, from the most free-spirited ones to the most conservative ones, experience when neocolonialism deterritorializes them. Their relationship symbolizes the clash of the Western and Middle Eastern cultures during the neocolonial deterritorialization and provides several examples revealing the dilemmas Middle Easterners experience in this process. In this regard, Hamid fictionalizes two opposite characters and dives into their relationship to indicate the consequences of neocolonial deterritorialization on their identities.

Nadia is described to be a free-spirited woman who does not comply with oppression of the society where she lives. The narrator starts her introduction from her childhood and implies that she is not the one that patriarchy desires to see. She is sent to a school attaching importance to "rote memorization" which underlines its backwardness, and the relationship between her and the school is "ill-suited" (Hamid, 2017: 17). The disharmony between her and the school does not stem from her unsuccess, but from her open-mindedness, and the narrator achieves in depicting this disharmony, building a juxtaposition between rote learning and her tendency to art. This first impression also hints for her determined personality and indicates that she is not the one who complies with the oppression easily because she spends "a great deal of time doodling in the margins of her textbooks and notebooks, hunche[s] over to hide curlicues and miniature woodland universes from the eyes of her teachers" (2017: 17). She does not hesitate to do what she desires even though she lives under the threat of "a slap on the back of the

head" (2017: 17). Her resolution continues till the end of the novel, and it enables her to maintain her physical and literal nomadism during her deterritorialization and reterritorialization.

The contribution of neocolonialism to the spread of political Islam in the Middle East is incontrovertible. Neocolonial policies performed in the region after the Cold War give rise to a period of deterritorialization because "the comfortable division of ideological blocks and nation states set down territorially by the Cold War" are re-designed to reterritorialize "the old ethnicities and new economies" (Tuathail and Luke, 1994: 382). Those political and economic developments have also deterritorializing effects on identity of locals, thereby transforming them into neocolonial nomads in their own territory. In addition to the physical dislocation, deterritorialization also refers to the nomadic identity that is always under the influence of outer factors in the society. During deterritorialization, identity is regarded not as a being, but becoming which refers to changes experienced by nomads in their relationship with outer space. Referring to perpetual movements, which prevent stability and fixation of identity, becoming is regarded as a state of inbetweenness (Deleuze and Guattari, 2005: 293). In *Exit West*, Nadia becomes a nomad in the unnamed city due to her inadaptability to the religion centred culture. Her nomadism begins with her intellectual and emotional divergence from her family because of "her constant questioning and growing irreverence in matters of faith" (Hamid, 2017: 18). Her such attitudes create a gap between her and the family members, and they enable readers to perceive the factors forcing her to be a nomad. In contrast to her mother and sister, she is not unvoiced, but decisive to reveal her opinions. Her marginality does not only put her in a position between her ideas and family in the society where notions of woman identity have been restructured by political Islam, but also hints for the beginning of her becoming that refers to her constant state of inbetweenness. Her initial deterritorialization, which can be regarded as intellectual and emotional divergence from her family, is also reinforced with her physical displacement through her leaving the family house. Being caught in the middle between her ideas and family, she decides to live on her own and rents a house (2017: 18). Hence, she becomes displaced from her first spatial environment, her family, which has imposed characteristics on her, thereby becoming an intellectual, emotional, and physical nomad in such a strict society.

Creating such a setting that is ecclesiastically straitlaced, the narrator highlights that neocolonialism subjects Nadia to permanent deterritorialization, breaking her family bonds off. The permanency of her deterritorialization is emphasized with trenchant words uttered by each member of the family: "the break involved hard words on all sides, from her father, from her mother, even more so from her sister, and perhaps most of all from Nadia herself" (2017: 18). This argument is not quotidian because the narrator explicitly expresses that "Nadia and her family both [consider] her thereafter to be without a family" (2017: 18) and implies that she becomes an alone nomad in the unnamed city where she does not have a family anymore. Even though it is not appropriate to attribute negative connotations to her deterritorialization since she experiences it by her own will, these examples of her divergence from her family are of significance because while they indicate her becoming rootless with the loss of family, they also foreshadow her permanent deterritorialization in the course of the novel.

Her divergence from the family also explains the function of subjectivity during deterritorialization. In Deleuzian terms, identity is deconstructed through "the cultivation of the self in a way that suggests important possibilities for learning how to make adjustments to our subjectivities" (Oladi and Portelli, 2017: 666). Due to this cultivation process, identity is regarded as not a being but becoming which "is not defined by points it connects, or by points that compose it, on the contrary, it passes between points, it comes up through the middle" (Deleuze and Guattari, 2005: 293). Since it is always in a state of ongoingness and inbetweenness, it becomes the accumulation of struggles for "subjectivity beneath the notion of fixed identity" (Oladi and Portelli, 2017: 666). In this regard, Nadia embodies the characteristics of nomadic identity since she always strives for subjectivity to undermine the fixed identity of woman in a society where neocolonialist policies have left no space through Islamization. Her struggle for subjectivity is initially emphasized with her reaction to her family and norms of the society. While her decision to leave home and, to live alone, as an unmarried woman, indicates her keenness on subjectivity, her nomadic identity becomes concrete through her physical deterritorialization from her family. She severs her connection with her family and finds a small apartment where she can conquer possibilities of her subjectivity.

However, in such a neocolonial society where social and cultural norms are re-structured, the struggle of a woman for subjectivity may encounter resistance impeding the process. This resistance can be considered as the factor that creates the state of

inbetweenness that Nadia experiences during her becoming process. The narrator clarifies these factors that may demotivate her to follow her subjectivity writing that "Nadia's experiences during first months as a single woman living her own did, in some moments, equal or even surpass the loathsomeness and dangerousness that her family had warned her about" (Hamid, 2017: 18). These hardships push her to a dilemma between returning to her family home and experiencing subjectivity at her new home, but she proves to be a perfect nomad with her state of inbetweenness in the process of subjectivity. The narrative builds a contrast between those hardships and her new free life and reveals through the use of contrasting conjunction, "but" she acts in accordance with her 'becoming' process: "But she ha[s] a job at an insurance company, and she [is] determined to survive, and so she [does]" (2017: 18). This contrast is of significance to comprehend the nature of nomadic identity because while it reflects the state of inbetweenness, it also reveals the process of reterritorialization during deterritorialization.

As Deleuze and Guattari suggest, "the nomad reterritorializes on deterritorialization itself" (2005: 293), nomadic identity tends to form new possibilities to create subjectivity. These can be considered as Nadia's new preferences after she leaves home, and the narrative exemplifies the reterritorialization process she experiences with her new social sphere and behaviours:

> "She secured a room of her own atop the house of a widow, a record player and small collection of vinyl, a circle of acquaintances among the city's free spirits, and a connection to a discreet and non-judgemental female gynaecologist. She learned how to dress for self-protection, how best to deal with aggressive men and with the police, and with the aggressive men who were the police, and always to trust her instincts about situations to avoid or to exit immediately" (Hamid, 2017: 18).

When she becomes deterritorialized from her family home, she finds another space where she follows her subjectivity. Besides, her deterritorialization does not only refer to the physical change of the space, but also all alterations it promotes in her tendencies and behaviours. For example, the artistic pieces in her family house are limited to "religious verses and photos of holy sites" (2017: 17), but one of the initial objects that the narrator describes in her new territory is a record player, which implies her self-emancipation through her preferences in the new territory. Besides, her preferences in her old territory used to be carried out in the margins because of oppression on her. When she is a student at the primary school with traditional rote memorization, she has to hide her artistic tendencies and she draws pictures "in the margins of her textbooks and notebooks" for fear of her teachers (2017: 2). However, now, she puts her preferences indicating her

artistic tendencies at the centre. She also changes her social circle and eliminates inconsiderate people, such as her father and sisters who are prude and judgemental. In her new territory, she reterritorializes herself by letting insightful and free-spirited people into her life and creates a social circle who do not judge her becoming. Moreover, since reterritorialization enables nomads to make regulations to reach subjectivity, she also acquires priorities, such as dressing for self-protection, overcoming the aggression toward her and benefiting her instincts, to survive in such a patriarchal society (2017: 19). These initiatives, which are the precautions that she takes to conserve the authenticity of her new space, are not adequate for Nadia because she, as a nomad, tends to experience alternatives to effectuate subjectivity.

Since it is hazardous for her to discover the possibilities for subjectivity physically in the unnamed city where neocolonial Islamization restricts most initiatives of women in the public, Hamid equips her with a mobile phone with the help of which she discovers the world virtually. In contrast to Saeed who has strict limits in using his mobile, she is eager to discover all possibilities that her mobile offers. It becomes "her company on long evenings," thereby enabling her to ascertain the outer world that is full of new possibilities for her. With the help of the internet, she gets an opportunity to discover those possibilities because she does not use it for a specific aim. However, she dives into the internet and acquires each possibility that can influence her fluid identity, watching about "bombs falling, women exercising, men copulating, clouds gathering, waves tugging at the sand" (2017: 37). This diversity cultivates her becoming because while she watches "bombs falling" or "waves tugging at the sand," she does not only obtain information about neocolonialism that is spreading to the city but also about another hopeful life out of the borders built by her family or the society. While she watches "women exercising" or "men copulating," she may discover new perspectives about her body, or she may discover new tendencies about sexuality. One of the obvious examples pointing out the influence of those possibilities on her nomadic identity is the change in her sexual preference in the end of the novel. Briefly, Hamid implies that all these virtual interactions open new possibilities before her, push her to the state of inbetweenness and accumulate emergent perspectives in her fluid identity in the unnamed city where neither her physical existence nor her identity can survive. Hence, her mobile is not just an instrument to communicate with Saeed but has similar functions with the magical doors that open possibilities of new territories in the novel because it virtually opens new possibilities

before Nadia who acquires, interiorizes and incorporates them into the process of her becoming.

However, Nadia does not confine herself to those virtual possibilities, but attempts to discover them in person and accumulates them to reach subjectivity. Throughout the novel, the narrator lays an emphasis on her free-spirited nature and forms a logical basis for her emancipatory attitudes conforming with her nomadic identity. At the beginning of the novel, she is described to be a person who, as an alone woman, does not hesitate to participate in evening courses in the unnamed city which is dangerous even though it is "not yet openly at war" (Hamid, 2017: 18). While her first impression clues in her nature, it also points out her precision about identity and foreshadows the struggles of her nomadic identity for possibilities. Then, she, as a free-spirited woman, challenges the norms of her family and doctrines of her religion, and decides to leave family home to experience all possibilities individually, which can be regarded as the beginning of her physical nomadism through deterritorialization from family home. Her physical deterritorialization inspiring her nomadic identity has two varieties: abandonment of family home and the city, and both are reflected through different symbols. As known, nomads used to have animals or vehicles that helped them migrate, and those animals or vehicles have built the archetypal image of nomads. Similarly, Hamid succeeds in drawing the image of a nomad for her through her riding 'a scooter' after she leaves the family home. The scooter can be seen as the modern version of the animals that nomads used to benefit in their mobility. This analogy is built by the similarity between the archetype of a nomad on an animal and the image of Nadia riding her scooter. This similarity can also be associated with the use of the same verb, to ride, for both animals and scooters. Shortly, it becomes an instrument with the help of which she not only minimizes her commitment to the space imposed on her, but also emancipates her to explore possibilities in other spaces. On the other hand, another symbol that Hamid utilizes to underline her nomadism is the magical doors that provide them with mobility when they want to flee their place of birth. Through magical realism, Hamid produces the futuristic symbol recalling the teleportation machine and helps them migrate to safe territories. These magical doors function to be the futuristic vehicles that the nomads in the novel use, and they are essentially similar to the scooter that Nadia rides or animals that earlier nomads used to ride to migrate to remote territories. Thus, by means of these

symbolic vehicles, Hamid diminishes her commitment to the fixity of identity and allows her to experience all possibilities in person to unearth subjectivity.

Her physical displacement from family house creates a new liberal space where she experiences new possibilities in her journey to subjectivity. In the novel, the narrator increases the effect of those possibilities by building a contrast between her former life that is dominated by her family and her current life that is open to subjectivity at all points. Deterritorialization, in fact, emancipates her from the domination of the family and she becomes a nomad who is ready to experience all possibilities to subjectivity. In this journey, her body becomes the war zone where she fights against norms of the society and rules of the religion that restrain her from reaching subjectivity. Disposing of the abovementioned borders, she sets herself free and experiences the bodily pleasures that are forbidden in her former territory. She, as an unmarried woman in such an ecclesiastically straitlaced city, loses her virginity on one-night stand, and the narrator explicitly expresses that she gets rid of "the weight of her virginity with some perplexity but not excessive fuss" (Hamid, 2017: 31). The narrator implies that she regards virginity as weight that the society lays a burden on her shoulders. However, she does not ascribe the same meaning to her body and does not want others to be able to speak authoritatively on her body. She demolishes the authority on her body when she carries out the deplorable action resolutely and ungravely. Hence, her body becomes a means for her not only to show reaction to the society or her family, but also to follow possibilities to subjectivity.

On the other hand, the fluidity of nomadic identity is also reflected through her sexuality that is strictly latched on to heterosexuality in such religious societies. Her sexuality is firstly uttered when she becomes deterritorialized from the family house, which refers to an abandonment from the norms of the society and doctrines of the religion. As examined above, her initial deterritorialization creates a space where she can explore the possibilities that her body offers through sexuality. Then, she wishes to experience the pleasures of those possibilities with Saeed, but he does not want to have a sexual intercourse with her since it is "against his beliefs" (2017: 31). She attempts to entice him throughout the novel, but she fails because of his strict commitment to the doctrines of the religion. One can regard her rejection as deterritorialization from her sexuality and Saeed's consistent detainment as the factor creating the state of inbetweenness that does not only deteriorate their relationship, but also promotes her to reterritorialize her sexuality. On the other hand, their relationship also encompasses new

possibilities for Nadia because even though they do not have a sexual intercourse, they follow a "ritual that still resulted in release" which enables her to experience new pleasure possibilities that are different from the ones she has experienced with his former boyfriend (2017: 139). Hence, the change in her sexual preference at the end of the novel can be perceived with her deterritorialization from her heterosexuality by Saeed and her reterritorialization on homosexuality through their relationship without copulation.

Furthermore, her relationship with Saeed also renders possible the perception of her fluid identity since it reveals her identity as not being but becoming in her deterritorialization. While her nomadism is embodied through her displacement from her family house and the unnamed city, her nomadic identity is revealed through her relationship with Saeed. As analysed above, Nadia's leaving family house helps her experience possibilities for subjectivity, and she reveals her nomadic identity in her journey through the relationship with Saeed. Her deterritorialization coincides with her relationship with Saeed, and the narrator considers this relationship as the beginning of her journey because the first night she takes him in her new house is compared to birth. When they meet in her apartment, they beguile the time at the terrace till the sunrise. Then, Saeed leaves, and the narrator indicates the impact of the first night of the relationship on her through an analogy with birth writing "she stood naked, as she had been born" (Hamid, 2017: 45). Her symbolic nakedness and rebirth in the first morning of her relationship do not only signal to alterations she experiences, but also clue in her effort to deconstruct the traditional image of Middle Eastern woman because she is now "ready to resist the claims and expectations of the world" (2017: 45). In her new territory, she is reborn as a woman who gets rid of boundaries of norms and rules and who is eager to strive for possibilities to subjectivity.

Additionally, Hamid utilizes the magical doors to associate the image of rebirth with deterritorialization in the novel and likens Nadia and Saeed's passing through the doors to the process of re-birth writing:

> "the passage was both like dying and like being born, and indeed Nadia experienced a kind of extinguishing as she entered the blackness and a gasping struggle as she fought to exit, and she felt cold and bruised and damp as she lay on the floor of the room at the other side, trembling and too spent at first to stand, and she thought, while she strained to fill her lungs, that this dampness must be her own sweat" (2017: 98).

This description likens the passages through the magical doors to reincarnation that can be considered as the death of old identity and the birth of the new one. The narrative

associates them with her nomadic identity since they enable to comprehend the alterations in her opinions for social and individual phenomena during her deterritorialization. Thus, with the help of the images of birth both in the former and latter deterritorialization, Hamid implies that she is born as a new woman with new ideas and tendencies whenever she passes through a magical door and becomes deterritorialized.

This novelty in her ideas and tendencies do not only indicate that her identity is in a state of flux, but also clarifies the circumstances that create her uneasiness toward individual and social phenomena and force her to leave the relationship or space. The deterioration of her relationship can be perceived through the novelty she acquires with her re-birth in deterritorialization. Her new identity becomes prominent in her relationship with Saeed. The narrator explicitly expresses the increasing tension between them and foreshadows the alterations they undergo during deterritorialization. Firstly, when they are in Mykonos, he gets angry with her since she attempts to kiss him in public. Then, the narrator explains that she has "never seen bitterness in him before" and she becomes "a bit unsettled" (2017: 102-103). Her unsettlement points out the state of inbetweenness that her nomadic identity experiences, and it causes her to question their relationship. Secondly, when they are in a big and comfortable mansion in London, Nadia takes a long shower and then she emerges "from the bathroom wrapped in her towel, her towels for she had one around her body and another around her hair" (2017: 123). As soon as he sees her, he utters angrily "you can't stand here like that," and she replies, "Don't tell me what I can do?" (2017: 123). Her unsettlement in Mykonos becomes anger in London, and while it clarifies how the state of inbetweenness opens new doors to new possibilities, it highlights her new identity that does not allow him to order her as men do in the unnamed city. Thirdly, when they argue about the goods stolen by refugees, he mentions, "the visible deterioration brought on" by refugees. Thereupon, "she recommends him rigorously not to be "an idiot" since such behaviours harm him, and he is "shocked by her tone" (2017: 130). This reveals the perspectives they get in their new territory. While she accepts herself as a member of the refugee community in London and feels empathy with them, he considers refugees as the reason of the chaos in London because of the guilt of having left his homeland. Hence, these examples do not only point out their deteriorating relationship, but also the new perspectives they acquire in their interaction with new territories.

On the other hand, those perspectives also function to reveal that her nomadic identity triggered by physical deterritorialization affect her attitudes toward social phenomena, and they indicate that she has transformed into a cosmopolitan individual. In philosophical terms, a cosmopolitan individual refers to a "citizen of the universe"; however, this definition does not allude "rootlessness" since it encompasses "a universal circle of belonging that involves the transcendence of the particularistic and blindly given ties of kinship and country" (Cheah, 2006: 487). Besides, her nomadic identity meets on common grounds with cosmopolitanism since it "is characteristically elaborated with the experience of cultural multiplicity" (Anderson, 2006: 77). She, as a nomad, follows all possibilities to subjectivity in her archetypal journey and forms a multiplicity in her identity, which enables her to settle in the cosmopolitan territory easily at the end of the novel. In this regard, Hamid brings together cosmopolitanism of the territories where refugees from different cultures, languages, religions or identities gather and her nomadic identity considered as becoming, thereby presenting multiplicity as a solution to the contemporary refugee problem. Being deterritorialized from her family and homeland, Nadia severs her connection with her kinship, citizenship or the roles imposed on her, and she becomes a cosmopolitan individual. She declares her ideas on the issue when Saeed offers her to move to the place where people from their unnamed city live. She asks why he wants to move, and he replies, "To be among our own kind". Then, she asks, "what makes them our kind" and he answers, "They are from our country". Yet, his answer does not make a sense for her because she reveals her cosmopolitan identity uttering that they are "from the country they used to be from" and "not like [her]" (Hamid, 2017: 149). Her physical nomadism promoting her nomadic identity leads to alterations and transforms her into a cosmopolitan individual who prefers multiplicity to uniformity. She lays an emphasis on the multiplicity of the new spaces where they try to reterritorialize themselves, praising the diversity of refugees in the council organized to argue about the condition of refugees in London. The participants are "both like and unlike those" whom she knows "in her city and they are both "familiar and unfamiliar," which implies the multiplicity of the cosmopolitan London (2017: 145). Her attitude toward the participants clues in her enthusiasm for being a member of a cosmopolitan territory because she finds "their seeming acceptance of her, or at least tolerance of her, rewarding, an achievement in a way" (2017: 145). She prefers staying in the house among those people from different races and cultures to staying in the house where people from her city of birth live. She confesses that it is "better" to be among those different people and that house recalls her

"the place of her birth" where she is unable to breathe (2017: 156). Objecting to stay among people from her homeland and her insistence on staying in that house which is full of diverse possibilities prove her nomadic identity. The narrator considers her attitude as a clean slate in her life and likens her feelings about the stay to her freedom on the scooter writing, "a new time [is] here, and, fraught or not, she relish[es] this like the wind in her face on a hot day when she [rides] her motorcycle" (2017: 156). She regards her participation in the council not only as success, but as also another step to her subjectivity because she becomes a part of the cosmopolitan territory where her ideas have importance and where she tastes freedom.

Experiencing the pleasure of multiplicity or tolerance for her opinions encourages her to move to another territory where there are "almost no natives" (2017: 195). Marin is a cosmopolitan territory where the absence of natives problematizes belongingness. As a neocolonial nomad who leaves behind all constructed codes, such as marriage, citizenship, religion or sexuality, Nadia does not have difficulty in settling Marin. However, she has to sever her last tie with her past: to break up with Saeed. Since their deterritorialization proves their differences, the separation takes place easily when Nadia just takes her backpack and leaves. She gets rid of all constructed codes with the help of her nomadic identity, and her last deterritorialization leads her to a territory where she has an opportunity to reterritorialize herself. She starts to work at a cooperative and finds a room to stay. For the first time in the novel, she feels a sense of belonging to the territory where she lives by her preferences, and her room "comes to feel to her like home" (2017: 194-195). Hence, Nadia's physical nomadism promoted by neocolonial deterritorialization is combined with her nomadic identity, which rejects the fixity of self since it is not a being but becoming. Her physical and identity displacements enable her to experience nomadism where "becoming is creation," and this allows her to overpass the boundaries constructed by her society, family and religion and to follow her subjectivity. In this regard, Hamid attempts to reflect the probable adaptation of the Middle Easterners who are deterritorialized by neocolonial policies, fictionalizing a rewarding end for those, like Nadia, through a cosmopolitan space in which fixed identities of outer territories fade away and which allows its residents to follow all possibilities to subjectivity.

However, Hamid is also aware of the fact that physical nomadism rises difficulties for those having strong ties with their cultures, territories, and religion to settle in new

spaces. In this adaptation process, physical hardships coincide with identity problems, and neocolonial nomads experience identity crises. He enunciates their inefficacy in adaptation writing, "[f]or many, adjustments to this new world was difficult indeed, but for some it was also unexpectedly pleasant" (2017: 172). His characterization forms a basis for Nadia's success and Saeed's failure in adaptation of new cosmopolitan spaces because while her nomadic identity corresponds to her free-spirited nature, his tendency to sedentary being pushes him in dilemmas in his archetypal journey. Although Saeed is described to be "independent minded" through direct characterization in the first chapter, the rest of the novel, which reveals his dependency on his culture and religion, proves that that the first description is ironical (2017: 8). Furthermore, by means of conducting irony to delineate Saeed, Hamid specifies that it is "the case in those days" for those men who are "independent minded," "grown," "unmarried," "with decent post and good educations" to live in their family house (2017: 8). While he attempts to lay bare the dominance of social norms on men through normalising their stay in family houses, he also implies the reason of Saeed's subsequent identity crisis, underlining his strong bonds with his family and patriarchal norms.

The narrative also provides readers with Saeed's indirect characterization that enables his identification not only as an individual dependent on his family, social norms, or religion, but also as a closed minded one who does not dare to experience new possibilities. As Nadia's free-spirited nature is reflected through her attitude toward her mobile phone with the help of which she obtains the opportunity to discover new possibilities virtually, his attitude toward his mobile phone reveals his timidity through his diffidence in using it. Since the possibilities it opens before him is formidable, he tries to resist "the pull of his phone" (2017: 35). He considers its function as mesmerising and likens numerous possibilities it offers to "a banquet of limitless food, stuffing himself, stuffing himself, until he [feels] dazed, and sick" (2017: 36). With the help of this analogy in which the banquet causes digestion troubles, the narrator implies that he is aware of his dependency on his sedentary life and abstains from those possibilities, which may cause troubles when he attempts to internalise them. Thus, he removes or restricts the applications that may displace him from his comfort zone and decides to use it in a limited time through strict discipline. Despite his awareness of its probable troubles on him, he goes on using it to communicate with Nadia who comes in his patriarchal space as a new possibility and exposes him to the state of inbetweenness with her nomadic identity.

Briefly, their mobile phones becomes mediators that virtually open new possibilities before them because while her mobile, as examined above, introduces her new perspectives contributing to her becoming, his mobile builds bridges between him and her who deterritorializes him from his comfortable patriarchal space.

As Nadia becomes deterritorialized when she leaves the family home and experiences the state of inbetweenness to reach subjectivity, Saeed becomes partly deterritorialized through his relationship with Nadia. This relationship becomes the mediator that helps him encounter outer possibilities, and it frequently exposes him to face the state of inbetweenness. This relationship becomes the symbolic territory where he experiences the state of inbetweenness because it frequently pushes him in a dilemma between her opinions promoted by her nomadic identity and his socially, religiously and patriarchally constructed worldview. What he expects from this relationship is similar to his parents' relationship that starts as a love story and goes on with marriage traditionally. The narrative evokes his expectation whenever they come together. For example, while they beguile the time on the roof of her house, Saeed sees the lemon tree that stands upright with its strong roots. He associates it with his family that has strong bonds with the unnamed city they live and wishes to have such a strong relationship with Nadia, like them (2017: 43). However, Nadia is not the true person who can meet his expectation, and the narrative accentuates the discrepancy between them through their opinions on marriage and sexuality. In contrast to his enthusiasm for a traditional family, she defines her relationship that may lead up marriage as "a galloping terror" and her feeling for marriage as "something that [strikes] her akin to resentment" (2017: 62). Besides, their discrepancy becomes concrete through their sexuality because while she wishes to have sexual intercourse, he rejects her on the ground of his belief. Thus, her body becomes the battleground where his desire and belief clash and leaves him in a state of inbetweenness whenever she turns him on. When she brings "her face close to him in his bed," he acquiesces to "muster the enthusiasm to bridge the tiny distance," but he avoids passing his limits (2017: 62). Her body offers possibilities that are forbidden by the norms or rules. Even though they do not copulate, her body introduces him those possibilities when he kisses her and takes pleasure from her body. Thus, she deterritorializes him from his space where he is described to be a decent man, thereby pushing him into the dilemma between possibilities Nadia offers and his socially, religiously and patriarchally constructed ideas.

His partial deterritorialization is completed with his mother's death because it does not only sever his ties with the unnamed city, but also convinces him to migrate to remote lands to find a secure home. He can be delineated as a neocolonial nomad anymore because "the nomad goes from one point to point only as a consequence and as a factual necessity" (Deleuze and Guattari, 2005: 380). His physical nomadism emerges as a consequence of his mother's death and his unnamed city's destruction by neocolonialism while it also embodies the necessity to find a secure home. His deterritorialization from the unnamed city coincides with the desiccation of the lemon tree, which metaphorically stands for his ideal relationship in "his ideal self," and its death foreshadows the end of his relationship with Nadia (2107: 188). In contrast to Nadia who is "feverishly keen to depart," he "desperately want[s] to leave his city" because his departure strikes "him as deeply sad, as amounting to the loss of a home, no less, of his home" (Hamid, 2017: 89-90). Their reactions to deterritorialization clarify its influence on them because while, as examined above, she overcomes the social, patriarchal and religious boundaries and embarks on her nomadic identity to reach subjectivity, he becomes an enforced nomad who leaves his city in despair since he perceives that he belongs to nowhere anymore. There is nothing binding her to the unnamed city, and this makes her "more comfortable with all varieties of movement in her life than" him (2017: 90). Yet, he is tied to the unnamed city where he has family with "the impulse of nostalgia," and it does not only becloud his journey, but also forces him to build a similar home in new territories (2017: 90). That is to say, his impulse of nostalgia prevents him from following possibilities that his archetypal journey offers but compels him to experience troubles when he encounters diversities in new territories.

His impulse of nostalgia is in contradiction with his forced nomadism, and it destines him to follow possibilities recalling his familiar sedentary life throughout his nomadism. Even though his relationship with Nadia and physical displacements give him opportunities to discover those possibilities, his past hounds him and creates a necessity in his nomadic identity to tend to preferences corresponding to his past because "memories always have a reterritorialization function" (Deleuze and Guattari, 2005: 294). The narrative delineates Saeed as a man who has strong bounds with family house, which does not only stand for a space, but also refers to traditions and culture that he is accustomed. When he leaves home for the last time, he runs "his fingertips over the apartment's furniture and the telescope and the bottle containing the clipper ship" and he

takes “a photograph of his parents” and “a memory stick containing his family album” (Hamid, 2017: 95-96). In contrast to Nadia who has just a rucksack that does not contain anything recalling her past, Saeed records each detail about his home in his mind and takes his parents with him, which has an impact on his archetypal journey. The narrative reveals the influence of memory on him through the photo of his parents when they pass through the magical door and find themselves in the mansion where they get a room to settle in. While she is aware of their temporariness in that room and just takes out of “their backpack only items that [are] absolutely required,” he takes out his family photo and places “it on a bookshelf” (2017: 120). Its existence in the room is of significance for Saeed because it transforms “this narrow bedroom, at least partially, temporarily, into a home,” which points out that he associates the definition of home with the family photo representing the tradition of the former territory (2017: 120). Hence, his becoming process becomes a struggle to build a home in accordance with the expectations promoted by his feeling of nostalgia.

His impulse of nostalgia also moulds his expectations from the relationships in founding a traditional family in that home. Even though he “value[s] family above all,” their physical nomadism drags them to new territories where their identities show alterations through new possibilities in their journey (2017: 188). While those possibilities approximate her to her subjectivity, they direct him to the preacher’s daughter since his expectations from relationship is challenged by Nadia. Although he considers the deaths of his parents and the loss of Nadia as “the death of ideal self” who may lose the chance of founding a traditional family in which his identity promoted by his memory is not challenged, his physical nomadism coincides with his nomadic identity and offers him another possibility, the preacher’s daughter (2017: 188). In her archetypal journey, Nadia proves that she is not the woman whom Saeed needs to start a family through her sexuality and attitudes that reject his domination on her. On the other hand, the narrative underlines the harmony between Saeed and the preacher’s daughter whose mother is from his city, drawing attention to their fondness on Saeed’s former territory (2017: 188). Her fondness is not just curiosity about the former territory but points out her sensitivity to the traditions that the former territory stands for. Thus, through his marriage with her, she becomes a mediator with the help of whom he becomes the true member of the territory where he lives with his own people in uniformity.

Saeed does not only confront a problem with Nadia whose identity alters through displacements, but also with the community where they live in London. The house transforms into a cosmopolitan community with the diversity of refugees from different races and religions. In contrast to Nadia who gets accustomed to living in such a territory through her nomadic identity, he fails to reterritorialize himself on this cosmopolitan space. Even though she becomes the part of the council, he considers himself as an outcast in that house with diverse identities. Although the council seems to consist of Nigerians, the narrative remarks on the hybridity of their identities and language:

> "The Nigerians were in fact not all Nigerians, some were half-Nigerians, or from places that bordered Nigeria, from families that spanned both sides of a border, and further that there was perhaps no such thing as a Nigerian, or certainly no one common thing… Together in this group they conversed in a language that was built in large part from English, but solely from English, and some of them were in any case more familiar with English than were others. Also they spoke different variations of English, different Englishes" (2017: 144).

While the hybridity of the council corresponds to her nomadic identity, thereby enabling her to become the member of such a cosmopolitan community, his sedentary identity that is controlled by the impulse of nostalgia otherizes him and forces him to spend time in his people's house where his identity becomes meaningful. The narrative also remarks that this hybrid house is uncanny for him because there are other young men who "size him from time to time," and even though he experiences similar incidents in his country, he problematizes those attempts in this house since he is "alone" and "the only man from his country" (2017: 146). He regards himself as an other in that house where he does not feel "at ease" because of his aloneness, which reveals his unhomeliness in this house. Furthermore, the narrative elaborates his unhomeliness deconstructing his manly position in this house. He, as a member of patriarchal society, is accustomed to intervening with his partner, but he perceives that the hybridity of the territory has also reflections on attitudes between men and women when Nadia replies to him scolding "Don't tell me what I can do?" (2017: 123). In addition to the incident that makes him angry and resentful, he starts to question his manly position that he brings with his memory to this house after the woman in black leather ridicules him, "blocking his way with her narrow, jagged form, her back leaning against one wall, a foot planted on the other" (2017: 146). She plagues him with her stance on his way and her derisive gazes on him. Even though he wants "to run," he knows he has "nowhere to run to" and he has to pass by her (2017: 147). Then she creates a narrow space for him to pass, and he passes by her touching her

body. The narrator reveals his feeling when he passes by her stating that he is "feeling emasculated," which implies that he feels as if he were castrated due to such an incident menacing his manhood in that house. Briefly, the narrative problematizes his patriarchy, which can be associated with his impulse of nostalgia for the former territory, in such a cosmopolitan space where women, such as Nadia and the woman in black leather, can literally or physically stand on his way. Hence, the hybrid house where Nadia enjoys multiplicity brings forth his unhomeliness, posing a threat to Saeed's patriarchal identity.

His unhomeliness encourages him to live among people from his country where he feels belongingness, which can be seen as deterritorialization, and this requires another reterritorialization process that enables him to set up a home where he feels belongingness. "Reterritorialization must not be confused with a return to a primitive or older territoriality" because "it necessarily implies a set of artifices by which one element, itself deterritorialized, serves as a new territoriality for another" (Deleuze and Guattari, 2005: 174). It can be seen as an effort that nomadic identities make to adopt to new territories, building a replica of their ex-territories. Similarly, he attempts to form a new space that is not identical to his country but has some features recalling it. The similarity between the house and the unnamed city is emphasized with "the familiar languages and accents and the familiar smell of cooking," and they become the factors alluring him to spend more time there (Hamid, 2017: 148). He also perceives that even praying among people from his country is different, and these characteristics help him "feel part of something, not just something spiritual, but something human, part of this group" (2017: 148). This house becomes the territory where his existence becomes meaningful with the help of his nostalgia for his past, and he reterritorializes himself on the house where he finds cultural and religious common points promoting the feeling of belongingness.

Saeed is the representative of a patriarchal man who has strong bonds with his family and his fondness is represented with his nostalgia for family members throughout the novel. His existence among people from his country reminds him of his father who is dead anymore, and when he starts to consider that he is again the part of something, he thinks of his father "for a wrenchingly painful moment" (2017: 148). Feeling guilty about his failure in meeting expectations of his family, he tends to start a family in accordance with the expectations of his family and society when he acquires a place in the community where he feels cultural belongingness. Since his relationship with Nadia becomes problematic because of the differences in their identities and expectations, they begin to

perceive “the grating of their presence on the other” and “wander separately during the days” (2017: 138). This physical separation, which “[comes] as a relief to them,” enables them to reterritorialize themselves on new relationships that correspond to their identities (2017: 138). Saeed’s emotional intimacy with the preacher’s daughter is also associated with family members because she is also described to be an individual who has strong bonds with her country and family members. She is curious about the country where her mother is from and asks him “to tell [her] about [her] mother’s country” (2017: 138). The narrative follows their emotional intimacy through their references to their family members because their relationship gains strength as they talk about their country, which indicates that what enables this relationship is not just the emotional intimacy between them, but their nostalgia for the culture that they have difficulty experiencing in such a cosmopolitan territory.

These difficulties he experiences while striving for adapting to new territories also reveals his commitment to sedentariness. Unlike Nadia, who is at peace with all possibilities she encounters in nomadism, Saeed establishes a bond with the territories where he lives, placing family heirlooms there or reterritorializing himself on the community with mutual cultural characteristics. His keenness on territories helps him show empathy towards nativists who regard refugees as sources of the chaotic circumstances in their countries, and this creates the state of inbetweenness in questioning his position as a refugee in new territories. He likens the men who are beguiled with “the words of the man with the white-marked beard” to “the militants” in the unnamed city (2017: 152). He considers his presence in the community as concertion with the militants, and it makes him feel “something rancid in himself, like he [is] rotting from within” (2017: 153). Clearly, the image of the refugees who arrive in a large numbers evokes the flow of the militants having come and ruined the unnamed city, which leaves him in the state of inbetweenness whether to join the community or not. However, his commitment to sedentariness is so tenacious that even though he is deterritorialized from his patriarchally and religiously obsessional country, he tends to meet the expectations of his family and society, resisting new possibilities during his nomadism or preferring the ones enabling him to build a replica of his former territory. Thus, his search for an authentic identity functions synchronically with the longing for a sense of home.

His state of inbetweenness about the political position of refugees in new territories also sheds light on his ambivalent behaviours towards the natives. Even though

"immigrants in the neo-colonial centre might, to a certain extent, have the freedom of following a traditional lifestyle," they tend to "internalise and perform what is constructed as the superior and the proper in order to be appreciated and recognized and to overcome cultural debasement and denigration" (Bağlama, 2020: 636). The narrative constructs the superiority of "the foreman" over Saeed who works "on a road crew" under his supervision, attributing elevatory adjectives such as "knowledgeable", "experienced", "fair" and "strong" (Hamid, 2017: 176-177). He is also delineated as a native who does not talk to refugees unless it is necessary but condescends to eat "his lunch among the immigrants," especially sitting "next to Saeed" and who has "that sort of quiet charisma that young men often gravitate towards (2017: 177-178). While this superiority enables refugees, including Saeed, to admire the supervisor, it also helps them perceive how to be appreciated and recognized by natives and to deal with cultural bias:

> "Also, for Saeed and for many others on the team, their contact with the foreman was the closest and most extended of their contacts with any native, and so they looked at him as though he was the key to understanding their new home, its people and manners and ways and habits, which in a sense he was, though of course, their very presence here meant its people and manners and ways and habits were undergoing considerable change" (2017: 178).

Even though he tends to construct the replica of his former traditional space after deterritorialization, he also attempts to experience the possibility of settling into new territory by being appreciated and recognized by the supervisor. His state of inbetweenness becomes concrete through his ambivalence towards natives, but, unlike Nadia, his sedentary identity does not allow him to adapt to the cosmopolitan territory and forces him to become a true member of the community of people from his country, carrying a gun, praying more frequently than he used to do and marrying the preacher's daughter who has similar religious and patriarchal tendencies.

Consequently, in *Exit West*, Hamid deals with the contemporary refugee crisis, fictionalizing an unnamed city, which recalls several Middle Eastern countries where thousands of people have been compelled to migrate to the West by neocolonial practices since the turn of the twenty-first century. Reflecting the destructive military interventions that extreme form of neocolonialism has designed in the region, he considers those neocolonial practices as the factors forcing locals to migrate to safer territories in search of a home. Those neocolonial policies have exposed locals to deterritorialization, and he focuses on its consequences on individuals through Nadia and Saeed who become neocolonial nomads in their search for a home. However, as a writer regarding migration

as a fundamental right, he ignores the hardships refugees experience in their journeys through magical doors providing them with instant departures and arrivals, which enables him to draw attention to the consequences of deterritorialization rather than the hardships or tragedies they experience. He fictionalizes two protagonists with distinctive personalities and follows their alterations and traumas promoted by deterritorialization through their relationship. He benefits from their distinctive personalities to deal with their reterritorialization on new territories because their distinctiveness helps him deal with their adaptations from different perspectives. Nadia has the feature of nomadic identity, which is regarded as not a being, but becoming, thereby avoiding any bonds with fixed norms, cultures or beliefs. Her deterritorialization from the unnamed city gives her opportunities to reterritorialize herself on new possibilities she acquires in her journey, and she becomes the true citizen of the cosmopolitan territory, which harbours diverse refugees from different races and religions. On the other hand, Saeed, as an individual having strong ties with norms, culture, rules and religion through his impulse of nostalgia, has difficulty in adapting to the hybrid territories that threaten his sedentary identity. His physical displacement from his family house and country creates identity problems when he encounters possibilities enabling him to consider himself as an outcast in hybrid territories. His self-definition also clears up his reterritorialization on the community with people from his country because the alterations he faces in his archetypal journey discomforts him and impels him to found a life within the boundaries of the community where his identity is not challenged.

CHAPTER III

THE WASTED VIGIL AND *THE BLIND MAN'S GARDEN*

3.1 Neocolonial Deterritorialization in *The Wasted Vigil*

This chapter attempts to analyse how each step of the development of neocolonialism has a deterritorializing effect on the residents of the neocolonial Afghanistan. Firstly, the chapter defines Nadeem Aslam as a deterritorialized writer whose family was exiled from the neocolonial Pakistan due to his parents' sympathy for communism and clarifies his tendency to reflect deterritorialization in his novels with his individual background. Secondly, the chapter clarifies the history of neocolonialism which arrives the Middle East during the Cold War, conducts indirect means in the subsequent civil war and destroys the region with its direct means, military interventions, after the 9/11 attacks. Thirdly, the chapter underlines that the turbulent neocolonial history of Afghanistan characterizes it to be a space where individuals with different racial, political and religious backgrounds gather and form interactions which lead to alterations in their identities. The chapter, lastly, puts forward that those individuals become neocolonial nomads whose mobilities correspond to transformations which are promoted not only by their experiences in the neocolonial Afghanistan, but also the multiplicity generated by the interactions they form in the microcosm of Afghanistan, Marcus' house.

3.2 Nadeem Aslam as a Deterritorialized Writer

Nadeem Aslam is a British Pakistani novelist answering the definition of a migrant writer. He was born in Pakistan and moved to Britain when he was fourteen. His family's migration can also be delineated as an exile because they had to abandon Pakistan, where the US imperialism exerted dominance, since his father was labelled as an ardent communist. His family's political exile which can easily be associated with neocolonial policies practiced in the Middle East leads to migrant experiences efforming his perspectives on life and politics as a second-generation migrant and a feeling of nostalgia for his country. He sheds light on his hybridity in one of his interviews that "if you look at certain machines, they say made in China but assembled in Germany. I always say I was made in the East but assembled in the West. So I belong to both of those places" (Yaqin 43). While his lack of belongingness either to the East or the West refers to his deterritorialization, it also enables him to build a political stance which is critical of the fundamentalism of both the East and the West. His family's deterritorialization by the US neocolonialism, which waged war against communists in the region during the Cold War, builds sensitivity for Middle Easterners who are still being otherized as terrorists by the neocolonial discourse. His sensitivity finds reflection in his fiction which lays bare not only the consequences of neocolonialist practices in Pakistan and Afghanistan after their independence, but also the impact of religious fundamentalism on locals. In this regard, Aslam's *The Wasted Vigil* and *The Blind Man's Garden* meet on common ground with their mutual concern on the political and social intricateness of the Middle East since the Cold War period. They provide a realistic snapshot of the social, economic, and political contemporary condition of the Middle East where locals become deterritorialized in their own territories due to their being trapped in the destruction by both neocolonial militaristic interventions and terrorism of religious fundamentalism.

3.3 History of Neocolonialism in the Middle East in *The Wasted Vigil*

In *The Wasted Vigil*, Nadeem Aslam focuses on the political, social and militaristic intricateness of contemporary Afghanistan and Pakistan which are described as neocolonial spaces that have been victimized respectively by brutality of the Soviet regime, the Taliban and the war against terrorism legitimized by the US after the 9/11 terrorist attacks. Narrating the violence each side inflicts to each other to build political hegemony in the region and to locals who are caught in the vicious circle of death and torture during the last two decades of the twentieth century and the first decade of the twenty first century, Aslam depictures the contemporary political, social and economic disarray in Middle Eastern countries, such as Afghanistan and Pakistan. Those countries are depicted to be a melting pot of a neocolonial space where both the oppressors that have been designated by neocolonial policies and the oppressed that have been victimized by different ideologies gather, and their individual stories intertwine with each other's, pushing them in a state of inbetweenness. Even though the present time of the narrative tells the story of the aftermath of the 9/11 terrorist attacks promoting the invasion of Afghanistan by the US neocolonialism, individual stories of different characters who are obliged to live in the region due to their personal or official excuses are joined together accomplishedly with the political history of the region. Therefore, the narrative does not only reveal the contemporary neocolonial invasion in Afghanistan and Pakistan, but also clarifies the circumstances, such as the increasing hegemony of the Taliban, with the help of which the US neocolonialism considers direct military invasion as a requirement with the motto of war against terrorism. The narrative simultaneously tells the story of two different periods. The former period starts with the Soviet invasion in Afghanistan and goes on with the rise of the Taliban as a potent force in the region with the logistic support of the US, which lays bare the indirect methods that the US neocolonialism utilizes to undermine the hegemony of communist regime. The latter is about the period when the US launches military operations to annihilate fundamentalist terrorist groups that performed terrorist rampage at World Trade Centre and Pentagon. This refers to the direct military invasion, the extreme neocolonial method, which the US neocolonialism performs in the region. In brief, in *The Wasted Vigil*, Aslam provides readers with the historical development of neocolonialism in the region because the narrative does not only focus on indirect methods the US performs during the Cold War, but also underlines

that neocolonialism transforms into direct military invasions in its extreme form through the invasion of Afghanistan.

The Wasted Vigil reflects the intertwined stories of individuals with different racial, religious and intellectual background who are obliged to live in the region due to their own motives. Marcus is an English doctor who is married to an Afghan woman, Katrina, who is a nurse. He refers to the colonial history of Afghanistan because he is not a man who moves to the region, but who is born there. His father is also "a doctor in Afghan frontier" and he is killed by a man who accuses his father off his son's apostasy (Aslam, 2009: 41). His mother is "a nurse in the heart of the British Empire's most turbulent province," and proving his hybridity, Marcus's family roots make him natural member of the postcolonial Afghanistan (2009: 41). He becomes the vigil whose life is wasted in such a neocolonial space, as the title refers to. His tragic life story hints for the political disarray that the region experiences after the decolonization period. Initially, their daughter, Zameen, is kidnapped during the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan. Then, the hegemony of the Soviets is demolished by the Taliban that are supported logistically by the US. Establishing a control over the country due to the authority gap following the withdrawal of the Soviets, the Taliban designate a bigoted government ruling the country brutally. The Taliban make Katrina cut Marcus's hand due to theft even though he is innocent, and this event deranges her, and she nails all books at their house to the ceiling. The bigoted society under the rule of the Taliban does not allow women to challenge the imposed religious norms to survive. When Marcus is taken as a captive by a warlord to treat wounded fighters, Katrina is stoned to death since she, as an Afghan woman, lives with a man without religiously valid espousal. Having lost his wife, Marcus sets frequent journeys to find his missing daughter, Zameen, and his grandson, Bihzad. In one of those journeys, his path crosses with David, Lara and Casa, each of whom is the victim of the political turmoil that neocolonialism has built in the region. David is a former CIA agent who has joined the agency and come to Afghanistan due to his hatred for the Soviets that killed his brother in Vietnam. In the past time of the narrative, David falls in love with Zameen and feels intimate with her son; however, when he is on duty in Tajikistan for three months, both the woman and son are kidnapped, and David sets on journeys to find them. He cannot find them but comes across Marcus with whom he becomes good friends. Even though David knows that Zameen is raped by a Soviet soldier, he does not tell the truth to Marcus for long years. Yet, in the present time of the narrative, a Russian woman,

Lara, who comes to Afghanistan to seek for his missing brother, Benedikt, who participated in the Russian invasion of Afghanistan, arrives Marcus's house and Benedikt turns out to be the Russian soldier who has raped Zameen. With the arrival of Casa, a fanatical Taliban militant who gets injured and shelters to be treated, Marcus's house becomes the microcosm of the region. Each character represents a political perspective that has taken a role in the neocolonial history of the region since the cold war. This aggregation enables readers to witness how their individual stories intertwingle with the political history of the region and how neocolonial policies conducted in the region have deterritorialized them physically and metaphorically.

In *The Wasted Vigil*, Aslam expresses that political Islam has caused the devastation of Afghanistan and Pakistan and regards the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan as a triggering factor for the rise of fundamentalism. He clearly states that the Soviets "precipitated much of present-day Afghanistan's destruction by invading in 1979" because that was the beginning of the period which resulted in the rise of fundamentalism in the region (2009: 11). To help readers perceive how locals are easily persuaded to join radical groups against the Soviets, the narrative exemplifies violence committed to locals from the president to ordinary citizens:

> "There had been reports of Soviet soldiers landing their helicopter to abduct a girl and flying away with her, parents or lovers following the trail of her clothing across the landscape and finally coming across her naked bone-punctured body, where she had been thrown out of the helicopter after the men had been sated… When the Soviet Army had entered Kabul, the Spetsnaz commandos running through the corridors of the Presidential Palace looking for the president, whom they immediately put to death when they found him" (2009: 17-18).

Being exposed to such random violence and to an ideology which denies their religion, locals tend to support radical groups. On the other hand, the invasion arouses political and humanitarian reactions all over the world, and the US does not miss that opportunity and initiates "a programme of massive economic and military aid to Pakistan as a frontline state and conduit for similar assistance and logistic support to the Afghan Islamic resistance forces, the Mujahideen" (Saikal, 2004: 209). The study considers that period as the beginning of neocolonialism in Afghanistan which is brought under economic and political control with the help of logistic support and remarks that the devastation of modern Afghanistan can be associated with neocolonialism which has appeared during decolonization movements all around the world approximately in the same period.

Similarly, the novel underlines the influence of the US neocolonialism on the political and military rise of fundamentalist groups and exemplifies the logistic support it provides for Islamist guerrillas. Initially, the narrative lays bare the strategic alliance between the US and fundamentalists, emphasizing fundamentalists' glorification through the media publishing magazines "with Osama bin Laden on the cover, photographed as always with the Kalashnikov of a Soviet soldier he had killed here in the 1980s" (Aslam, 2009: 48). Aslam also takes the alliance a step further and writes that the terrorist who encourages Bihzad to organize a terrorist attack has "his photograph taken whilst shaking Ronal Reagan's hand" (2009: 65). Being inspired by the massive international condemnation for the violence the Soviets perform in Afghanistan, the US does not hesitate to send the CIA agents to the region to organize the delivery of the aids. There is a flow of agents to the region which becomes "the prime staging area for the jihad against the Soviet invaders, rivalling East Berlin as the spy capital of the world by 1984" (2009: 151). Those agents do not only help "the anti-Soviet guerrillas, the dukhi," teaching them how to use weapons or plant bombs, but also organize the delivery of the aids (2009: 110). Aslam describes the frequency and hugeness of the aids passing through Peshawar, the border city between Afghanistan and Pakistan, and writes that even though the city used to "one of the main trading centres linked to the Silk Road," it has become the main road that is used by military convoys and ambulances carrying the wounded and the dead (2009: 151). Considering logistic supports including military aids as "the last stage of neocolonialism," Nkrumah underlines that local groups trespass on military aids, stating that "sooner or later the weapons supplied pass into the hands of the opponents of neo-colonialist regime and the war itself increases the social misery which originally provoked it" (Nkrumah, 1966: xvi). Aslam exemplifies this process of neocolonialism, suggesting that the weapons sent to Islamist guerrillas are used against the US because they sell those weapons to the enemies of the US. He clearly underlines the handover of the weapons in the neocolonial intricateness, writing that "two Afghans were arrested in Pakistan for attempting to sell Stingers to representatives of the Iranian government, for one million dollars each" (Aslam, 2009: 212). Such huge logistic aids do not only enable fundamentalists to triumph against the Soviets, but also lead to unbounded rise of fundamentalists who earn millions of dollars, selling the weapons supplied by the US and who attempt to designate strict religious government due to the authority gap after the retreat of the Soviets.

Aslam considers Islamization of the region as a process of social engineering that the US neocolonialism has performed in the region, especially in Afghanistan and depictures the transformation of the country vividly. He underlines with a feeling of nostalgia that the region used to be completely different from the negative connotations it signifies today:

> "It was a different city once. Two decades ago, a group of laughing college girls had discovered that the white car parked on Flower Street belonged to Wamaq Saleem – the great Pakistani poet who was visiting Afghanistan to give a recital of his poems – and they had covered it entirely with lipstick kisses" (2009: 245).

To emphasize the alteration that the region has undergone, Aslam depictures the bigotry that fundamentalists have built through political and military aid by the US neocolonialism and focuses on its influence on locals. As a microcosm of neocolonial Afghanistan, Marcus' house reveals the transformation of the country. During the narrative, the house turns out to be a symbolic cemetery of life before neocolonialism. It has six rooms, five of which have images on the walls which are dedicated to the five senses; however, Marcus and Katrina are obliged to hide those images with mud due to fear of the Taliban (2009: 13). The ceiling of the house is full of nailed books and even though Katrina nails them when she is mentally unbalanced, the narrative emphasizes that the books would be burnt or bombed by the Taliban if they were not nailed on the ceiling (2009: 8). The garden of the house is full of treasures reminding them of the pleasures they used to have before the Taliban, and the narrative exemplifies the ex-pleasures with a cassette player, cassettes and wines that they have to hide in the ground since they quail before fundamentalists (2009: 21). Furthermore, Aslam reveals the pressure that the Taliban perform in Afghanistan to build bigotry, stressing its influence on all dimensions of life:

> "And now – only hours after gaining control of Usha – [the Taliban] began whipping women in the streets for showing their faces. They banned smoking, music, television, kite flying, ludo, chess, football. There were bonfires of books and videos and audio tapes. They stood on the sides of the roads arresting men who didn't have beards, taking them to jail until the beards had grown. They ordered shops to close at prayer time, and in the first few hours they nailed a singer of devotional music to the mulberry tree in front of the mosque, for not revealing where he had buried his instruments" (2009: 239).

The more powerful the Taliban become, the more pitiless their rule becomes, and Marcus and Katrina, who challenge the oppression of the Taliban, inevitably take their share; While Marcus' hand is cut off because of assumed theft when he tries to take his wife's pictures, Katrina is stoned to death due to her religiously invalid marriage. Depicturing

the violence that the Taliban perform, imposing manipulated religious norms and rules to locals, Aslam also implies that the US neocolonialism has contributed much to the turmoil in Afghanistan, by teaching them how to be more slaughterous and manipulating their religious feelings. The omniscient third person narrator dives into the mind of David, the CIA agent, and unfolds how the US neocolonialism have taught the Taliban to be more decisive and merciful with an incident revealing that the CIA agents have trained the Taliban to be suicide bombers to explode the Salang Tunnel guarded by the Soviets:

"The only possible way of collapsing the tunnel was for someone to blow themselves up in there. The Afghans were appalled when the Americans suggested this to them. No one volunteered because suicide was a sin. The path would not fork at the moment of the explosion, sending the bomber to Paradise, the infidels to Hell. No, the Afghans told the Americans then, it would deliver both parties to Allah's Inferno" (2009: 77).

Aslam does not aim to justify the Taliban violence in Afghanistan during the subsequent civil war after the retreat of the Soviets but puts an emphasis on the transformation of religious thoughts with the rise of fundamentalism. He implies that Islamization, a social engineering that neocolonialism has conducted in Afghanistan, has built bigoted society where fundamentalism has raged out of control and the Middle East has become a neocolonial space that is regarded as the cell house of Islamist terrorist groups.

Aslam, in *The Wasted Vigil*, considers the unbounded rise of the fundamentalists during the civil war as one of the most significant factors promoting direct neocolonial military invasion of Afghanistan by the US on the plea of war against terrorism. He suggests that the political and military rise of fundamentalist groups provides them with courage to provoke a wave of anti-Americanism, exemplifying with an insurrection taking place in Pakistan:

"The rioters were led by a gang of students from the fundamentalist Islamic wing of the city's university. Inspired by the events in Tehran and the fire-breathing triumph of Ayatollah Khomeini, they had been waiting for a chance to demonstrate their own power" (2009: 104).

Even though the insurrection takes place in Pakistan, Aslam benefits from it to underline the alteration in political balance in the region. Anti-Americanism spreading among Muslim countries finds reflection in the neocolonial discourse that used to define Islamist groups as freedom fighters, and the neocolonial discourse generates new definitions for fundamentalists:

"Instead of saying 'jihadis', the newspapers and radio are being advised to employ the word 'irhabis', which means 'terrorists'. Instead of 'jihad', they are being told to use

‘hirabah’– ‘unholy war’. Instead of ‘mujahidin’, it’s ‘mufsidoon’– ‘the mayhem makers’” (2009: 350).

All these definitions become concrete with the terrorist attacks organized both in the US and in the region by the fundamentalist groups of the Middle East, and Aslam argues that the first attempt to explode the World Trade Centre in 1993, the 9/11 terrorist attacks to the World Trade Centre and Pentagon and terrorist rampages organized in the Middle East provide the US neocolonialism with an excuse it needs to perform direct military intervention in the Middle East. The excuse of the invasion of Afghanistan is war against terrorism, and the narrative expresses that the neocolonial discourse glorifies the excuse, regarding it as a sacred human duty “com-missioned by history” (2009: 36). The narrative frequently verbalizes the reason of the direct invasion through the perspectives of neocolonialist characters trying to justify their existence, uttering “[the US soldiers] are [t]here to help [Afghans’] country. [They] came to get rid of the Taliban for [Afghans] (2009: 374). Those neocolonialist characters also justify their physical existence and violence, accusing of Islam and fundamentalists (2009: 414). Underlying the justification of the direct neocolonial military intervention, Aslam shares his political stance through Dunia, an Afghan woman who is obliged to discontinue teaching at a school where Western education is provided. Interrupting James, a CIA agent, who attempts to glorify the neocolonial excuse of war against terrorism and justify the existence of the US army in the Middle East, she lays bare the fact that the Taliban have transformed from freedom fighters to terrorists due to their unbounded rise promoted by the economic and logistic support of neocolonialism.

Even though *The Wasted Vigil* does not narrate military operations the US neocolonialism launches in the region in a detailed way, Aslam regards direct military intervention, the extreme form of neocolonialism, as a war against terrorism. He states that “America’s Special Forces are operating in the region” and “the hunt for terrorists” continues in Afghanistan’s deserts (2009: 9). Those operations are not limited to raids performed by a small group of soldiers, but also include heavy bombardments, such as the one organized to the mountain of Tora Bora (2009: 12). The narrative also suggests that “cluster bombs” whose usages were prohibited by an international treaty are used in the neocolonial war following the terrorist attacks (2009: 76). Briefly, while depicting the neocolonial turmoil in the Middle East, Aslam underlines the function of direct military intervention of the US after the 9/11 terrorist attacks.

On the other hand, Aslam also lays bare the indirect methods that the US neocolonialism utilizes, drawing attention to the function a group of local who help neocolonialists reach their exploitative goals. Fanon suggests that neocolonialism benefits from "the bourgeoisie it nurtures" (2011: 119) and similarly, Aslam regards the warlords in the Middle East as the group of people who are economically and logistically supported by the US neocolonialism. Aslam underlines this neocolonial relationship between warlords and the US through Gul Rasool, who is described as the most powerful local ally in the region. Underlining Gul Rasool's contribution to fight against the Taliban, Aslam reveals the huge amount of money that the US neocolonialism has spent for their support, writing:

"The first CIA team that arrived in Afghanistan soon after the attacks, to persuade warlords and tribal leaders, had brought five million dollars with them. It was spent within forty days. Ten million more was flown in by helicopter: piles of money as high as children – four cardboard boxes kept in a corner of a safe house, with someone sleeping on them as a precaution against theft" (Aslam, 2009: 202).

This relationship is based on mutual interests because while warlords obtain wealth on large scale, they are also appointed to significant political positions which enable them to work for their masters' interests. Gul Rasool is one of those warlords because he obtains "a position in the ministry of reconstruction and development" and goes on pleasing his neocolonial masters by obeying their orders (2009: 71). Such political distortions explain the so-called independency and manipulated governments of neocolonial countries, and Aslam's critical attitude towards the distortion of the country finds reflection in Gul Rasool's appointment when the narrative clearly states that "he is in the government the US install[s]" in Afghanistan (2009: 411). In short, Aslam reveals the distorted political structures in neocolonial countries, such as Afghanistan and Pakistan, by shedding light on the indirect methods the US neocolonialism utilizes to create chaotic atmosphere and to have an influence on policymakers of target countries.

Consequently, in *The Wasted Vigil*, Aslam suggests that Islamization of Afghanistan is a project of social engineering that the US neocolonialism has conducted in the region. Promoting political Islam and providing Islamist radicals with logistic and economic support, the US neocolonialism has enabled radicals to become a militarily and economically powerful potent force in the region. While that support results in the retreat of the Soviets, it also creates brutal fundamentalists who have built bigoted hegemony, by perpetrating violence not only to the Soviets, but also to locals and their allies, Americans. Aslam implies that the unbounded rise of the Taliban, which is, in fact,

promoted by the US neocolonialism, has designated a reign of terror in the Middle East. Hereby, the US neocolonialism has legitimized the direct neocolonial military intervention in the region, making propaganda of war against terrorism. Dealing with the fervent neocolonial period since the Cold War, Aslam attempts to indicate the influence of the turmoil on both the representatives and victims of neocolonialism in the narrative and lays bare that those neocolonial policies have deterritorialized both figuratively and physically, forcing them to leave behind their homelands, beloveds and identities.

3.4 Transformation of the Deterritorialized in *The Wasted Vigil*

Reflecting the transformation of neocolonialism from indirect control through logistic and economic support to direct military invasion of Afghanistan, Aslam, in *The Wasted Vigil*, reveals the political, economic and social deterioration in the region, especially Afghanistan and Pakistan, since the Cold War. In the novel, he fictionalizes a neocolonial space where the stories of individuals who are representatives or victims of neocolonialism interlace with each other. Referring Marcus as the wasted warden of Afghanistan in the title, the narrative centres on his tragic struggle in neocolonial Afghanistan and reveals that the neocolonial Afghanistan has reached an extremity that does not tolerate his hybridity. All members of his family, Katrina, Zameen and Bihzad, become deterritorialized physically and metaphorically in the neocolonial Afghanistan, and he spends his life seeking for his missing daughter and grandson. While Katrina's metaphorical deterritorialization is initially reflected with her madness and then with her lapidation, Zameen and Bihzad's deterritorialization becomes concrete with their abductions and displacements between the political poles that neocolonialism has built in the region. Besides, the neocolonial Afghanistan becomes a multi-layered space where the stories of David, a representative of the US neocolonialism, and Casa, standing for fundamentalists neocolonialism has strengthened, intertwine with each other, opening possibilities for them to make regulations for subjectivities. Gathering Marcus, David, Lara, Dunia and Casa at Marcus' house, Aslam, in *The Wasted Vigil*, correlates their stories with their past, which does not only shed light on their individual background, but also complies with the neocolonial history of the region. Herewith, he lays bare that neocolonialism has created deterritorialized individuals, forcing them to be a part of neocolonial policies or to experience the physical, social and cultural turmoil in the region.

In *The Wasted Vigil*, neocolonial deterritorialization begins with the dislocation of individuals who set journeys to find their beloveds lost in the turmoil or who arrive neocolonial Afghanistan of their own volition. Those physical journeys enable them to gather at Marcus' house where they set archetypal journeys which urge their identities to undergo transformations. The fact that their physical dislocations provide them with opportunities to experience transformations in their identities complies with the Deleuzian understanding of deterritorialization. For Deleuze and Guattari, identity is a process of becoming which "comes up through the middle" (2005: 293). Deterritorialized

identity is formed with “the cultivation of the self in a way that suggests important possibilities for learning how to make adjustments to our subjectivities” (Oladi and Portelli, 2017: 666). Ascribing nomadism to identity, Deleuze and Guattari regards it as a process of becoming which refers to the alterations occurring through subjects’ relationship with outer factors and underlines that nomadic identity pushes subjects into a state of inbetweenness (2005: 293). In this regard, Aslam fictionalizes a neocolonial space where deterritorialized individuals come together and experience alterations in their identities due to state of inbetweenness during their reterritorialization.

David is one of the deterritorialized individuals transforming from a CIA agent who is faithful to the US neocolonialism to an anti-imperialist who runs counter to other agents to save the life of a Taliban soldier, Casa. David is a true nomad who is physically dislocated from his home by neocolonial policies of the US. He decides to become a CIA agent and comes to Afghanistan to avenge himself against the Soviets for his brother, Jonathan, who have deceased in the Vietnam war. His physical journey to the Middle East offers possibilities for him to cultivate subjectivity, and it becomes an archetypal journey in which his identity undergoes alterations. As a neocolonial nomad, he wanders across the Middle East and accumulates possibilities which contribute to his transformation. He falls in love with Zameen and has intimacy with Bihzad; however, when he is on duty, both Zameen and Bihzad are kidnapped. His struggle to find them enables him to witness closely the brutal disarray the US neocolonialism has generated in the region. Even though he learns that Gul Rasool, a warlord the US neocolonialism has strengthened, kills Zameen, David does not give up seeking for Bihzad. David usually takes to the roads to find Bihzad, but although he fails to find the son, he meets his grandfather, Marcus. Their encounter becomes a source of motivation for both to find Bihzad, and they start to experience the neocolonial violence, which pushes them into a state of inbetweenness and urges them to undergo alterations.

In the novel, the narrator narrates two different periods simultaneously, and this division reveals the transformation that David undergoes through his first-hand experiences in the neocolonial Afghanistan. In the past time of the narrative, David is a fervent CIA agent who does his best to serve for the interests of the US neocolonialism due to his hatred for the Soviets who have killed his brother in Vietnam. He teaches “the rebels how to rig these up, to kill Soviet soldiers in Kabul and Kandahar, in Herat and Mazar-i-Sharif” (Aslam, 2009: 182). The narrative always associates his existence in the region with the violence the US neocolonialism commits in the region. He is described to

be a brutal agent who foreknows the blowing up of a passenger plane "carrying Afghan schoolchildren bound for indoctrination in the Soviet Union," but who lets them die for the interests of the US neocolonialism (2009: 109). He approves of all kinds of violence serving for the profits of the US neocolonialism and he does not attempt to save the lives of civilians. The narrator lays bare his neocolonialist mindset about the operation, stating that "[t]he civilised world would see [the violence] and condemn Soviet brutality, Moskov made to rethink its policies" (2009: 173). However, then, his physical journeys as a CIA agent in the neocolonial Middle East turn out to be archetypal journeys illuminating the dark side of his existence in the region, and he begins to perceive the meaninglessness of the atrocity in the region. The narrative reveals his transformation with a striking example:

"One evening [David] stood to watch a pair of children, participants in a game of hide-and-seek that was in progress in a street of hovels. They were crouching next to an open sewer that spilled black matter, their eyes trained on the door from which the seeker was probably to emerge, the smell of cooking smoke and bread floating in the evening air. David watched as the two children sprang to their feet and grabbed the little boy who had just appeared in the door, chewing, having just finished a meal. They marched him to a corner and then quickly, before David could believe what he was seeing, or react, a finger was inserted into the overpowered little boy's throat, the vomit emerging and being caught in the hands of the two assailants, who then began to eat the still-undigested food. The little boy stumbled away dazed and fell, his eyes bright with liquid even in the dusk. And David was hurrying through the four-foot wide 'street', trying to find a way out of the maze. He had helped create all this" (2009: 185).

David notices that his hatred for the Soviets has blinded him, and the journeys through the depth of neocolonialism enable him to witness the atrocity directly and to question his existences as a representative of the US neocolonialism in the region.

Furthermore, his love for Zameen and Bihzad urges him to set frequent journeys, and his physical nomadism complies with his nomadic identity which undergoes alterations due to the perspectives he obtains for the US neocolonialism. In his search for them, David learns that they are taken as captive by Gul Rasool, and Zameen and Bihzad have deceased in the chaos created by the US, the warlords and fundamentalists. Associating her death with Gul Rasool, a puppet the US neocolonialism utilizes, David perceives that he "step[s] on his own footprints" while "following the trail of her murderers" (2009: 189). What he finds about her death can be seen as another possibility which pushes him into a state of inbetweenness during reterritorialization because he starts to question not only his existence in the region, but also reliability of the CIA taking an active role in killing Zameen. Even though he supposes that Christopher, a CIA agent,

is responsible for her death, he, then, comprehends that her death is not "about *greed* and *personal gain*" but one of the dirty businesses of the CIA (2009: 385; original italics). Uncovering that the CIA has planned the death of Zameen since he neglects his duties while seeking her, David severs all ties with the CIA and spends the rest of his life to find her missing son, Bihzad. Thus, David's neocolonial deterritorialization drags him into the turmoil where he falls in love with a woman while carrying out his agency, and his journeys offer new possibilities which indicate that the US neocolonialism is not only brutal to locals, but also to its agents in the region. To emphasize the brutality of the US neocolonialism, Aslam fictionalizes such an alteration in David's identity and reflects the neocolonial deterritorialization of David, who transforms from a fervent agent to a neocolonial nomad; he endeavours to save Casa, a fundamentalist terrorist, expressing that Casa "is the child of a human, which means he has a choice, and he can change" (2009: 413).

Underlining the possibility of change even for the strictest, Aslam considers the neocolonial space as the environment where different political doctrines, religions and social norms clash. Those clashes pave the way for the transformation of identities. As a microcosm of the neocolonial Afghanistan, Marcus' house becomes a space where opposite poles of neocolonial Afghanistan gather, and Aslam utilizes these arguments to accentuate alterations in David's ideas on the US neocolonialism. On his early days at the CIA, David approves of the violence committed to locals or of the agreements which ensure advantages for the US neocolonialism, and the narrator reveals his thoughts on the issue:

> "Strange sacrifices were required in that shadow-filled realm, strange compromises. In another month the Soviet Union would invade Afghanistan, and Pakistan's corrupt and brutal military dictator would become a fêted ally of not just the United States but of most of the Western world, David himself present on a number of occasions where the man was extravagantly celebrated and flattered, his own voice adding to the dishonest chorus" (2009: 106).

However, David's argument with Lara, who always deals with the violence in the Middle East since the Cold War from a humanitarian perspective, promotes the state of inbetweenness David faces due to his own experiences and findings about Zameen's death. Aslam utilizes those arguments as facilitating factors in his transformation and reveals his state of inbetweenness through his silence which becomes a motif in the narrative. When Lara asks questions about the duties he has performed, he keeps his silence, which shows his sense of guilt and his transformation. For instance, when Lara

asks David whether it is true that the US neocolonialism has agreed with the ones who blow up the passenger plane carrying Afghan children, David does not answer him and falls into silence (2009: 109). Similarly, when she asks him whether he has "helped the anti-Soviet guerrillas, the dukhi," he keeps his silence again, and the narrator describes his muteness "[n]othing from him. The sound of the wood splitting as the fire comes and the water swaying" (2009: 111). In addition to his arguments with Lara which ends with his silence, he also subsides into silence in his self-questionings. When he directly witnesses the atrocity, the US has created in Afghanistan through an incident in which two boys force another boy to vomit and eat the vomited matter, the narrator reveals that he initially attempts to blame the Soviets for the atrocity, but then falls into silence, stating that "all this was the Soviet Union's fault because… because… He couldn't complete the thought" (2009: 186). These arguments, inner or outer, can be considered as possibilities which enable individuals to adjust during reterritorialization. While they help readers perceive David's transformation, Aslam benefits from them to strike a critical attitude towards the US neocolonialism, fictionalizing such a CIA agent who cannot be indifferent to the atrocity in the neocolonial Afghanistan and transforms into the one who not only questions policies of the US neocolonialism, but also undermines the motto of war against terrorism by saving the life of a fundamentalist terrorist, Casa.

David and Casa are two sides of the same coin within the framework of *The Wasted Vigil*, and both are deterritorialized individuals whose identities undergo alterations through possibilities they encounter in neocolonial Afghanistan. Aslam builds a juxtaposition between David, a CIA agent, and Casa, a fundamentalist terrorist, and they spend time together in Marcus' house to indicate that even extreme thoughts can change with mutual interactions. Like David, Casa is also described to be fervent in doing what he believes, and the narrative, through indirect characterization, delineates him as a terrorist who manipulates a young man's religious emotions and does not hesitate to send him to death as a suicide bomber. However, Aslam does not give up on such narrow-minded individuals and reflects the potential of transformation in them, fictionalizing a microcosm of Afghanistan, Marcus' house, where they share their ideas without guns or bombs, learn to respect others' opinions and discover good sides in those whom they regard as enemies.

Casa stands for deterritorialized youth in Afghanistan. He is described to be a local boy who has lost his family in the Cold War. The neocolonial struggle severs all his ties

with his family, leaving him behind without a family and relatives, and he becomes a true nomad who "does not even know his own name" and who is brought up in "orphanages" and educated in "madrassas" (2009: 334). Even though his personal background normalizes his existence among fundamentalists since political Islam benefits from madrassah education to promote Jihadism, Aslam takes him away and enables him to set a journey towards Marcus' house. This is considered as his deterritorialization from fundamentalist space, and it offers him new possibilities through which he designates his identity.

Casa's deterritorialization begins with his falling into a trap while going through a beautifully flowered garden. He gets injured and stumbles through Marcus' house to be treated, which refers to his dislocation from fundamentalist groups. Casa's prejudice against Marcus, an English unbeliever, is demolished when Marcus takes him to the hospital. Despite Casa's insistence of leaving, Marcus does not allow him to go away and die but persuades him to be treated at hospital. Marcus and David do not leave him there and invite him to Marcus' house after he is released from the hospital. Herewith, he embarks on an archetypal journey which pushes him into a state of inbetweenness leading to alterations.

Casa is a fervent terrorist believing in fundamentalism as the only salvation both in the neocolonial Afghanistan and in the afterlife. He manipulates religious and nationalist feelings of a young boy claiming that Americans are "traitor[s] to Islam and Afghanistan" (2009: 62) and does not hesitate to send the boy to devastate an American school as a suicide bomber. His characterization complies with the ambivalence and inbetweenness he experiences when he tries to reterritorialize into a new territory, Marcus' house. To emphasize his credence that even fundamentalists can change, Aslam fictionalizes such a strict fundamentalist, Casa, whose individual background enables readers to perceive his fanatical tendencies. Aslam reflects Casa's ambivalence and inbetweenness while he discovers possibilities during his archetypal journey. Casa's thoughts about Marcus, who has saved his life, and David, who has paid his hospital bill, reveals his ambivalence. He is grateful to them for "the gentleness they [display] towards him" in the house and for the favours they have done, and he feels obliged to communicate with them and to help David build a canoe (2009: 216). On the other hand, the narrator reflects his ambivalence, stressing that while his fundamentalist side provokes him to resort to violence against Marcus and David, he also cannot ignore them. While he

imagines their dead bodies “before the stone idol’s head, he also does not want them to come closer to the mine (2009: 258-259). The narrative clearly reveals that he is in between his gratefulness and fundamentalism. Even though he knows that they are gentle and do not harm him, he plans to use the mine to kill them since he regards them as a treat for his religion.

Marcus’ house is the first territory where Casa reterritorializes, facing possibilities apart from his strict religious norms. Those possibilities do not have much influence on his bigotry until Dunai, a local woman, who is dislocated by fundamentalists from her school, arrives home. Although he spends time with Marcus, Lara and David, he insists on his bigotry and believes strictly that his country is Muslim territory where life must be designated by the rules of Islam and all people must believe in Islam (2009: 218). However, even though he does not sever all ties with fundamentalism completely, Dunia’s arrival pushes him into a state of inbetweenness leading to moderation in his strictness on religion. Their relationship begins with exchanging pray rugs and goes on exchanging ideas on politics and religion. In these conversations, Dunia’s powerful arguments encourage Casa to review his bigotry, especially his thought that “a woman should keep her face covered” and the narrative underlines his defeat, stating that “there’s something thorn-like in his voice” (2009: 319). Similarly, Dunia attempts to convince Casa to make a distinction between religion and fundamentalism suggesting that “Muslims love Islam. But Muslims hate fundamentalism. *That* can be destroyed” (2009: 319). She also remarks that fundamentalists cannot provide the region with salvation, putting forward, “What [Afghans] have to make sure is that Muslim don’t fall in love with the ways of fundamentalists-then [they]’d be in trouble” (2009: 319). On the other hand, she also argues with other CIA agents on the US neocolonialism and suggests that it has initially created the Taliban and then benefitted from it. She reveals her political stance blaming both the US neocolonialism and the Taliban for the neocolonial Afghanistan, expressing that “[the US neocolonialism is] as bad as [the Taliban are]” (2009: 319). She draws an image of an ideal Muslim for Casa and even though he cannot confess his transformation, the omniscient third person narrator reflects his feelings writing that “he does not want to be that” fundamentalist causing devastation of Afghanistan. Taking off his clothes and being naked in complete darkness, he becomes ready symbolically to change and starts to write about the transformation that his nomadic identity undergoes after deterritorialization. The narrator defines what he writes as

"sentences about himself" and "the truth" which "he can only say in the dark" (2009: 377). However, when he opens his eyes and holds a candle to the pages, he sees that they are still blank and remarks that "Allah" does not wat him to change. Yet, as a deterritorialized individual who is pushed into inbetweenness, Casa does not give up writing:

> "He continues to write however – no pigment, just pressure – until both pages are filled and several more. Finishing, he rips them out and folds them carefully…. Words that can't be seen. A silent cry, …. Nothing but the maelstrom of his breathing in the darkness now" (2009: 378).

Thus, Marcus' house, the territory Casa tries to reterritorialize, offers him possibilities to accumulate new characteristics, spending time and sharing ideas with Marcus, Lara, David and Dunia; thereby, enabling Casa to reveal that he can transform from a radical to a moderate Muslim.

However, Aslam knows that transformations are not so easy in the neocolonial Middle East as they are in different parts of the world, and he does not prefer to finish the novel with a happy ending. He fictionalizes another deterritorialization for Casa, who falls prey to Gul Rasool when he tries to rescue Dunia, who is kidnapped from Marcus's house. Casa becomes a neocolonial nomad who is frequently deterritorialized by neocolonialism, and his captivity encompasses new possibilities which influence his identity. In this new territory, he is tortured by the CIA agents who sew "his lips together with needle and thread" (2009: 405) and this drags him into a deadlock of inbetweenness. Even though David rescues him from the tortures of CIA agents, Casa kills both himself and David. The narrator describes the scene from Lara's perspective who is in the house and cannot hear their voices. Lara sees David talking to Casa, and then there happens an explosion which "opens a shared grave for them on the ground" (2009: 422-423). Even though readers do not know what they are talking about, the scene complies with David's credence on Casa whom David regards as the one that can transform into a moderate man. Yet, Casa becomes ambivalent due to the tortures, and he kills himself and his saviour. David and Casa are the two of those who become deterritorialized in the neocolonial Afghanistan. Although they are described to be natural enemies, Aslam suggests that what creates hatred between them is neocolonialism, fictionalizing a neocolonial space where the dichotomy between them is demolished through conversations. However, Aslam does not also ignore the realities of the region and describes them as victims who have deceased in the neocolonial turmoil.

Similarly, Aslam depicts neocolonial Middle Easterner women as deterritorialized, shedding light on experiences of Zameen, Katrina and Dunia who vanish physically in neocolonial Afghanistan. While they are dislocated physically and exiled to different territories or refugee camps, they are also forced to adopt gender roles manipulated by fundamentalists. Their physical depletions refer to different periods in the neocolonial history of the region and reveal how they are dislocated from the society. Zameen is one of the women witnessing the beginning of the neocolonial turmoil with the Cold War. She is kidnapped by the Soviets who claim that she is a supporter of religious guerrillas, and she is raped by Benedikt, a Soviet soldier. Then, while her physical dislocation from her family drags her to different territories in the neocolonial Afghanistan, it also promotes Marcus and David to set frequent journeys to find her. The narrative does not provide readers with much detail about her experiences during her exile, but benefits from her disappearance, associating it with the neocolonial policies to reveal their deterritorializing effects on individuals.

Katrina is another woman who is victimized by the US neocolonialism which consolidates both warlords and the Taliban that contribute much to the chaotic atmosphere of the region, implementing random policies and resorting to violence at will. Initially, she is withheld by Gul Rasool to treat his fighters and dragged in different territories throughout the neocolonial Afghanistan. But then, Gul Rasool "[abandons] her in the mountains, and she [goes] from place to place. Trying to practice her profession as much as she could" (2009: 238) Becoming a true neocolonial nomad, she reterritorializes herself into a political stance challenging the political potent, the Taliban, which the US neocolonialism has designated. Since the Taliban impose religiously strict government which does not leave a space for women to exist with their own individuality, the neocolonial Afghanistan becomes a territory which marginalizes women such as her. The bigotry initially forces her to cut her husband's hand since he is caught while he tries to take her drawings back. Although he does not want to obey the order, she is obliged to do when they threaten her to kill him, and she loses her mental health. Then, the straitlaced rule of the Taliban blames Katrina for adultery, suggesting that her marriage is void since the marriage ceremony has been carried out by a woman, and she is stoned to death. Hence, Katrina refers to another group of local women who, unlike Zameen, manage to survive in the Cold War, but decease in the religiously rigid neocolonial Afghanistan under the rule of the Taliban.

Dunia, on the other hand, stands for a local woman who adopts a critical standpoint against both the US neocolonialism and fundamentalism in the post-Taliban period. As one of deterritorialized individuals who have lost her family members in the neocolonial atrocity, she has a political stance which obviously expostulates the role of both in devastation of Afghanistan. When she argues with James, a CIA agent, and Casa about the contemporary condition of Afghanistan, she analyses the political history of her country logically and has courage to suggest that the US neocolonialism and fundamentalism are responsible for the atrocity. She directly opposes James, who claims that "[they] are [in Afghanistan] to help [her] country. [They] came to get rid of the Taliban for [Afghans]" and remarks that even though she is content with the fall of the Taliban, she is intelligent enough to perceive that they are in Afghanistan for their own profits (2009: 374-375). Moreover, she is not a woman to surrender the restrictiveness of bigotry, but the one that challenges the roles imposed upon women expressing her thoughts with strong arguments. When she argues with Casa about women's veiling, she indicates that she is educated enough to talk about the issue while Casa believes in the constructions of bigotry unquestioningly (2009: 320). She becomes prominent as a balanced woman with the help of whom Aslam reflects the image of an ideal Middle Easterner woman. She, as a deterritorialized woman, makes adjustments to form an identity, experiencing possibilities after her deterritorialization, and her alteration is glorified by Aslam. However, in *The Wasted Vigil*, Aslam does not draw a hopeful future for such educated and idealist women but underlines that the neocolonial Afghanistan is a territory where women who do not surrender to bigotry are at the peril of evanesce through Dunia's disappearance at the end of the novel.

Consequently, in *The Wasted Vigil*, Aslam deals with the turbulent period which starts with the Cold War and goes on with the direct military intervention of the US neocolonialism. To shed lights on the political developments in the region after decolonization, Aslam's narration involves two different time spans. While he clarifies the rise of fundamentalism with the support of the US neocolonialism in the past time of the narration, he, in the present time of the narration, indicates that the direct military intervention of the US is the consequence of the unbounded rise of the fundamentalism. In the present time of the narrative, Aslam gathers David, Lara, Dunia and Casa, representatives of political powers in the neocolonial history of the region, at Marcus's house. While he provides readers with details not only about their individual backgrounds, but also the neocolonial history of the region with the past time, he lays

bare the transformation they undergo in the present time of the narrative. His main focal point is to emphasize that neocolonialism has dislocated many individuals, Russians, Americans or Middle Easterners, and they undergo alterations due to their survival struggles in the neocolonial Afghanistan. With their strong arguments, Lara and Dunia raise awareness on neocolonialism and fundamentalism. Lara enables readers to perceive David's transformation, questioning his involvement in the neocolonial brutality performed in the past and encouraging him to take an action to stop the ongoing violence. Dunia, on the other hand, makes an impression of a religious individual who has capability to question, and her arguments with Casa has a great influence on his transformation. Aslam benefits from the interactions among the characters to highlight that moderation of rigid ideas is the only way of salvation for the region. However, Aslam also knows that moderation is very difficult for Afghanistan, and concordantly, he prefers a tragic end in which Casa and David die, Lara turns back to Russia, Dunia disappears, and Marcus is on his own in ruined Afghanistan.

3.5 Neocolonial Deterritorialization in *The Blind Man's Garden*

This chapter aims to analyse how direct neocolonial military interventions dislocate locals and compel them to physical and figurative journeys during which they obtain new characteristics. The chapter suggests that the US neocolonialism comes back to the Middle East to fight against the fundamentalist groups it created in the Cold War, creating the neocolonial Afghanistan and Pakistan where locals become physically and metaphorically deterritorialized due to the violence performed by both. To associate their dislocations with neocolonialism, the chapter lays bare the post-9/11 Pakistan and Afghanistan where the US neocolonialism has performed military operations with a motto of war against terrorism. The chapter also underlines indirect methods that the US neocolonialism utilizes to increase its hegemony over the target countries through military aids, banking systems and international corporations. Describing the contemporary Afghanistan and Pakistan as a region surrounded directly and indirectly by the US neocolonialism, the chapter sheds light on local's deterritorialization which refers to their alterations promoted by their experiences in the neocolonial space. Furthermore, the chapter also emphasizes that the bigoted society that has been built with the support of neocolonialism generates pressure on locals, deterritorializing them from their religion figuratively and leaving them into a state of inbetweenness.

3.6 Neocolonial Military Interventions in the Middle East in *The Blind Man's Garden*

Nadeem Aslam's *The Blind Man's Garden* reflects the contemporary Afghanistan and Pakistan through the stories of deterritorialized locals who are metaphorically or physically driven away in their own countries by the war-torn atmosphere generated by neocolonial policies. Aslam's empathetic attitude towards Middle Easterners causes the novel to be categorized as being "on the treacherous fault-line between the binaries of terrorist discourse… between Islam and the secular West" since it tends to "voice silenced thoughts" which regard the neocolonial policies performed in the region as the factors expediting social, economic and political deterioration in the region (Scanlan, 2010: 267). Contrary to the post 9/11novels, such as *Terrorist* by John Updike and *Falling Man* by Don DeLillo, which "reinforce the view of Islam as a religion of violent fanatics," by showing empathy towards the victims of the attacks, *The Blind Man's Garden* lays bare the existence ordinary locals who become deterritorialized in their neocolonial war-torn homelands despite their disobedience to fundamentalists. Its plot, which does not only refer to the political issues in Pakistan where the story starts, but also in Afghanistan, betokens his interest in politics that he also confesses in one of his interviews:

> "Politics is important to me. I keep saying we've lived through an extraordinary decade, beginning with the attacks on 11 September 2001 and ending with the Arab Spring. Mohamed Atta's suicide at one end and Mohamed Bouazizi's suicide at the other. And between these two moments, we had the War on Terror, the call to Jihad, the invasion of Iraq and Afghanistan, Guantanamo Bay, Abu Ghraib, Daniel Pearl, the murder of Benazir Bhutto and the murder of Osama Bin Laden" (Yaqin, 39).

His preoccupation with the political issues concerning the economic, social and politic decadence of his homeland forms the basis of the novel. As he unburdens his willingness "to tell the story of what happened to Pakistan, because Pakistan has paid a huge price for what has happened during the last ten years but also during the Afghan Jihad" (Yaqin, 43), *The Blind Man's Garden* and *The Wasted Vigil*, which are analysed within the course of the dissertation, reveal the war-torn Middle East which is created not only by extreme form of neocolonialism performing military intervention, but also by religious fundamentalist groups that have been utilized by the US imperialism.

The Blind Man's Garden centres upon the dreary experiences of a Pakistani family whose lives change suddenly in the "war on terror" conducted by the US imperialism in the aftermath of the 9/11 attacks. The novel underlines that even though the family members are content with their modest life in their flowered garden representing their

beautiful country, they become deterritorialized because of both the war on terrorism and the consequences of the neocolonial atmosphere which has been designated since the Cold War. Rohan, whose blindness is addressed in the title, is the patriarch of the family, and with his wife Sofia, who apostatizes before her death, he has founded a school, the Ardent Spirit, to restore the magnificence that Islam civilization has lost lately. Rohan has a biological son, Jeo, a trainee doctor, who is married to Naheed and a biological daughter, Yasmin, a teacher at the Christian school. Rohan also has two adopted sons, Basil, married to Yasmin, and Mikal, who leaves home because of his love for Naheed. Their modest lives turn upside down when Jeo decides to help the wounded in the Afghan war. Finding out Jeo's intention, Mikal also decides to accompany him, and their physical journey stands for family member's archetypal journeys which make them deterritorialized in their own territories. Jeo's death and Mikal's survival struggles against not only the US soldiers, but also fundamentalist groups, enable the narrative to lay bare the contemporary neocolonial atmosphere in Pakistan and Afghanistan.

In accordance with his desire to shed light on the impact of the 9/11 attacks on Pakistan, Aslam specifies Heer, a small town in Peshawar, which is very close to the border between Pakistan and Afghanistan, and the turbulent period after the attacks as the setting of the story:

> "It's October. The United States was attacked last month, a day of fire visited on its cities. And as a consequence, Western armies have invaded Afghanistan. 'The Battle of the World Trade Center and the Pentagon' is what some people here in Pakistan have named September's terrorist attacks. The logic is that there are no innocent people in a guilty nation. And similarly, these weeks later, it is the buildings, orchards and hills of Afghanistan that are being torn apart by bombs and fire-shells…The wounded and injured are being brought out to Peshawar" (Aslam, 2014: 6).

Such a setting preference provides him with the opportunity to draw the contemporary picture of the Middle East where extreme form of neocolonialism conducts all means to destroy and exploit the region. Moreover, Mikal's journey to Afghanistan helps Aslam reveal the extreme violence that the US neocolonialism performs in the war against terrorism. Aslam, thus, aptly portrays the neocolonial Middle East where the US neocolonialism and fundamentalist groups fight for the sake of their noble causes.

The narrative delineates the militaristic presence of the US in the region, focusing on the destruction caused by extreme form of neocolonial military interventions in the region. Direct military interventions are exemplified by "[l]aser-guided bombs" and "missiles summoned from the Arabian Sea, from American ships that are as long as the

Empire State Building" which are aiming at Afghanistan (2014: 14). Those military operations are clearly regarded as a direct means of extreme form of neocolonialism because they refer to neo-imperialist attempts targeting at the Middle East with the motto of war against terrorism after the 9/11 attacks:

> "According to a newspaper a brick from the pulverised home of Mullah Omar has been flown to the United States as a war trophy for the White House. And, according to another, on 19 September a CIA paramilitary officer was told by his chief at Langley, Virginia, 'I want bin Laden's head shipped in a box filled with dry ice. I want to show it to the President'" (2014: 27).

The motto of war against terrorism enables the US neocolonialism to launch raid any place regarded as risky or related to terrorists. The narrative exemplifies the US military's capability to perform an operation in Afghanistan when Mikal and Jeo are brought to a fortress where locals who are said to be members of fundamentalist groups hide (2014: 73). The fortress is ruined with heavy gunfire on suspicion of being a cell house for terrorists, which does not only underline the pseudo independence of Afghanistan, but also reveals that Afghanistan becomes the garrison of the US neocolonialism. As Nkrumah suggests, in extreme form of neocolonialism, "imperial power may garrison the territory of the neo-colonial State and control the government of it" (Nkrumah, 1966: ix). The US neocolonialism establishes military dominance over Afghanistan and becomes capable of reigning the whole region. The hegemony of the US neocolonialism is reflected through the imagery of military "boots" which leave "deep imprints on the muddy ground" (Aslam, 2014: 162). Here, while the boots stand for the physical militaristic existence of the US neocolonialism, the muddy ground refers to Afghanistan, which is slid into chaos by such a direct military intervention. The authorial voice also emphasizes the magnitude of the US hegemony and its effects on the region, stating that "America is everywhere. The boots are large as if saying, 'This is how you make an impression in the world'" (2014: 162). The narrative strikes a critical attitude towards those operations because they transform into a witch hunt and create war-torn Middle East where locals are caught at the middle of violence, underlining that they "devolve into an endless series of raids and man-hunts" (2014: 162).

The violence perpetrated in Afghanistan by the US army to take the revenge of the terrorist attacks is just only one part of the spiral of violence that neocolonialism has built in the region since the Cold War, and *The Blind Man's Garden* sheds light on the function of fundamentalist groups in creating violent neocolonial Afghanistan.

Fundamentalist groups were founded and equipped with the armament by the US during the cold war to fight against communism in Afghanistan, and they became so dominant and powerful that they attempted to shape the lives of locals in accordance with the manipulated extreme religious rules. The narrative exemplifies the violence and corruption of the Taliban reign through lynching of Ahmet the Moth, the former ruler of the school of Ardent Spirit, a Taliban soldier by ordinary locals:

> "Every ounce of rage- every rape, every disappearance, every public execution, every hand amputated during the past seven years of the Taliban regime, every twelve-year-old boy pressed into battle by them, every ten-year-old girl forcibly married to a mullah eight times her age, every man lashed, every woman beaten, every limb broken-was poured into the two men by fist, club, stick, foot and stone, and when they finished and dispersed nothing remained of the pair. It was as if they had been eaten" (2014: 52-53).

The oppressive rule of the Taliban and its affiliation with al-Qaeda ensure the excuses that the US neocolonialism needs to send armies to the Middle East after the 9/11 attacks. Thus, the US neocolonialism does not only obtain the opportunity to bring democracy, a neocolonial excuse utilized by the US imperialism to launch military operations to the Third World countries, to the Middle East, but also to take the revenge of the terrorist attacks, killing every member of fundamentalist terrorist groups. In addition to the militarism performed by the Taliban, the physical existence of the US army in Afghanistan transforms the region into a neocolonial hell where both the US army launches random raids to kill terrorists and the Taliban organizes suicide bombings in public places such as, bazaars, schools, or churches. To draw the contemporary picture of neocolonial Middle East, the narrative exemplifies the terrorist attacks performed in public places with the one organized "in a market in Kasmir killing bystanders" (2014: 52) and the bombing of a church that Rohan, Basie and Yasmin witness when they seek Jeo in Heer, a town in Pakistan (2014: 94). While the narrative attempts to reveal the contemporary condition of the region, it also clarifies those attacks with the neocolonial collaboration between the US and Pakistan government because their organizers are stated to have ties with the school of Ardent Spirit which is, in fact, founded by Rohan to revive the glory of Islam, but then ruled by Major Kyra, who prefers to impose the idea of jehad. The narrative consistently regards the school of Ardent Spirit under the control of Major Kyra as a cell house where fundamentalists plan to organize terrorist actions, and this attitude becomes concrete through the raid of the Christian School of Heer by the students at the school of Ardent Spirit. Since the students cannot stand the idea of Christian school which provides modern subjects such as Math, Music, Biology,

Chemistry and English, they decide to launch a raid at the school and to kill Father Mede, the Christian headmaster of the school (2014: 194). Such an attitude in the narrative implies Aslam's political stance which associates the prevalence of jihad in Pakistan with the education system that has been controlled by fundamentalist ideology after the Cold War. During the 1970s, political Islam, which was inspirited "by the West as an ideological antithesis," transformed into a "potent force" in the Middle East (Soherwordi, 2013: 21) and it attempted to shape education policies, ensuring "the expansion of the country's madrassahs" throughout Pakistan (Ziring, 2003: 186). This enabled Islamization of education, and "madrassahs multiplied all over the country and the more fundamentalist orders took the lead in ministering to young people who otherwise had little educational opportunity" (186). Because of Islamization, Middle Easterners "began to transfer their allegiance from heads of states… to militant revolutionary organizations" (Kepel, 1995: 21) and madrassahs giving strict religious education becomes the source of jihadist volunteers because "the output from these school of religious instruction became the willing recruits for a steady stream of jihadism" (Ziring, 2003: 302). Hence, associating all suicide bombings and terrorist attacks in the novel with the school of Ardent Spirit, Aslam censoriously underlines the function of Islamization on education which procures the flow of brainwashed youth for jihadist movement and sheds light on the violence that fundamentalist groups create in neocolonial Middle East.

The Blind Man's Garden, in general, focuses on the neocolonial turmoil where innocent locals become deterritorialized in their own territories due to the chaotic atmosphere created by both the US neocolonialism, which does not only intervene in the region militarily, but also provokes locals politically, and by the regime of the Taliban performing strict ruling methods. The narrative takes a snapshot of the neocolonial turmoil in the region:

> "It's mayhem in Afghanistan. The Taliban are ruling with an iron fist, punishing traitors, informers, spies and those inciting rebellion. But the people are rising up, encouraged by America's covert help-the Special Forces soldiers are moving on horseback from village to village between towns and cities, dressed in shalwar kameez and shawls and woollen caps, emboldening, bribing and arming the population" (Aslam, 2014: 52).

Taking its side with innocent locals who wedge in this chaos, the authorial voice also unfolds the indirect methods that the US neocolonialism conducts to disorder the region politically, highlighting its efforts to encourage locals to stand against the Taliban. To define such characteristics of neocolonial countries, Thiongo remarks that neocolonialists

benefit from a "comprador class" which helps neocolonialists realize their policies "by torture, fraud, imprisonment, military brutality, terror" and "supress[es] the people on behalf of their paymasters" (1981:121). In a similar vein, the authorial voice in *The Blind Man's Garden* associates comprador classes in neocolonial countries with warlords who affiliate with the US neocolonialism in the Middle East, by seizing, questioning, torturing and selling locals. Readers firstly perceive this neocolonial alignment between warlords and the US forces when Rohan sets out on a journey to find the bird pardoner's son, who has the same name with his missing son, Jeo, and finds him imprisoned at a headquarter of a warlord:

> "[Rohan] falls asleep looking at the photograph on the far wall. The warlord is shaking hand with an American colonel. The date on the frame says it was taken soon after the Taliban regime was toppled last month. The opposite of war is not peace but civilisation, civilisation is purchased with violence and cold-blooded murder. With the [neocolonial] war. The man must earn millions of dollars for guarding the NATO supply convoys as they pass the through the area, and for the militia he must have raised to fight the Taliban and al-Qaeda soldiers alongside American Special Forces" (2014: 143).

Warlords constitute one of the biggest problems in Afghanistan in the post-9/11 period because the decline of the Taliban strengthens and enables them to commit violence randomly in territories that they lay claims to due to the absence of central authority, and they helped the US neocolonialism spread its hegemony over the region (Reunion, 2007: 133). The narrative focuses on the function of warlords in neocolonial Afghanistan where they seize locals, whether Jihadists or not, and sell them to the US or to their families and exemplifies the extreme violence they conduct over locals through the bird pardoner's son, Jeo, and Mikal's slavery by warlords. If prisoned locals are significant for the US forces due to their ties with the Taliban or al-Qaeda, they are "handed over to the Americans for $5000 each," and if they are ordinary locals having no relationship with radical groups, warlords demand a ransom from their families (Aslam, 2014: 144). Warlords resort to extreme violence to make seized locals confess their tie with the Taliban or al-Qaeda in secret prisons which smell "sweat, urine and excrement, of rotting wounds and flesh" (2014: 144) and the violence perpetrated on prisoners is so extreme that they "want to kill" themselves (2014: 135). While the authorial voice underlines the consolidation of the hegemony of the US neocolonialism with the help of warlords, it also invites readers to consider innocent locals who are grilled in such prisons because of the neocolonial discourse associating Middle Easterners with terrorism.

Furthermore, the novel underlines the role of the governments of neocolonial countries in strengthening the hegemony of neocolonialists in their countries through the obvious collaboration between them. In extreme form of neocolonialism, governments of neocolonial countries become "wholly subservient to neocolonial interests" and work in collaboration with them to be able to obtain aids neocolonialists promise (Nkrumah, 1966: xiv). Aslam's narrative underlines "the alliance that the Pakistani government has formed with the United States" (2014: 33) and exemplifies the raids that "Pakistani soldiers-assisted behind the scenes by Americans" have organized throughout the country to kill or take away fundamentalist groups (2014: 268). Military aids provided by the US neocolonialism strengthen the Pakistani government's hand in gaining control over radical terrorists while they also enable the US neocolonialism to spread in the country. Aslam's narrative regards this alliance as one of the most significant factors creating neocolonial Pakistan and adopts a critical manner towards the Pakistani government which follows an equilibrium policy between fundamentalist groups, such as the Taliban and al-Qaeda, and neocolonialist forces of the US. This critical attitude is emphasized when an unnamed man who is "a lieutenant general" in the ISI (Inter-Services Intelligence of Pakistan) questions Kyra, who plans the raid at the Christian School of Heer. This meeting reveals the confidential relationship between terrorist groups and the government because the unnamed man scolds Kyra angrily for the raid, stating that fundamentalist groups are not allowed to organize terrorist attacks without receiving permission from the government (2014: 331). Even though the Pakistani government seems to support the US in the war against terrorism, it does not disaffiliate with jihadist groups, but continues to support them, creating a violent tension, which "beckoned [locals] to choose between satanic forces of neocolonialism and those calling for the Kingdom of the God" (Ziring, 2003: 200). Aslam centres this dichotomy on the neocolonial society throughout the narrative and reveals the dividedness of locals in such a neocolonial space through families whose members become deterritorialized due to the violent atmosphere created either by the US military forces or fundamentalist groups. Rohan's family functions to indicate how the dividedness promoted by neocolonialism leaches in even the smallest unit of the society because while some members of the family experience violence of the US forces, the others face severity caused by fundamentalist groups. Furthermore, Aslam also underlines the extremity that this dichotomy reaches in neocolonial spaces through the family of Akbar, a man Mikal meets at the prison of the US forces, who kills his father since his father plans to report the Jihadists hiding in their house (Aslam, 2014: 359).

Thus, Aslam's narrative does not only indicate the neocolonial relationship between the Pakistani government and the US neocolonialism, but also deals with the dichotomy it creates in the society through locals who become deterritorialized in their own countries due to the severity triggered either by the US forces or fundamentalists.

In addition to *The Blind Man's Garden*'s focus on the consequences of direct military invasions of the US neocolonialism in the Middle East countries such as Pakistan and Afghanistan, it also hints for indirect means of neocolonialism preparing the target country for the ultimate goal, military intervention. Neocolonialism carries out economic siege that is ensured by transnational corporations and a "banking system" which enables neocolonialists to manipulate decision making mechanisms of neocolonial countries through the capability of controlling "foreign exchange" (Nkrumah, 1966: x). Aslam's narrative portrays neocolonial Pakistan as a country that is besieged economically, but its tone for this condition is a bit sarcastic. Aslam lets the students of the Ardent Spirit that organize terrorist attacks to the Christian School of Heer argue about the economic hegemony of the US over their country. Even though they are aware of the economic siege built with the banking system, stating that "a dollar is worth seventy-two Pakistani rupees," they do not have the intellectuality to analyse its reason politically, but explain the economic imbalance through their love for their country: "It is because each American person loves America seventy-two times more than each Pakistani person loves Pakistan" (Aslam, 2014: 197). Moreover, the economic hegemony of neocolonialists is also funded by "multinational companies" which carry out "the exploitative operations" in neocolonial countries (Young, 2016: 48). Aslam reflects the capitalist goals of neocolonialism which tries to transport profitable products to the farthest part of the world through "three Nestle bottles" (2014: 416). Such a well-known trademark, Nestle, stands for multinational companies which has obtained a capability to reach the farthest regions of the world with the help of neoliberal policies promoted by neocolonialism. While those bottles imply the hegemony of those companies with Mikal's obtaining them in the middle of nowhere while crossing a desert, they also indicate inadequate productivity of neocolonial countries where locals need those products. In addition to these indirect economic means that neocolonialism utilizes, the narrative also reveals the function of multinational organizations which have become instruments of the US neocolonialism. One of the most significant of those organizations is the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO), which has become the military instrument that the US

neocolonialism utilizes in posing a military threat in target countries. Aslam's narrative highlights the efficiency of NATO in neocolonial countries, drawing attention to "the NATO supply convoys" which do not only provide those fighting against terrorists with armament, but also supply locals with humanitarian aids to gain over them (2014: 143).

However, those direct and indirect means of neocolonialism have not improved the social and political chaos in the region, but turned the region into neocolonial hell where the US neocolonialism fights against terrorists while innocent locals are compelled to stay by either the US forces or fundamentalists' sides. Aslam portrays the political and social consequences of neocolonial policies, depicting Pakistan as "a land of revenge attacks" where everybody "seems [to be] engaged in killing everyone else" in a hallucinative dialogue between Mikal and a white man questioning him in a prison controlled by the US forces (2014: 214). His portrayal also reveals the economic inadequacy of contemporary Pakistan referring to its poverty caused by the neocolonial economic siege destroying financial structure of the country, referring it as the one "where the taps don't have water, and the shops don't have sugar or rice or flour, the sick don't have medicines and the cars don't have petrol" (2014: 214). Neocolonialism has destroyed all structures in Pakistan, and the narrative hints for Aslam's political stance blaming the US neocolonialism for destituteness of Pakistan through this dialogue. The white man bursts into loud laughter upon seeing Mikal in the cell, and the third person omniscient narrator clarifies the reason of the laughter with the wretchedness of Pakistan and locals. Even though Mikal knows what causes destituteness in Pakistan, he cannot express his thoughts since he cannot speak English, the language of the neocolonialists:

> "Mikal begins to whisper back at him now: 'What about you? What about you? what about you what about you …' He struggles against the chain and begins to shout. 'What about the part you played in it?' He wishes he knew how to say it in English. If I agree with you that what you say is true, would you agree that your country played a part in ruining mine, however small?" (2014: 215)

Through this hallucinative dialogue, the narrative does not only render the destituteness of Pakistan whose political, social and economic structures are weakened or destroyed by neocolonialism, but also implies that the US neocolonialism is responsible for it. However, neocolonial subjects, like Mikal, are not capable of expressing their thoughts because what prevails is the discourse of the powerful, and their claims in native language are not heard or understood. This dialogue also enables readers to perceive the helplessness of Middle Easterners who are aware of the wretchedness of their country,

but who wedge in the turmoil created by the US neocolonialism and fundamentalist groups.

Consequently, *The Blind Man's Garden* sets a notable literary example which sheds light on the impact of direct neocolonial military interventions over locals after the 9/11 terrorist attacks. The novel also reveals how neocolonialism penetrated the Middle East in the Cold War, consolidated its hegemony with its support to radical religious groups and utilized the excuse of war against terrorism to invade the region. Focusing on the life of Rohan family whose members have dreary experience after the terrorist attacks, the novel deals with innocent locals who wedge in the turmoil created by both direct military operations of the US neocolonialism supposing them as potential terrorists and radical religious groups blaming them for affiliating with imperialists. The narrative implies that well-armed US neocolonialism has arrived the region to devastate the Middle East that it has designed since the Cold War, leaving behind locals who become deterritorialized in their own countries.

3.7 Deterritorialized Locals in the Neocolonial Space in *The Blind Man's Garden*

In *The Blind Man's Garden*, Nadeem Aslam deals with deplorable experiences of ordinary locals who are caught in the disordered Middle East which has been built by a process of social engineering conducted by the US neocolonialism since the Cold War. While the novel presents the historical development of neocolonialism in the region, it also provides readers with an emphatic perspective for locals through Rohan family who become deterritorialized due to the political disturbance promoted by the US neocolonialism. The Rohans stand for ordinary families whose lives are turned upside and down by the direct military intervention of the US neocolonialism, and the family's deterritorialization begins literally when Jeo, Rohan's biological son, and Mikal, his adopted son, set on a journey to help the wounded in a town very close to the border between Afghanistan and Pakistan. While this journey refers to the dislocation of many Middle Easterners who join to Jihadists, wish to protect their country, or go to help the wounded, it also lays bare its impact on other members of family who also become deterritorialized in the contemporary political disturbance. Each member of the family must bear the consequences of direct neocolonial military intervention which does not only dislocate Mikal and Jeo from their home, but also Rohan, Naheed, Yasmin and Basil from the ordinary life that they have in their flowered garden. Thus, in *The Blind Man's Garden*, Nadeem Aslam lays bare how extreme form of neocolonialism conducting direct military intervention deterritorializes ordinary Middle Easterners in their own territories.

In *The Blind Man's Garden*, neocolonial deterritorialization begins with Mikal's physical journey through the depth of the war in Afghanistan; however, his individual history also indicates that he is a neocolonial nomad who has become deterritorialized upon losing his biological family during the Cold War. The reason of his dislocation from family is directly related to neocolonial policies because the narrative defines his parents as the victims of the struggle between communists and fundamentalist groups. His parents are communists, and his father disappears during the political and military turmoil between fundamentalists and communists (2014: 17). After his mother's death, Rohan enrols Mikal and his brother to the Ardent Spirit. Even though the narrative does not clarify the reasons of his parents' deaths, it implies that their deaths are directly related to their political stance, which indicates that neocolonialism initially subjects Mikal to deterritorialization, severing his family bonds permanently. His characterization as a man whose face holds "a look of unbearable isolation" complies with his deterritorialization

in his childhood, and the narrative prepares readers for his subsequent deterritorialization with his abandoning home frequently. Being described as a man whose humanitarian side is powerful and a man at loss due to his love affair with Naheed who is married to Jeo, his stepbrother, Mikal decides to accompany Jeo, who volunteers to help the wounded in the war in Afghanistan, to protect him since Jeo is described to be impractical and needs protection. This journey forms the basis of the narrative and reveals the deterritorializing impact of neocolonialism over locals.

Aslam's main objective in the novel is to reveal the impact of the extreme form of neocolonialism conducted in the Middle East. Mikal, an ordinary local who is equally against fundamentalist groups and the US imperialism, Jeo, an idealist doctor wishing to help the wounded, and Rohan, who takes to the roads to dissuade his sons, become the representatives of ordinary locals whose main concerns are the country where they live their modest lives. Their characterizations in the narrative enable them to set on a physical journey, which represents the archetypal journey of Middle Easterners who become deterritorialized in the neocolonial Middle East where they are physically or metaphorically dislocated by the turbulent political and social atmosphere created by fundamentalist groups and the US forces. On the other hand, this journey does not only reveal the alterations that physical journeyers undergo, but also turns into archetypal journey of their kinspeople who are directly influenced by their displacement.

In the narrative, taking to the roads for own purposes becomes a notable motif, and each journey represents a group of locals experiencing differing deterritorializing impact of neocolonial policies. Jeo stands for the educated youth who decease in the turmoil that neocolonial policies have created. He is only a third year student at a medical faculty and feels that he should be there to help those protecting their country (2014: 15). He leaves home and sets on a journey towards a border town, Heer, where he will help the wounded, but he deceases in the neocolonial Middle East where it is impossible to distinguish the violence created by fundamentalist groups from the one promoted by the US forces and their allies, warlords. Briefly, like thousands of Middle Easterner youth, Jeo's life comes to an end at early ages due to direct military interventions, leaving behind parents having difficulty in bearing the grief of losing a child and a widow woman for whom it becomes unbearable to live in such an ecclesiastically straitlaced society. On the other hand, Rohan stands for locals who wedge in religious rigidity that has been built by neocolonial support for fundamentalism. Since Aslam focal point is ordinary locals who

are caught in the perils of neocolonial war, Rohan is not described as a man who gives countenance to radical groups, but he represents religionaries who strictly embrace the ecclesiastically straitlaced way of life that has become dominant in the region with the support of the US neocolonialism. The authorial voice of the narrative is critical of such religionaries who ignore the invigoration of political Islam, and Rohan's blindness in his journey becomes the symbol of nomism of religionaries in the neocolonial period starting with the Cold War. Lastly, Mikal represents locals who are equally against both fundamentalists and the US neocolonialism. Mikal seems to be the one that Aslam idealizes in the narrative because even though he is victimized by both radical groups and the US forces, he neither affiliates with the representatives of neocolonialism nor loses the humanitarian side in his soul. However, what meets these family members on common grounds is their deterritorialization by neocolonialism.

Rohan's deterritorialization is perceived by drawing attention to the impact of ecclesiastically straitlaced society on religious locals whose feelings have been manipulated by political Islam that has become potent force in the region. The neocolonial Middle East becomes a religious space where doctrines of radical groups frequently find reflections among locals who become blind to the manipulation of those groups, and Aslam's narrative regards this as neocolonial deterritorialization which does not only dislocate them from their innocent religious feelings, but also repulses them from the ones they love. During deterritorialization, identity is regarded as a process of becoming which refers to the alterations occurring through subjects' relationship with outer factors, and those alterations pushes subjects into a state of inbetweenness (Deleuze and Guattari, 2005: 293). In *The Blind Man's Garden*, Rohan is described as a deterritorialized character who remains in between ecclesiastically straitlaced worldview that has been built by neocolonial policies and his humanitarian side. Taking its side with ordinary Middle Easterners who are caught in the perils of neocolonialism, Aslam's narrative discerns between ordinary locals with rigid religious tendencies and fundamentalist terrorists. For him, having a rigid religious worldview does not mean being an ardent supporter of radical groups. Rohan is portrayed as a religionist man who prefers living in accordance with the rules of religion, but his pietism does not close him to radical groups. Even though he is a devout who gives strict religious education to his children and whose marriage deteriorates because of his wife's apostasy, he does not approve of the Ardent

Spirit's support for Jihadism and gets sacked from the school where he wishes to educate students who will dignify Islam (Aslam, 2014: 36).

However, Rohan is a neocolonial subject who becomes deterritorialized due to his ambivalence in neocolonial Pakistan where political Islam shapes a society which is regarded as an antithesis to the US imperialism. Aslam underlines that even though there are ordinary religious locals who do not support radical groups, the neocolonial Pakistan, where fundamentalism is considered as a saviour, deterritorializes ordinary locals, pushing them into a state of inbetweenness:

> "[Rohan] is immensely proud of Jeo's desire to go to Peshawar and be of help. He knows that had he been a young man himself he would not have stopped at Peshawar: he doesn't know how he would have resisted entering Afghanistan. And not just for help and aid – he would have fought and defended with his arms. And, yes, had he been present in the United States of America back in September, he would have done all he could to save the blameless from dying in those attacked cities, partaken in their calamity" (2014: 30).

The narrative's indirect characterization of Rohan reveals ambivalence of neocolonial subjects who are caught in between opposite feelings for neocolonialists. Even though Rohan thinks that he would fight against the US neocolonialism in Afghanistan if he were young, he also feels sorry for Americans who are killed by Muslim terrorists. Rohan's ambivalence refers to inbetweenness of religious locals who are regarded as potential terrorists even though they do not support radical groups, but just want to protect the region from imperialism. Briefly, Rohan's inbetweenness, which is implied with his pride of Jeo's participation in the war in Afghanistan and his opposition to Jihadism, does not only reveal the existence of locals who neither support fundamentalist terrorists nor get satisfaction from the terrorist attacks, but also underlines the state of inbetweenness that ordinary locals undergo in the process of deterritorialization due to the ecclesiastically straitlaced society.

In addition to societal impacts of deterritorialization on peoples of the Middle East, the narrative sheds lights on deterritorializing function of religious rigidity on individuals through Rohan whose strict religious worldview pushes him into a state of inbetweenness. Rohan is always in between his rigid sense of religion and humanitarian values. One of the most notable examples of this inbetweenness is his relationship with his wife, Sofia. She is a modern and "confident" woman who has "thrived at the university" and become an English teacher (2014: 189). After graduating from university, they build the Ardent Spirit to give modern education; however, the neocolonial society

with a rigid sense of religion has a destructive effect on their marriage. Even though they love each other, their relationship is broken due to Sofia's apostasy because Rohan wedges in the narrow-minded worldview that has become dominant in the region while Sofia loses her faith. When Rohan dismisses a student, whose mother is a prostitute from the Ardent Spirit, Sofia stops teaching at the school, and their marriage starts to deteriorate (2014: 48). In fact, the boy is caught while trying to steal a shovel to dig his father's graveyard and check "if it matches the picture that [his] mother keeps on the shelf" because his friends tease with the absence of his father (2014: 187). Rohan goes to see the boy's mother and learns that she is a prostitute. Upon learning her indecency which is completely poles apart from his rigid sense of religion, he conducts the boy out of the class, stating that "[the boy's] mother is a sinful woman" (2014: 188). This incident lays bare the deterritorializing impact of rigid sense of religion on family members because Sofia gets angry not only with him, but also with the influence of religion on individuals. The more she talks pretentiously about religion, the more narrow-minded he becomes, and their marriage deteriorates due to their individual preferences (2014: 188). Even though Rohan claims what he does is true, the third person omniscient narrator enables readers to perceive Rohan's inbetweenness when he meets the boy who has become an oculist, expressing his regret that he has "had occasion to think of [the boy] not a few times over the years" (2014: 185). On the other hand, Rohan is not a completely regretful, but a complicated man who is in between his piety and humanitarian values because he then changes his attitude and goes on accusing her of prostitution, uttering "there are many ways to live a good life" and "May Allah have compassion on her soul" (2014: 186). In short, the narrative portrays him as an in between neocolonial subject who both performs regretful and denunciatory attitude for his expelling the boy from the school.

His complicated attitudes also become concrete in his marriage which turns into problematic due to his rigid sense of religion. Even though he loves Sofia, he finds himself in a dilemma upon learning her apostasy. His rigidity about faith does not allow him to respect her, and he performs ambiguous attitudes towards her. To emphasize the impact of his bigotry on his affection with his wife, the third person omniscient narrator lays bare his inbetweenness about marriage, expressing his feelings that "in his mind, he accuse[s] her of misrepresenting herself to him before marriage, because he [would] never choose someone with such monstrous doubts" (2014: 46). However, the narrator also underlines

his ties of affection with her through his protective behaviors. For instance, when she is in her death bed, he burns the pictures that she has drawn because he is anxious about her judgement for challenging Allah who forbids drawings since they cause idolatry (2014: 24). He is also described to a man who does not ignore her but begs Allah "to look after her in her death, just as He is looking after him and his children in their lives" and "to forgive her" (2014: 46). He always reads the Holy Book and prays for her soul to omit the idea that her body is tortured due to her apostasy (2014: 47). Even though his protective attitudes are partially related to his bigotry, they at least reveal that he has love bond with her. However, his bigotry promoted by the ecclesiastically straitlaced society makes him figuratively blind, and when he cannot convince her believe in Allah again, he gives up providing her medicine and causes her death (2014: 72). The narrative reveals that Rohan, as a neocolonial Middle Easterner, is in between his wife and bigotry which does not allow him to be married with an unbeliever, and his inbetweenness urges him to perform extreme behaviors.

Rohan is the embodiment of religionaries who become deterritorialized in neocolonial Middle East, and Aslam lays bare the function of religionaries on their own deterritorialization through him. Rohan's gradually increasing visual impairment indicates Aslam's political stance for those religionaries who do not support radical groups, but who become blinder and more oblivious for invigoration of political Islam that has been promoted by neocolonial policies since the Cold War. While the ignorance of religionaries increases, the hegemony of political Islam densifies in the region, and even though they do not support fundamentalist terrorists, the narrative implies that they are the ones who become wholly deterritorialized in their own counties. Rohan becomes blind due to a violent incident that Jeo, the bird pardoner's son, explodes fuel tanks to kill the US forces and the warlord having tortured him. His blindness is symbolic because Aslam implies that religionaries' ignorance results in their deterritorialization in their own countries. Their ignorance which is symbolically referred by Rohan's gradually increasing visual impairment transforms into physical deterritorialization through neocolonial violence. Extreme form of neocolonialism ruins their territories, and their deterritorialization forces them to imagine the beauty of their territories nostalgically as blind Rohan walks across his beautifully flowered garden without seeing but imagining its fabulosity in past. Furthermore, in addition to contribution of madrassah education to Jihadism, Aslam's narrative assumes a critical attitude towards the rigid religious

education that religionaries impose upon youth and unfolds its function on Jihadism through Rohan's questioning the relation with his insistence on rigid religious education and his son's participation in Jihadists. Regarding the strict religious education, he has imposed on his children as one of the big mistakes he has made in his life, he wonders whether that education has an influence in his sons' decision to join the war (2014: 98). Aslam regards religious education as a factor breeding Jihadism in the region and underlines the significance of secularism at education implying not only madrassah education but also rigid religious education at families breeds the idea of Jihadism in the Middle East. Briefly, Rohan stands for religionist Middle Easterners who have become deterritorialized as political Islam becomes dominant and pushes them into a state of inbetweenness. Being in between their piety and humanitarian values, they perform ambiguous behaviours, which deterritorialize them from their beloved one not only physically, but also emotionally.

Taking its side with innocent locals having secular perspectives, Aslam's narrative deals with deterritorialization of neutral locals who neither affiliate with the US neocolonialism nor support radical groups. Those locals become neocolonial nomads who are caught in the neocolonial turmoil one way or the other, and in *The Blind Man's Garden*, their deterritorialization becomes concrete in Mikal's journey through the depth of the neocolonial war that has been occurring since the 9/11 attacks. Mikal is a true nomad whose deterritorialization begins with the loss of his parents who decease in the struggle against the US neocolonialism during the Cold War, as many communists did in the Middle East. His indirect characterization which portrays him as an independent individual who frequently abandons home complies with his sudden decision to set on a journey with Jeo; thereby, transforming his figurative nomadism into physical. His nomadism which provides him with new opportunities to obtain new perspectives in a neocolonial space corresponds to the Deleuzian understanding of identity which regards it not as a being, but a process of becoming. Being inspired from mobility of nomadism, Deleuze and Guattari regards identity as a process of cultivation in which "it comes up through the middle" (2005: 293). While nomadism of identity refers to the accumulation of struggles for "subjectivity beneath the notion of fixed identity," it also hints for adaptation of the self through "possibilities for learning how to make adjustments to our subjectivities" (Oladi and Portelli, 2017: 666). Thus, Mikal's journey in which he becomes a nomad who is dragged along the neocolonial Middle East due to the violent turmoil does not only represent his physical dislocation, but also refers to his becoming

process including his adjustments to efform his self through possibilities he encounters during his nomadism.

In *The Blind Man's Garden*, Aslam benefits from Mikal's deterritorialization to reveal his political stance for the neocolonial Middle East. For Aslam, the US neocolonialism is responsible for the political, social and military turmoil in the contemporary Middle East, and fundamentalist groups are not right choices to dispose of the US neocolonialism. Mikal is a neocolonial nomad who is considered as deterritorialized due to not only his loss of parents who die in struggles during the Cold War, but also his journey promoted by direct neocolonial interventions. Mikal' deterritorialization enables readers to observe the violent space that direct neocolonial policies have built, and while Aslam takes a snapshot of contemporary Middle East, he also glorifies Mikal's abstention from supporting fundamentalists and the US neocolonialism. When Mikal learns that Jeo goes to the border town between Afghanistan and Pakistan, he, as a man who places members of Rohan family above everything, decides to accompany him. Since the narrative idealizes Mikal's becoming process, the authorial voice obviously clarifies Mikal's willingness to set on a journey with his love for Jeo. Mikal stands for ordinary locals who are wedged in the neocolonial turmoil, and even though he neither gives countenance to fundamentalism nor regards the US colonialism as salvation, he becomes deterritorialized one way or another. His physical deterritorialization forces him to experience consequences of neocolonialism, and what he witnesses during his journey enables him to cultivate idealized subjectivity.

His journey begins at a charitable organization that administers a madrassah educating poor children, and readers observe the neocolonial Middle East closely through the journey (Aslam, 2014: 98). Initially, the organization sends him and Jeo to a Taliban headquarter. However, since Kyra, who organizes groups volunteering to join Jihadists, becomes hostile towards their father, Rohan, due to Rohan's opposition to jihadist movements in the Ardent Spirit, they are sent to a headquarter that is raided by the US forces. His nomadism which forces him to experience the neocolonial turmoil opens new possibilities for him, and this can be considered as the process of reterritorialization that follows deterritorialization subsequently. Reterritorialization helps nomads to make regulations to reach subjectivity, and Mikal's experiences in neocolonial space enables him to perceive the meaninglessness of the neocolonial war taking place in the Middle East. Even though they join Jihadists as volunteers, they are firstly abandoned in a cave, and accused of being American spies by the Taliban fighters finding them there. Through

the descriptions of the fighters who "are twelve" years old and join the Taliban for different purposes, the narrative underlines that fundamentalists, one side of the neocolonial war, are nothing, but the ones that increase violence in neocolonial Middle East:

"They talk earnestly about the Crusades and jihad, of legendary weapons and famed warriors, and they are from all parts of Pakistan and the wider Muslim world, Egyptians, Algerians, Saudi Arabians and Yemenis, between the ages of sixteen and twenty-five, recruited through a fatwa issued by the Saudi cleric Sheikh al-Uqla, a fatwa praising the Taliban for creating the only country in the world where there are no man-made laws. There are Uzbeks and Chechens also and a group from northern England, several of them with turbans wound around baseball caps so they are easy to remove. Among them though there is one Pakistani who just wants to catch an American soldier and collect the bounty being offered by Osama bin Laden, one hundred thousand dollars per soldier, more than a million rupees" (2014: 63).

The narrative implies that fundamentalists manipulate the neocolonial war by bringing diversity of radical religionaries into the Middle East, and their excuses of fighting are not related to the salvation of Pakistan. Even the Pakistani soldier is there to earn money. Although Mikal does not support Jihadism, his nomadism enables him to perceive entanglement of Jihadist movement from one of the innocent and neutral locals.

However, his first-hand experiences among the Taliban fighters and the death of Jeo do not urge him to feel intimate with the US neocolonialism or its puppets, warlords, because his deterritorialization also provides him with possibilities which cultivate his identity through the violent space designated by neocolonial policies of the US in the Middle East. Jeo and Mikal are taken to a Taliban fortress that is raided by American forces. In the raid, Jeo is killed, and Mikal is taken captive by the Americans. His imprisonment by warlords and the US forces renders the extreme violence that the US neocolonialism can reach, which reminds of contemporary scandalous tortures in prisons in the Middle East. After the raid, Mikal sobers up in the prison of a warlord who amputates his fingers and accessions them to his finger collection on a doorframe (2014: 110). Then, he is "bartered and sold among various warlords" and used by them for dirty business such as theft (2014: 158). In his final duty, he is sent to a mosque to steal "the Prophet's cloak," but he wounds the father and son with whom he will carry out the theft. He runs from them and finds "a graveyard of planes and helicopters" which have been used in the neocolonial war; however, they do not have importance for him because he is an ordinary local who tries to survive in the neocolonial space, and he burns them all to become warmer in the cold (2014: 166). Then, he takes a shelter at the mosque where he

is tasked with stealing the Prophet's cloak, but he discerns that the mosque is the meeting point where warlords deliver hostages for each of whom the Americans may pay $5000.

His imprisonment by the US forces opens another possibility for him to cultivate his subjectivity, and his nomadic identity undergoes a process of reterritorialization enabling him to experience perils of neocolonialism. When the mosque is raided by the US forces, he is taken to an American prison that "is filled with curses and prayers of other captives" (2014: 199). The narrative clarifies his imprisonment with the neocolonial discourse which regards Middle Easterners as potential terrorists and normalizes violence performed upon them after the 9/11 attack; he is taken to a room where "[a] large white man sits in the left corner under a poster of the Twin Towers, the moment the second plane hit, the fireball attached to the side of the building" (2014: 200). He is questioned by David, a CIA agent, who tries to uncover his relationship with "Osama bin Laden, Mullah Omar or Ayman al-Zawahiri," leaders of al-Qaeda, and the narrative tells each detail of his questioning which includes variety of torture methods:

> "Mikal refuses to speak and they take him to a bare windowless room, attach a chain to his wrists and, asking him to raise his arms above his head, fasten the chain to a ring on the ceiling. The room is filled with brilliant light. A sleep deprivation cell. Every time he falls asleep the arms shackled to the ceiling wrench him awake. The prison is an abandoned brick factory. In a vast warehouse inside the main building there are two rows of metal cages, filled with boys and young men, some with hoods over their heads, industrial white lights shining down on them at all hours. After he loses consciousness in the sleep deprivation chamber, he awakens to discover that he has been stripped naked and is being washed with a hosepipe. A Military Policeman dries him and walks him naked to the tent that had smelled of balloons where his wounds are dressed again. They put him in a jumpsuit, put the metal back onto his limbs, and he is brought to one of the cages in the warehouse and he curls up on the floor (2014: 204).

His agonising questionings are worth quoting at length because they help readers understand the function of the possibilities he encounters during his reterritorialization. Those tortures he experiences, as an innocence local in the American detention centre transforms him from an apolitical man into a man who attempts to kill two American soldiers who, in fact, sets him free. His physical deterritorialization transforms him into a nomad in neocolonial space and forces him to experience the possibilities during reterritorialization. Those possibilities, which can be regarded as the perils of neocolonialism in his imprisonment under the Taliban, warlords Americans, enable him to cultivate subjectivity which is equally against fundamentalists and the US neocolonialism. His neutral political stance can be regarded as rhizomic within the Deleuzian understanding. At the core of Deleuzian nomadic identity lies the multiplicity

that subjects acquire during reterritorialization into new territories, and identity is considered as a as a process of becoming since it collects possibilities "while it passes between points," and it "is not defined by points it connects, or by points that compose it" because "it comes up through the middle" (Deleuze and Guattari, 2005: 293). Those possibilities that are accumulated within the multiplicity of nomadic identity help perceive the idea of rhizome in their nomadology. Making an analogy between wild plants, which become decentred and multiple structured since they grow horizontally, and identity, Deleuze and Guattari delineate rhizome as "a system" which "subtract[s] the unique from the multiplicity to be constituted" (2005: 6). That system refers to the possibilities which create multiplicity during reterritorialization because it "ceaselessly establishes connections" which cause alterations in "roots and radicles" (Miller, 1993: 11). Briefly, rhizomic perspective refers to multiplicity that occurs through alterations of root due to perpetual connections, and similarly Mikal's nomadic identity becomes rhizomic due to alterations in his root through the connections he establishes in neocolonial space. When direct neocolonial military intervention deterritorializes him by encouraging him to follow Jeo through Afghanistan, he obtains opportunities to experience what neocolonialism has generated in his country through his imprisonment in the Taliban, warlords, and American prisons. His nomadic identity pushes him into a state of inbetweenness, and his unbelongingness can be described with the idea of Deleuzian understanding of "a no-man's land" that is "nonlocalizable" for him due to the turmoil that neocolonialism has built in the region (Deleuze and Guattari, 2005: 293). His country becomes nonlocalizable for him because he, like all ordinary locals, remains in between Jihadism and the US neocolonialism. Even though he gains his freedom, killing two Americans, he becomes a true nomad who wanders along the country without feeling of belonginess:

> "He is still trapped, the cage is just bigger… He makes several haphazard journeys into surrounding towns, within the coronet of mountains and hills that surrounds Peshawar. Getting into a bus without asking the destination, he disembarks halfway and changes direction, or continues in the same direction but on the next bus… He is an exile in his own homeland, his eyes filled with uncrossable distances" (Aslam, 2014: 251).

His physical nomadism complies with his nomadic identity accumulating the possibilities during his reterritorialization, and the narrative considers him as a true nomad. Even though he manages to reach his family home where he has a chance to come together with Naheed, he leaves home again upon Akbar's request to deliver money to his sister. In contrast to readers' expectations for him to stay home after so much violence he has

experienced, he prefers to set to another journey to the depth of neocolonial space, proving that he has transformed into a nomad who is deterritorialized by neocolonialism.

His final journey also reveals that his deterritorialized identity becomes rhizomic, and in contrast to his tendency to resort to violence against representatives of neocolonialism, as he kills the American soldiers, he transforms into a man who tries to save the life of an American soldier whom he meets on his way to Akbar's family home. Having a decentred and multiple structured identity due to possibilities he accumulates during reterritorialization; he performs ambivalent behaviours towards the unnamed American soldier carrying the snow leopard cub that Mikal has seen in Akbar's family home. Even though Mikal believes that he can pragmatically benefit from the soldier to find Akbar's family, he also feels emotional intimacy towards him. Mikal's journey with the soldier opens another possibility for his nomadic identity and even though Mikal knows that the soldier will kill him at the first opportunity, Mikal goes on protecting him both in the village where locals want to kill the soldier and, in the house, where a warlord captures them. The authorial voice emphasizes Mikal's ambivalence towards the soldier and encourages readers to consider its reason by asking a rhetorical question: "what lay behind Mikal's ambivalence, almost tenderness, towards the soldier?" (Aslam, 2014: 439). Mikal's behaviours towards the soldier are ambivalent because even though he has captured the soldier and put him in chain, the omniscient third person narrator implies that he has tenderness towards him. The narrative clarifies the change in his attitude with an instant enlightenment about the meaninglessness of their condition:

> "Looking through the broken window between them [Mikal] is suddenly overwhelmed, not by any emotion he knows, suddenly feeling himself unequal to so wide a chase, so remorseless a life. He is shocked to find himself close to weeping, a few initial sobs escaping. He wipes the tears but can't stop and he covers his face with his incomplete hands and weeps loudly, uncontrollably. He reaches out a hand and places it on the man's shoulder and, his mouth full of failed words, tells him about Naheed, the sidelong gold of her look, and about Jeo, and about his incarceration by the Americans and by the warlord who mutilated his hands and sold him to the Americans for $5,000. About Rohan's blindness. About the death of Basie… 'I am sorry I killed your countrymen.'" (2014: 431).

Mikal's deterritorialization forces him to experience the neocolonial turmoil, and his reiterated journeys towards the depth of neocolonial space transforms him from an apolitical man into the one who feels obliged to take action to get rid of the vicious circle of hatred between Middle Easterners and Americans. His enlightenment becomes a motivation for Mikal to rescue the soldier from the hellishness of the Middle East, and

the narrative symbolically describes their survival struggle with a "bridge over the river that is burning with flames as tall as electricity poles" (2014: 436). Mikal has two options; he either turns the soldier in and watches him be killed or he must be brave enough to pass the burning bridge. The image of the burning bridge symbolizes dangerousness of his choice because it is probable for him to die for the sake of his attempt to rescue the soldier. The narrator reveals the meaning that Mikal gives for his attempt:

> "[Mikal] has to get across, because the bridge is the bridge between the innermost part of him and the American's, something that can't be consumed or rendered meaningless even by fire, a bridge to his parents and Basie, to a world where Jeo is still alive and where Tara never went to prison, to the white-hot core of the fire, the flash that took away Rohan's sight. He won't let them catch the American soldier, and at that moment he loves the American soldier, and he loves the two he killed, and he loves the dead girl who wore jasmine, so much so that he feels his heart will not bear the weight of it and will kill him before the fire kills him" (2014: 437).

His journeys teach him that it is meaningless to kill or to be killed in neocolonial Middle East, and the bridge offers him a symbolic option to get out of the neocolonial space that is burning and to pass an alternative world where neocolonialism has not ruined the lives of the ones he loves. The narrator dives into Mikal's inner thoughts and states that what neocolonialism has created in the Middle East is more deathful than his attempt to rescue the soldier. He knows that the vicious circle of death will go on in neocolonial space unless ordinary locals, who are victims of neocolonialism despite their opposition to Jihadism, take an action. Therefore, he does not only leave the solider to his fate when they pass the bridge but also helps the US force find him in a mosque where Mikal hides him. The US forces raid the mosque and rescue the soldier under heavy gunfire. Mikal is killed in the raid, and the narrative glorifies his attempt to rescue the soldier through a bitter irony when the soldier uses microphones of the mosque to call for help, stating that "the minaret, meant to invite the faithful to offer prayer and praise to the Almighty, is summoning unbelievers, to arrive and desecrate His house" (2014: 450). Since the authorial voice always glorifies Mikal's neutral attitude throughout the novel, such an ironic statement enables readers to denounce the fundamentalist perspective and to stay by Mikal who ignores radical tendencies to save the soldier. Mikal's deterritorialization complies with the attitude of Aslam who idealizes Mikal as an ordinary local, who regards neither fundamentalism nor political and military hegemony of the US as a saviour of the region. During his reterritorialization, readers perceive that being apolitical does not protect locals from victimization, but those ordinary locals are the ones who also become deterritorialized one way or the other in their own territories. However, while Aslam

utilizes Mikal's deterritorialization to glorify locals who neither affiliate with the representatives of neocolonialism nor lose the humanitarian side in their souls, he also lays bare the turmoil that neocolonialism has built in the region and encourages readers to feel empathy with locals who are caught in such a neocolonial space through the archetypal journey of Mikal.

In addition to Jeo, Rohan and Mikal whose physical journeys refer to nomadism of their identities, the narrative also harbours characters who become deterritorialized figuratively in such a neocolonial space without setting on a journey. Their deterritorialization without physical nomadism complies with the ecclesiastically straitlaced society where bigotry disposes women of freedom, bludgeoning them into living in accordance with constructed norms of religion and patriarchy. The narrative emphasizes the contribution of political Islam to designate such a conservative society and deals with struggle of women who endeavour to get rid of the boundaries of such a neocolonial space. Aslam does not prefer to reflect a stereotype Middle Eastern woman but implies that even though while some women internalize the oppressive hegemony of patriarchy and religion, some object to the constructedness of such a society. Thus, he takes a snapshot of the condition of contemporary women through Sofia and Naheed, who do not resign themselves to expectations of such a narrow-minded society, and Tara, who internalizes the constructed doctrines of society. While Sofia and Naheed reflect Aslam's secular perspective, he narrates Tara's vain effort with a critical approach. However, what he tries to emphasize in his narrative is that all the women become deterritorialized in such a neocolonial space.

Sofia is a representative of modern women whose existence has come to an end with the hegemony of bigoted lifestyle promoted by neocolonial policies. In the novel, she is the only woman who takes off her burka upon his father's suggestion when she studies at Punjab university and lives alone at a hostel. Even though what she does is unacceptable in her society, her father urges her to do so, suggesting that "[m]odesty and decency dwell in the mind, not in a burka. [He] want[s her] to get education and it seems that this issue is distracting [her] from that" (2014: 223). Being supported by her father, Sofia becomes a self-sufficient free woman preferring to live in accordance with her preferences. The narrative also supports Sofia's being an educated woman who does not lodge in bigoted doctrines of religion and patriarchy through her indirect characterization. In contrast to the society where political Islam has built an understanding prohibiting art by dogmatizing that it leads to idolatry, the narrative describes her as an open-minded

teacher who has artistic abilities. She is described to be a talented artist who does not only draw pictures of trees, gardens, and flowers, but also sketches of living creatures. Her open-mindedness complies with her reaction when Rohan fires a boy from the school since his mother is a prostitute. To indicate the influence of bigoted society on such an open-minded woman, Aslam fictionalizes Sofia and allows her to struggle for her idealism and intellectualism. However, the neocolonial Middle East is not a space where such women can survive neither intellectually nor physically. All artistic pieces that Sofia has made are burnt by Rohan who argues that Allah "forbids such images lest they lead to idolatry," which refers to her deracination from art (2014: 24). Besides, she is obliged to cease teaching at the Ardent Spirit due to bigotry of Rohan, and her secession from the school stands for her deracination from her job that enables her, as a woman, to be self-sufficient in neocolonial Middle East. Severing her connection with characteristics which help readers to regard her as an open-minded woman, the bigoted society does not also allow her to survive physically as well. The narrative lays bare the extremity that zealots can reach with Rohan's killing Sofia. Her death is closely related to Rohan's bigotry which urges him to stop giving her medicine to prod her on the existence of Allah. Even though Sofia is not alive in the present time of the narrative, Aslam ably positions her at the centre of the story and enables readers to perceive the extremity that bigoted society has created in the region. Hence, he benefits from Sofia's intellectual and physical deterritorialization by the bigoted world view in order to reveal that even those who are provided with education become dislocated in the neocolonial Pakistan.

Dealing with the condition of women in the neocolonial Pakistan, Aslam puts Naheed in the middle between Sofia, who challenges norms of bigoted society and becomes marginal, and Tara, who keeps her silence and obeys expectations of religion and patriarchy. Being deterritorialized metaphorically by the death of Jeo, Naheed becomes a young widow who is under the threat of patriarchal prejudices. What she experiences in such a patriarchal and bigoted society can be regarded as her figurative nomadism which refers to "the cultivation of the self in a way that suggests important possibilities for learning how to make adjustments to our subjectivities" (Oladi and Portelli, 2017: 666). After her husband's death, she has to reterritorialize into that society, and those possibilities frequently push her into a state of inbetweenness and transform her identity into nomadic. Facing disadvantageous position of being a woman in a bigoted society and a widow in a patriarchal society, Naheed starts to question her position and attempts to take an action in a way which does not comply with the expectations of both.

Even though she is not an unbeliever, her experiences enable her to question Tara's obedient submission to religion when Kyra wants them to evacuate the house. Upon Tara's statement that she "will go to the mosque and ask the cleric to give [her] a talisman and [they] will pray," she utters angrily: "Who listens to our prayer?" (Aslam, 2014: 72). Her reaction proves that her figurative deterritorialization puts her in a disadvantageous position and the only way to overcome this condition is not to pray, but to obtain a diploma and to become a teacher to be a self-sufficient woman. Naheed is decisive to eliminate the barriers before her ideal and even though Tara presses her to get married with Sharif Sharif who becomes the voice of patriarchy in the narrative, expressing that "it is not good for young girls to be without a man once they have been with a man. It can cause them to seek out what they once had any which way" (2014: 181). His opinions reveal her inbetweenness due to her figurative deterritorialization; she is in between her ideal to be a self-sufficient woman and being the third wife of an old man. The possibility to get married with Sharif Sharif urges her to cling her ideal stronger, and the narrative heralds that she will reach her ideal, stating that the Christian school, which has been raided by the students of the Ardent Spirit, is reconstructed and she will complete the required qualifications by the time the school is finished (2014: 459).

The narrative builds a juxtaposition between Tara, who puts patriarchal and religious norms at the centre of her life, and Naheed, who undermines those norms and designates her life with her own decisions. The juxtaposition becomes concrete when they argue about Naheed's remarriage, and while Tara claims that "it is the only way" for a widow to be safe in such a patriarchal and religious society, Naheed asserts that "there are a thousand other ways," which does not only underline her decisiveness, but also the possibilities she accumulates during her reterritorialization. (2014: 237). Hence, in Naheed story, Aslam narrates her metaphorical nomadism promoted by Jeo's deterritorialization and lays bare that many widows are left behind by local men who find themselves in the middle of the neocolonial war. Those widows are obliged to reterritorialize into society, and glorifying Naheed's struggle and fictionalizing a hopeful future for her, Aslam, in the novel, takes a side with those who challenge the norms of bigoted society that have been designated by neocolonial policies since the Cold War.

Consequently, in *The Blind Man's Garden*, Aslam sheds light on the turmoil that the neocolonial war has promoted by the 9/11 terrorist attacks. Taking a side with a secular and apolitical perspective, Aslam deals with the consequence of neocolonialism

on ordinary locals. He underlines the function of political Islam which has designated a bigoted society with the help of neocolonial policies in the region and implies that neocolonial Middle East has deterritorialized ordinary locals, forcing them to be part of the war and to experience its consequences. While deterritorialization of Jeo, Rohan and Mikal become concrete with their physical dislocation impelling them to the depth of neocolonial space, other members of Rohan family become deterritorialized metaphorically due to the bigoted society constructed by neocolonialism. Thus, Aslam can reflect a variety Middle Easterners who become deterritorialized in this neocolonial turmoil. While Jeo represents the educated youth who have vanished into violence of neocolonial space, leaving behind heartbroken families and widows, Rohan stands for religionist locals who become blind to the improvement of political Islam and who radically regulate their lives in accordance with bigotry. Aslam is critical of such locals who contribute to the spread of the hegemony of fundamentalism in the region. Even though Rohan is against Jihadism, his bigot worldview pushes him into a state of inbetweenness and urges him to behave ambivalently. In *The Blind Man's Garden*, Aslam idealizes Mikal, who is commensurately against fundamentalism and the US neocolonialism. Experiencing the violence resorted to locals by both sides in his survival struggle, Mikal functions to reveal that even those locals cannot avoid being deterritorialized in such a neocolonial space. His physical deterritorialization drags him into different territories where he accumulates all possibilities to form a subjectivity during his reterritorialization and he transforms into a man who does his best to save an American soldier. Through his journeys, he learns that the vicious circle of death will go on in the Middle East and he makes a stride to stop pointless killing by saving the soldier's life at the cost of his life.

On the other hand, Aslam also sheds light on deterritorialization of women through Sofia, Naheed and Tara who become isolated in their struggles against norms of patriarchy and bigotry. Each of them represents a group of local women in the Middle East. While Sofia and Naheed challenge norms and roles that the society designed for them, Tara is one of the majority of women who owe loyalty to those constructions. Sofia is an educated teacher who has artistic skills and courage to question the constructedness of religion and patriarchy. However, Aslam suggests that neocolonial Middle East is a space where physical or metaphorical deterritorialization is inevitable for her. She has to suspend her career due to attitude of patriarchy towards women, her artistic pieces are

burnt since they are forbidden by religion, and she is, at last, killed by his bigoted husband because of her apostasy. Like Mikal, Naheed is also idealized in the narrative, and even though she becomes deterritorialized metaphorically upon Jeo's death, her reterritorialization transforms into a story of success, and she realizes her dream to become a teacher at the end of the novel. Contrary to Sofia and Naheed, Tara is one of most women who surrender unconditionally to the hegemony of patriarchy and bigotry on women. The narrative delineates such women as metaphorically deterritorialized because they are dislocated from their womanhood and forced to obey the norms of patriarchy and religion. Finally, in *The Blind Man's Garden*, Aslam sheds light on the neocolonial Middle East where locals become deterritorialized physically or figuratively due to the turmoil and ecclesiastically straitlaced society that neocolonialism has designated in the region.

Conclusion

Literature has always been dealing with politics, and while it reflects social, economic and cultural dynamics shaping a political conjuncture in a specific period, it also explores human beings' urges which pave the way for political movements. Man's thirst for more power and hegemony over others is one of the subject matters which become notable during the colonial period. During that period, literature does not only indicate policies performed in different parts of the world by colonialists, but also glorifies the aspects which normalize the colonialist attitude, generating a dichotomy between the West and the East to underline the superiority of the former over the latter. The decolonization period when the colonial period comes to an end politically coincides with the deconstruction of the hierarchy that the colonial discourse has created, and the postcolonial era begins. In this period, literature reflects the cultural legacy of the colonial period and undermines the dichotomy it has created. However, the end of colonialism does not indicate the end of exploitation for subjects of the Third World countries because the political conjuncture after World War II gives rise to the occurrence of a new exploitation method, neocolonialism. Even though neocolonialism is a term coined to identify the new exploitation method which begins with indirect methods and transforms into direct military intervention to meet expectations of capitalism in Africa after decolonization, its inclusive definition enables its usage for new exploitation strategies in different parts of the world. The dissertation has adapted neocolonialism to the Middle East and associated neocolonialism with the period which begins the Cold War when the US provides the regimes and fundamentalists in the Middle East with economic and logistic support in the fight against communism and continues with direct military interventions after the 9/11 attacks. In the dissertation, Mohsin Hamid's *The Reluctant Fundamentalism* and *Exit West* and Nadeem Aslam's *The Wasted Vigil* and *The Blind Man's Garden*, have been analysed to reveal the deterritorializing effect of neocolonialism on Middle Easterners. The dissertation has examined that destroying the political, social, cultural and economic structures of the neocolonial spaces, neocolonialism has compelled locals to experience the brutality of neocolonial spaces and has commenced a period of migration and inland dislocations which provide Middle Easterners with the possibilities through which their identities alter with their interactions in new territories or circumstances.

In his *The Reluctant Fundamentalism*, Mohsin Hamid delineates the impact of neocolonialism, which transforms into an extreme form with direct military interventions in the Middle East after the 9/11 terrorist attacks, on Middle Easterner immigrants who find a place for themselves with their own efforts in the West. Even though the alliance between the US and Middle Eastern regimes and radical groups since the Cold War facilitates Middle Easterner immigrants' acceptance to the US, the unbounded rise of fundamentalism and the 9/11 attacks demolish the collaboration. The Middle Easterner immigrants in the US do not only abide the Islamophobic attitude considering them as potential terrorists, but also the destruction of their countries by the military invasion of the US. The dissertation has argued that the new world order, founded by the US neocolonialism after World War II, deterritorializes Middle Easterners by transforming them into economic immigrants, but then they become deterritorialized due to the Islamophobia and direct neocolonial interventions in the region.

The dissertation has regarded Changez as an economic immigrant who decides to migrate to America to designate a satisfying life for himself because his family has lost the wealth they used to have in the new economic order. His ambition to take his place in the capitalist system urges him to be a volunteer nomad, and his academic success enables him to find a position at a finance company which decides firm's investments all over the world and to be a representative of the US capitalism. His physical dislocation and attempts to adapt to his New Yorker identity form a basis for analysing him as a deterritorialized neocolonial subject who reterritorialize into new territory, accumulating the required characteristics of his position at the company. With the help of the economic power and prestige of his position at the company, he begins to benefit from the advantages of New Yorker identity and behaves as if he were American. The dissertation has underlined his efforts to adapt to his corporate identity as a reterritorialization process that is subsequent to deterritorialization, and his reterritorialization reveals that he has collected possibilities to become a darker version of James Bond. Even though he endeavours much to adapt to his corporate identity and performs the required behaviours of his position, he perceives that he has something missing in his New Yorker identity and he supposes that he can complete it through a cosmopolitan marriage with a white American woman, Erica. Since he considers the marriage as a complement to be a citizen of the cosmopolitan New Yorker, he becomes obsessive in his relationship with her and he pretends to be Jim, her ex-boyfriend, to have sexual intercourse with her. However,

the dissertation has debated that even though he does his best both in his company and relationship to be completely a New Yorker, the 9/11 attacks and the subsequent direct military interventions in the region deterritorialize him from his New Yorker identity due to the Islamophobia and the feeling of treachery he has for his being a representative of the US neocolonialism.

Changez is a deterritorialized neocolonial subject, and while he endeavours to embrace the luxurious and flamboyant American way of life, the wretchedness and destitution of the Middle Eastern countries discomfort him. Yet, his ambition restrains him from recognizing the function of neocolonialism in the destruction of the region. Even though he becomes a potential terrorist after the attacks and follows the invasion in the region on the internet in frustration, he strives mightily to concentrate on his work. In his final duty, Juan-Bautista, a manager of the firm Changez inspects, awakes him to the function of the US neocolonialism in miserableness of the region, likening the US imperialism to the Ottoman Empire and Changez to janissaries. Thus, Changez comprehends his function in the US neocolonialism that ruins the Middle East, and the dissertations has regarded his resignation and decision to return to his country as backward deterritorialization. It has associated the 9/11 terrorist attacks with the unbounded rise of fundamentalism which becomes a political and military potent force in the region with the help of the US neocolonialism during the Cold War and has defined Changez's dislocation from the US and his American dream as neocolonial deterritorialization. His physical dislocation from the US due to neocolonialism brings about radical alterations in his identity, and he transforms from a manservant of the US neocolonialism into a man who spends the rest of his life informing students about the US neocolonialism in his country. On the other hand, Changez also proves to be a true deterritorialized subject because his return to his country does not refer to smooth adaptation due to the possibilities he has internalised during his dislocation; thereby, becoming a neocolonial subject experiencing unbelongingness both to the West and the East.

In *Exit West*, Mohsin Hamid depictures the contemporary condition of the Middle Eastern countries, such as Afghanistan, Pakistan, Iraq and Syria, where military interventions begin a mass migration movement from the Middle East to the West, ruining the countries in the region. He fictionalizes an unnamed Middle Eastern city where the political, social, economic and cultural structures of the city initially deteriorate with

unbounded refugee influx and then collapse with military interventions against fundamentalists. The unnamed city stands for the Middle Eastern cities that have been invaded by the US, which turns up the region under cover of war against terrorism, builds a garrison in Afghanistan and attempts to designate the whole region in accordance with its political and economic interests. The dissertation has argued that the unnamed city's association with the political, economic, social and cultural disarray in the Middle East after the 9/11 terrorist attacks establishes a strong ground for analysing the novel to examine the impact of neocolonialism on locals.

Through the unnamed city where brutality becomes random in the neocolonial war, Hamid emphasizes that the neocolonial Middle East is a space where neither Nadia, a free spirit woman objecting to the constructions of patriarchy and bigotry which have become dominant in the neocolonial period, nor Saeed, a patriarchal man whose only aim is to have a family and a modest life in his country, can realize their objectives. Neocolonial support for political Islam is one of the factors increasing its hegemony over Middle Eastern countries, such as Afghanistan and Pakistan, and the dissertation has argued that the collaboration between neocolonialism and political Islam have created a bigoted society where subjects challenging its tenets are dislocated. Nadia's initial deterritorialization is associated with her marginalization in her family who adhere to the tenets of bigotry because she must abandon his family house and live on her own due to her questioning of religion. Her deterritorialization from the family house enables her to liberate herself from the boundaries of the bigotry, and she attempts to cultivate her identity through the opportunities she encounters in her new territory. Using her burka as a means of protection in the religiously straitlaced society, she designates her life without surrendering the tenets of the bigotry and she even experiences prohibited acts in the neocolonial space, such as sexuality before marriage. However, Hamid argues that the destructiveness of the extreme form of neocolonialism does not allow Middle Easterner women to have the opportunity to maintain their lives in seclusion. Even though Nadia is content with her isolated life in her territory, the neocolonial war deterritorializes her again and she migrates to different countries through magical doors. On the other hand, the dissertation also has suggested that the extreme form of neocolonialism also deterritorializes locals who conform with the bigotry that neocolonial policies have designated in the region. The death of Saeed's mother severs his ties with his country, and he discerns that he cannot build a family in accordance with patriarchal expectations.

Even though Nadia and Saeed have different excuses to leave the country, the dissertation has remarked that neocolonialism has dislocated them physically, and their relationship which becomes troublesome gradually reveals the alterations that their identities undergo through their interactions with the factors in new territories.

Their passage to different territory through magical doors is associated with a process of birth, and this enables their dislocations to be analysed with Deleuze and Guattari's understanding of deterritorialization. As they regard identity as a process of becoming which accumulates possibilities to cultivate subjectivity, Nadia and Saeed's passages through magical doors are regarded as a process of rebirth, which implies that they are born as new individuals with characteristics that they have adapted through reterritorialization in new territories. Their relationship reveals the alterations their identities undergo because whenever they pass through magical doors and arrive different territories, their relationship deteriorates due to their differentiation. Even though Saeed clarifies the problem in their relationship shallowly, accusing Nadia of transforming into a disrespectful woman, the dissertation has highlighted that Hamid's explanation to their deteriorating relationship is, in fact, his solution to the problem of refugee's adaptation to new territories. Hamid knows their deterritorialization results in alterations in their identities, and they cultivate different subjectivities in their reterritorialization. Nadia becomes a citizen of cosmopolitan territory full of refugees with different sexual preference and racial and religious backgrounds while Saeed finds a place among people from his country in that cosmopolitan territory and has a relationship with the preacher's daughter who does not threat his patriarchal identity. Hamid offers such a cosmopolitan territory where refugees can find proper places as a solution to the adaptation problem of refugees who become deterritorialized by neocolonial policies performed in the Middle East.

In *The Wasted Vigil*, Nadeem Aslam draws forth how the contemporary political, social, cultural and economic intricateness in the Middle East have been designated initially by indirect policies and then by direct military interventions. Focusing on the development of the US neocolonialism which began to function in the Middle East through economic and military support for fundamentalists and regimes working for its profits during the Cold War and then became a dominant power in the region through military interventions after the 9/11 terrorist attacks, Aslam narrates the story of neocolonial subjects whose dislocations by neocolonial policies compel them to directly

experience the violence in the neocolonial space through two different time spans. The dissertation has utilized the time spans to distinguish indirect means of neocolonialism from direct military interventions, and while the present time of the narrative encapsulates the period which begins with the Soviet occupation in Afghanistan and the subsequent increment of the Taliban, the present time of the narrative sheds light on the chaotic period after the 9/11 terrorist attacks. Reflecting the intertwined stories of neocolonial subjects who exist in the region due to their own motives, Aslam reveals the deterritorializing effect of neocolonialism on them, forcing them to experience the military violence performed by the Soviets, the Taliban and the US forces and the cultural oppression imposed by bigotry.

The dissertation has depicted the setting of the novel as a melting pot of neocolonial space where the oppressor and the oppressed that have been designated by neocolonial policies come together because Aslam includes an Englishman, Marcus whose family history refers to the colonial past of Afghanistan, a CIA agent, David, who is sent to Afghanistan to train fundamentals and manage logistic supports for them, a Russian woman, Lara, who comes to the region to his brother, and a fundamentalist terrorist, Casa, and an open-minded local woman, Dunia, in the story and lets them gather at Marcus' house. Aslam also links their lives, adding Marcus' wife, Katrina, who is stoned to death by the Taliban, Zameen, Marcus' daughter who is captured by the Soviets and Lara's brother, Benedikt, who rapes Zameen. Thus, Aslam produces a literary text which reveals the deterritorializing effect of the whole neocolonial period on neocolonial subjects, narrating dolesome experiences of Middle Easterners with the help of two different times spans in the narrative.

Aslam regards the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan as the beginning of the US neocolonialism which began to function in the region through economic and logistic support for political Islam against communism. Associating the political and military turmoil which emerged in the last quarter of the twentieth century and continued with direct military interventions after the 9/11 terrorist attacks, Aslam reveals that the violence and intricateness in Afghanistan compel subjects to a process of inland dislocations, and the dissertation has defined them as neocolonial deterritorialization. Even though the inland dislocations begin with Zameen's captivity by the Soviets and Katrina's forced labour by a warlord in camps and mountains, the narrative does not provide readers with much information about the impacts of those dislocations on them;

however, they become a source of motivation for Marcus and David to set frequent journeys to find them. On the other hand, they enable Aslam to reveal the turbulent period during the Cold War with Zameen's disappearance and the unbounded rise of political Islam with Katrina's lapidation by the Taliban. Marcus and David's journeys through the depth of the neocolonial space does not only force them to witness the violence and brutality that neocolonialism has built, but also enable Lara, Casa and Dunia to gather at Marcus' house and to argue about the neocolonial Middle East. While their conversations reveal the alterations their identity undergo upon experiencing the ruthlessness of the neocolonial space, they also help fanatical opinions to moderate.

In *The Wasted Vigil*, Aslam offers a solution to the destituteness of the neocolonial Afghanistan through David and Casa's alterations. David is a neocolonialist CIA agent who comes to Afghanistan to train fundamentalists. His deterritorialization from his country offers new possibilities for him in the new territory. Even though he does his duty properly in his early years, he falls in love with Zameen, and his alteration begins. Upon her disappearance, he sets frequent journeys in the neocolonial space and directly witnesses the cruelty the US neocolonialism has generated. When he learns that the CIA has a role in her death, he stops working for the CIA and undergoes a radical change. He transforms into an anti-imperialist man and emancipates a radical terrorist, Casa, from the prison of the CIA. The dissertation has clarified his alteration with experiences in the neocolonial space because his physical deterritorialization enables him to see the realities of neocolonialism and to internalise those possibilities to cultivate a subjectivity. On the other hand, Aslam considers Casa, a fundamentalist terrorist, as a Middle Easterner who becomes deterritorialized from moderation due to the political Islam which has become a potent force designing the region. Casa's loss of family in the Cold War obliges him to be raised in orphanages and to be educated in madrassas which are utilized as places to brainwash by the political Islam. His individual history normalizes his participation in fundamentalist terrorist organizations; however, Aslam dislocates him from fundamentalist terrorists and places him among victims of neocolonialism and fundamentalism to suggest that fundamentalism is the production of neocolonialism and fundamentalists can change. The group at Marcus' house functions to be a mediator for his alteration, and Dunia has a great influence on him through her open-mindedness and her ability of self-expression. Casa's deterritorialization from the fundamentalists enables him to experience possibilities to love his country and religion as distinct from the way

fundamentalists claim. Even though Aslam does not describe Casa's alteration obviously, he implies it through an incident in which he takes off his clothes and writes about his transformation on a paper in full darkness. Taking the realities of the region into consideration, Aslam does not prefer a happy ending, but finishes the novel with David and Casa's death to highlight that there is no victor in the neocolonial war. Their death also hints for the fact that such alterations in the Middle East are not easy; nevertheless, the dissertation has considered Aslam's effort as a solution to the neocolonial Afghanistan because he implies that the destituteness in the Middle East may finish when fundamentalism is moderated.

In *The Blind Man's Garden,* Aslam takes a snapshot of the contemporary Afghanistan and Pakistan where the US neocolonialism wages war on terrorism after the 9/11 terrorist attacks. Aslam also reveals the atrocity created by fundamentalists through raids and suicide bombings in the region to underline that innocent locals become deterritorialized in their own countries since the neocolonial war compels them to a process of inland dislocations. The story revolves around the dreary experiences of Rohan family whose lives are turned upside and down by the direct neocolonial military interventions after the 9/11 terrorist attacks. The neocolonial war between the US forces and fundamentalists dislocates the members of Rohan family and drags them into the neocolonial turmoil. When Jeo, Rohan's biological son, and Mikal, his adopted son, leaves home to help the wounded in the war, Rohan also follows them to dissuade. Their deterritorialization from their modest lives compels them to experience the brutality of the neocolonial space. Jeo is killed at a camp and Rohan loses his sight in an explosion. Mikal helps readers witness the vandalism that neocolonialism has created in the Middle East through his journeys. Reflecting the cruelty of the neocolonial space through Mikal's journeys and Rohan's wandering to find his missing sons, Aslam does not only reveal the deterritorializing impact of the bigotry on locals, but also explores the alterations in locals' identity through their exposure to violence performed by the US forces and fundamentalists.

Taking sides with innocent people, Aslam distinguishes them from fundamentalist terrorist; however, he is also critical of their ignorance to the unbounded rise of fundamentalism. The dissertation has identified Aslam as a writer who clarifies the wretchedness of the Middle East with the political Islam which has built hegemony over locals through the political, economic and military support of neocolonialism. It has also

argued that the regimes and radical groups supported by the political Islam have a deterritorializing impact on religionaries. Even though those religionaries seem to object to fundamentalism, the bigotry built by the political Islam manipulates their religious feelings and they begin to subserve for the interests of fundamentalists unintentionally. Rohan stands for those religionaries. Even though he is in opposition to fundamentalism, his acquiescence to the bigotry leads him to maintain life in accordance with the expectations of fundamentalists. He provides his children with strict religious education and regiments them. Even though he approves of their participation in the war, he also accuses himself of his insistence on the religious education which promotes their motivation to join the war. Besides, his deteriorating marriage reveals the deterritorializing impact of the bigotry on his life because even though he loves his wife, Sofia, he stops giving her medicine and kills her just because of her apostasy. The dissertation has regarded Rohan as the embodiment of Middle Eastern religionaries who become deterritorialized from spirituality by the political Islam and has argued that Aslam alludes to those who cannot notice their manipulation by the political Islam with blindness, as stated in the title of the novel.

Aslam, in *The Blind Man's Garden*, reflects his political stance through locals who perceive that the US neocolonialism is responsible for the political, social, cultural and economic destituteness in the Middle East and radical groups are not logical options to be freed for the US neocolonialism. To reveal that the contemporary Middle East is the neocolonial space where both the US and fundamentalists perform violence on locals, Aslam obliges Mikal to wander in the neocolonial Afghanistan and Pakistan and to directly experience the brutality performed by both. Mikal's journeys to the depth of the neocolonial space do not only depicture the deplorable experiences of Middle Easterners after the 9/11 attacks, but also underline the alterations his identity undergoes through his reterritorialization in which he witnesses different factors. His captivities by the Taliban, warlords and the US forces respectively constitute a political stance which is opposed to both the US neocolonialism and fundamentalism, and he transforms into a man who risks his life to save an American soldier. The dissertation has argued that Aslam offers Mikal's alteration through his journeys as a solution to the neocolonial Middle East because he implies that the vicious circle of death promoted by both the US and fundamentalists should be finished, and recking human life without any exception can help build the peace in the region.

The dissertation has also focused on the deterritorialization of the Middle Eastern women in the neocolonial space. Aslam depictures the contemporary local women through Sofia, Tara and Naheed. The dissertation has considered Sofia as a representative of the neocolonial Middle Eastern women who are killed since they do not concur with the doctrines of the bigotry created by the political Islam. Tara stands for the majority of Middle Eastern women who become deterritorialized in the bigoted neocolonial space by consenting to the gender roles constructed by the bigoted neocolonial Middle East. However, the dissertation has defined Naheed as an ideal Middle Eastern woman who does not reconcile herself to the gender roles that bigotry and patriarchy obligate to her sex but cultivates a subjectivity to stand on her feet as an alone woman in the neocolonial space. Building a juxtaposition between Tara and Naheed, Aslam suggests that even though both become deterritorialized in the neocolonial space, the possibilities they accumulate during their reterritorialization may vary, and they, as women, may become representatives of bigotry and patriarchy or they maintain life freely in accordance with their expectations from life.

Mohsin Hamid's *The Reluctant Fundamentalist* and *Exit West* and Nadeem Aslam's *The Wasted Vigil* and *The Blind Man's Garden* meet on common grounds that they do not only depicture the neocolonial Middle East, but also reflect the deterritorializing impact of neocolonial policies on Middle Easterners. Regarding physical dislocations due to neocolonial policies as neocolonial deterritorialization, the dissertation has analysed the alterations Middle Easterners undergo with Deleuze and Guattari's understanding of deterritorialization which emphasizes the fluidity of identity through the possibilities that subjects encounter during their interactions with new factors. *The Reluctant Fundamentalist* becomes prominent as a novel which lays bare that 9/11 attacks undermine the acceptance of Middle Easterner immigrants in the West, otherizing them as potential terrorists. The invasion of the Middle East and their marginalization through Islamophobia deterritorialize them, which leads to alterations in their identity. Like Hamid, Aslam attempts to depict the contemporary turbulence in the Middle East and tends to associate it with the US neocolonialism. Similarly, *Exit West* deals with the contemporary refugee crisis and tells the story of dislocated Middle Easterners whose countries are demolished by neocolonialism and who do not have any option apart from migrating. As deterritorialized neocolonial subjects, their passages through magical doors enable them to gain new traits, and they undergo transformations whenever they arrive

different territories. Even though Hamid specifies that physical dislocations lead to alterations in identities, he also argues from a political perspective that neocolonialism has transformed Middle Easterners into nomads who seek for territories where they feel a sense of belongingness. However, Aslam focuses on deplorable experiences of locals who are forced to experience inland dislocations by the neocolonial war. While *The Wasted Vigil* depicts the history of neocolonialism through the intertwined stories of different characters, *The Blind Man's Garden* focuses on the turbulent period after the 9/11 terrorist attacks. Encapsulating each step of neocolonialism in the region, both novels emphasize that neocolonial policies or their consequences oblige Middle Easterners to inland dislocation in the neocolonial space, and their deterritorialization enables transformations in their identities since they cultivate subjectivities during dislocations. Consequently, even though both writers highlight that neocolonialism deterritorializes Middle Easterners, Hamids fictionalizes a cosmopolitan space where immigrants with diverse characteristics, races and religious background can lead a life freely while Aslam regards moderation of neocolonial subjects as a solution which may build the peace in the region.

REFERENCES

Achebe, Chinua. (2006). An Image of Africa. *The Massachusetts Review*, Winter, 1977, Vol. 18, No. 4 (Winter, 1977), pp. 782-794.

Anderson, Amanda. (2006). *The Way We Argue Now: A Study in the Cultures of Study*. Princeton University Press. New Jersey.

Amin, S. (2009). *Eurocentricism*, Monthly Review Press, New York.

Appadurai, Arjun. (2005). *Modernity at Large: Cultural Dimensions of Globalization*. University of Minnesota Press. Minneapolis and London.

Aslam, Nadeem. (2009). *The Wasted Vigil*. Faber and Faber Ltd. London.

----------. (2013). *The Blind Man's Garden*. Faber and Faber Ltd. London.

Asaad, Lava. (2020). *Literature with a White Helmet: The Textual-Corporeality of Being, Becoming, and Representing Refugees*. Routledge, New York and London.

Ashcroft Bill, Gareth Griffiths, and Helen Tiffin. (2002). *The Empire Writes Back: Theory and Practice in Post-Colonial Literatures*. Routledge, London and New York.

----------. (2007). *Post-colonial Studies: Key Concepts*, 2nd. ed. Routledge, London and New York.

Bağlama, Sercan. (2019). "Mohsin Hamid's *Exit West*: Co-Opting Refugees into Global Capitalistm". *New Middle Eastern Studies*. Vol. 9. No. 2. pp. 149-158.

Balfour, Lindsay Anne. (2017). "Risky Cosmopolitanism: Intimacy and Autoimmunity in Mohsin Hamid's *The Reluctant Fundamentalist*". *Critique: Studies in Contemporary Fiction*. Vol. 58. No. 3. pp. 214-225.

Barker, Ernest. (1951). *The Ideas and Ideals of the British Empire*, Cambridge University Press, London

Bhabha, Homi K. (1994). *Location of Culture*, Routledge, London and New York.

Belletto, Steven and Joseph Keith. *Neocolonial Fictions of the Global Cold War*. University of Iowa Press, The USA.

Blaut, J. M. (1993). *The Colonizer's Model of the World*. The Guilford Press, New York and London.

Boehmer, Elleke. (2005). *Colonial and Postcolonial Literature: Migrant Metaphors*. London, Oxford University Press.

Brown, Wendy. (2015). *Undoing the Demos: Neoliberalism's Stealth Revolution*. New York, Zone Books.

Brown, William and Fleming, David H.. (2011). "Deterritorialization and Schizoanalysis in David Fincher's Fight Club". *Deleuze Studies*. Vol. 5. No. 2. pp. 275-299. https://www.jstor.org/stable/45331462

Césaire, Aimé. (2000). *Discourse on Colonialism*. Translated by Joan Pinkham. New York, Monthly Review Press.

Cheah, P. (2006). "Cosmopolitanism". *Theory, Culture & Society*. Vol. 23. No.2/3 pp. 486-489.

Colas, Alejandro. (2007). *Empire, Polity*, Cambridge.

Colebrook, Claire. (2002). *Gilles Deleuze*. Routledge, London.

Clark, Cal and Clark, Evelyn A.. (2016). *Challenging Neoliberalism: Globalization and the Economic Miracles in Chile and Taiwan*. Edward Elgar Publishing, Cheltenham and Northampton.

Çelikel, Mehmet Ali. (2020). Memory and Ideology in Mohsin Hamid's The Reluctant Fundamentalist. Dokuz Eylül Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi. Vol. 22. No: 3. pp. 877-887

---------- (2021). "From Periphery to the Centre: Postcolonial Fiction vs. Colonialist Fiction". *Toplum ve Kültürleri Araştırma Dergisi*. Vol. 7. pp. 71-87.

Deleuze, Gilles and Guattari Felix. (2003). *Kafka Toward a Minor Literature*. Translation by Dana Polan. University of Minnesota Press, Minneapolis and London.

----------. (2005). *A Thousand Plateaus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia*. Translation by Brian Massumi. University of Minnesota Press, Minneapolis and London.

Fahmy, Nabil. (2021). "America and the Contemporary Middle East". *China International Strategy Review*. doi: 10.1007/s42533-021-00082-y

Fanon, Frantz. (1967). *Toward the African Revolution: Political Essays*. Translated by Hakoon Chevalier. Grove Press, New York.

----------. (2008). *Black Skins White Masks*. Trans. Charles Lam Markmann. Pluto Press, London.

----------. (2011). *The Wretched of The World*. Trans. Richard Philcox. Grove Press, New York.

Farhang, Mansour. (1993). The United States and the Question of Democracy in the Middle East. *Current History*. Vol. 92. No. 570. pp. 1-5. https://www.jstor.org/stable/45316750

Ferro, Marc. (1997). *Colonization: A Global History*. Routledge, London.

Foster, John Bellamy. (2006). *Naked Imperialism: The US Pursuit of Global Dominance*. Monthly Review Press, New York.

Foucault, Michel. (1991). *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*, Trans.by Alan Sheridan. Vintage Books, New York.

Green, Martin. (1980). *Dreams of Adventure: Deeds of Empire*. Basic Books, New York.

Gilley, Bruce. (2017). "The Case for Colonialism in the Middle East". *Third Quarterly*, 1-17. doi: 10.1080/01436597.2017.1369037

Giuliani, G. (2012). "The Colour Lines of Settler Colonialism". *Arena Journal*, Issue: XXXVII/38, 105.

Haider, Nishat. (2012). "Globalization, US Imperialism and Fundamentalism: A Study of Mohsin Hamid's *The Reluctant Fundamentalist*". *South Asian Review*. Vol. 33. No. 2. pp. 203-238. DOI: 10.1080/02759527.2012.11932885.

Hardt, Michael and Negri, Antonio. (2001). *Empire*. Harvard University Press. The United States of America.

Hamid, Mohsin. (2008). *The Reluctant Fundamentalist*. Harcourt, Orlando.

----------. (2014). *Discontent and its Civilizations: Dispatches from Lahore, New York and London*. Penguin, New York.

Hamid, Mohsin. (2017). *Exit West*. Penguin Random House. Great Britain.

İşler, Ahmet and Savaş, Ali Rıza. (2018). "20. YY. Uluslararası Güç Odağında Ortadoğu ve Batı Ülkelerinin Gelişmişliğine Tarihsel Bir Bakış". *Journal of Bitlis Eren University Institute of Social Science*. Vol. 7. No. 2. pp. 757-772.

J. James, P. (2015). *Imperialism in the Neocolonial Phase*. Kerrela, India, Massline Publication.

Johnson, Robert. (2003). *British Imperialism*. Palgrave Macmillan, New York.

Kepel, Gilles. (1995). *The Revenge of God: The Resurgence of Islam, Christianity and Judaism in the Modern World.* Trans. by Alan Braley. The Pennsylvania State University Press, Pennsylvania.

Loomba, Ania. (2005). *Colonialism/ Postcolonialism (2nd Ed.)*. London, Routledge.

Mann, M. & Fischer-Tiné, H. (Eds.). (2004). *Colonialism as Civilizing Mission: Cultural Ideology in British India*, Anthem Press, London.

McLeod, John. (2000). *Beginning Postcolonialism*. Manchester University Press, Manchester.

Miller, L. Chritopher. (1993). "The Postidentitarian Predicament in the Footnotes of A Thousand Plateaus: Nomadology, Anthropology, and Authority". *Diacritics*. Vol. 23. No. 3 pp. 6-35.

Morey, Peter. (2011). "The Rules of the Game Have Changed: Mohsin Hamid's *The Reluctant Fundamentalist* and Post-9/11 Fiction". *Journal of Postcolonial Writing*. Vol. 47. No. 2. pp. 135-146.

Mwaura, Ndirangu. (2005). *Kenya Today: Breaking the Yoke of Colonialism in Africa*. Algora Publishing, New York.

Papastergiadis, Nikos. (2000). *The Turbulence of Migration: Globalization, Deterritorialization and Hybridity.* Polity Press, Massachusetts.

Nguyen, Viet Thanh. (2017). "March's Book Club Pick: *Exit West* by Mohsin Hamid". *The New York Times*, 10.03.2017, https://www.nytimes.com/2017/03/10/books/review/exit-west-mohsin-hamid.html

Nkrumah, Kwame. (1966). *Neo-Colonialism: The Last Stage of Imperialism*. International Publishers, New York.

Oladi, Soudeh and Portelli, John. (2017). "Traces of Deluzian Nomad in Hope and Other Dangerous Pursuits". *The Journal of North African Studies*. Vol. 22. No. 4. pp. 665-678.

Osterhammel, J. (2005). *Colonialism: A Theoretical Overview*, trans. Shelley Frish, Markus Wiener, Princeton.

Preston, Alex. (2018). "Mohsin Hamid: It's Important not to Live One's Life Gazing Towards the Future". *The Guardian*. 11. 08. 2018, https://www.theguardian.com/books/2018/aug/11/mohsin-hamid-exit-west-interview

Perferct, MJ. (2019). "Black Holes in the Fabric of the Nation: Refugees in Mohsin Hamid's EW". *Journal for Cultural Research*. http://www.tandfonline.com/10.1080/14797585.2019.1665896

Said, Edward W. (1994). *Culture and Imperialism*. Vintage, London.

----------. (2003). *Orientalism*, Penguin Books, London.

Sartre, Jean-Paul. (2005). *Colonialism and Neocolonialism*. Translated by Azzedine Haddour, Steve Brewer and Terry McWilliams. Routledge, New York.

Salahudheen, Muhammed. (2017). "EW of Mohsin Hamid. An Analysis in the Light of Global Migration Crisis". *Literary Herald*. Vol. 3. No. 4. pp. 380-383.

Scanlan, Margaret. (2010). Migrating from terror: The Postcolonial novel after September 11. *Journal of Postcolonial Writing*. Vol. 46. No. 3-4. pp. 266-278.

Shohat, Ella. (1992). "Notes on the Post-Colonial," *Social Text, Third World and Post-Colonial Issues*. No. 31/32. pp. 99-113.

Soherwordi, Syed Hussain Shahed. (2013). "Political Islam: A Rising Force in the Middle East", *Pakistan Horizon*. Vol. 66. No. 4. pp. 21-37.

Spivak, Gayatri Chakravorty. (1985). "Rani of Sirmur: An Essay in Reading Archives," *History and Theory*. Vol. 24. No. 3. pp. 247-272.

----------. (1991). Neocolonialism and the Secret Agent of Knowledge. *Oxford Literary Review*. Vol. 13. No. ½. Pp. 220-251. https://www.jstor.org/stable/43973717

----------. (2010). *Reflections on the History of an Idea: Can the Subaltern Speak.* Ed. Rosalind C. Morris. Columbia University Press, New York.

Tiffin, Chris. (1992). Progress and Ambivalence in the Colonial Novel, Re-Sitting Queen's English: Text and Tradition in Post-Colonial Literatures Cross Cultures 7. *Rodopi*: Amsterdam and Atlanta. 1-9.

Tuathail, O. Gearoid and Luke, Timothy W.. (1994). "Present at the (Dis)integration: Deterritorialization and Reterritorialization in the New Wor(l)d Order". *Annuals of the Association of American Geographers*. Vol. 84. No. 3. pp. 381-398. https://www.jstor.org/stable/2563774

Vakhrushev, Vasily. (1972). *Neocolonialism: Methods and Manoeuvres*. Translated by Kathrine Judelson. Progress Publishers, Moscow.

Wa Thiong'o, Ngugi. (1981). *Writers in Politics: Essays*. Heinemann, London.

----------. (1994). *Decolonising the Mind: The Politics of Language in African Language*. Zimbabwe Publishing House, Harare.

Williams, R. (19799) *Keywords: A Vocabulary of Culture and Society*. Oxford University Press, New York.

Yaqin, Amina. "Nadeem Aslam in Conversation." Wasafiri, vol. 30, no. 3, Sept. 2015, pp. 39-44. Taylor &Francis Online, Doi: 10.1080/02690055.2015.1044785

Young, Robert J.C. (2005). *Colonial Desire: Hybridity in Theory, Culture and Race.* Routledge, London and New York.

----------. (2016). *Postcolonialism: A Historical Introduction*, Wiley Blackwell Publishing, the USA.