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Abstract: The pronounced universalism, standardization and elitism of the American literary tradition in English departments in countries of former experience of colonization have created an enduring relationship between the center and the margin through processes of assimilation, integration and ambivalence. The literary text has become critically open to contestation among differentiated components: the old military conquest, daily institutional compulsion, and in progress ideological interpellation, which have become the basic features of the post-colonial culture. However, in place of opposition and contestation of the authorized colonial hegemonic performances, different forms of assimilation and integration were articulated and attended in these departments. In the long run, opposition discourses have developed strategies to cleave from the Center, and in order to achieve this, and, by adopting borrowed means from the Center, these opposition discourses cleave to the Center itself, which creates an ambivalent relation between the Center and the Margin. Within this understanding, the need for post-colonialist discursive negotiations that require the native rewrite him/herself (not) as an object of imperialism, but as a subject of contestation remains one major aspect of discourses of resistance. In this paper, we address the various interpellation processes in post-colonial literature classroom by which the critic and the literature teacher address the post-colonial subject and produce him/her as a subject proper of colonization or Americanization. In addition to rehearsing the existing literature of resistance discourses, we investigate the role of the authoritative text as a means by which colonial and post-colonial regimes have enforced this tradition in past and post-colonial territories. We probe the various processes by which colonial subjects assimilated, incorporated or disallowed and rejected the extended processes of their literary education. Drawing on our investigations and analyses of these processes, we propose further outlets for resistance and dissent to these practices.
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Resumo: Neste trabalho de pesquisa, abordamos os diversos processos de interpelação em culturas pós-coloniais, através da qual o crítico e professor de literatura abordar o sujeito pós-colonial e produzim-lo como um "sujeito próprio" da colonização ou americanização. Apesar do fato de que todos os países com experiência anterior de colonização terem alcançado a sua independência política, muitas esferas sociais, culturais, econômicos ainda apegam-se aos poderes coloniais, e as instituições de ensino não são uma exceção. Talvez a tradição literária anglo-americana em departamentos de inglês nestes países constituia uma evidente perpetuação e propagação das potências coloniais nestes países, o que cria uma relação duradoura entre o centro e a margem. Dentro dessa compreensão, a necessidade de negociações discursivas pós-colonialistas que exigem do nativo reescrever a si mesmo (não) como um objeto do imperialismo, mas como um objeto de contestação continua a ser um aspecto importante do discurso contra-hegemônico e resistência. Na tradição literária, o texto é culturalmente aberto a contestação entre pessoas diferenciadas. No entanto, em lugar de rebelia ou resistência à americanizada e performances coloniais endossados, diferentes formas de oposição deve ser articulada e atendidos em discursos de resistência. A obra literária deve ser dita do "outro" e do subalterno desarticulada auto-consolidação. O projeto da ficção pós-colonial ou material literário deve apontar para interrogar discursos hegemônicos ocidentais juntamente com suas estratégias discursivas de uma
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posição restrita ou historicista dentro e entre os dois mundos. Além de ensaiar o discurso de oposição e resistência clássica, o documento oferece outras ventes para investigar os meios pelos quais regimes coloniais e pós-coloniais tinham forçados suas políticas e estratégias nos territórios do passado e pós-coloniais. Na sala de aula de literatura, que investiga os vários processos pelos quais os sujeitos coloniais são assimilados, incorporados ou não permitidas e rejeitou os processos estendidos da dominação colonial ocidental.
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**Introduction**

One way or another, almost three quarters of the modern and post-modern worlds have been affected by imperialist and colonialis movements in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries (GEORGE LAMMING, 1960). Such movements were encountered by different processes of decolonization including both forceful military and peaceful resistant movements. However, the academic and/or textual constitution of imperialist and colonialis devices (especially in artistic and literary productions) all through the colonized world becomes part of the larger dominant post-colonial discourse and involve unorthodox processes of assimilation and integration of preeminent colonial codes, regulations, policies and practices of compliance or acquiescence with colonial strategies (LOOMBA, 2005). This act involves several processes of appropriation or (misappropriation) of the dominant colonial discourses generating or producing what we can call a post-colonial culture. It is ironic how the integration of colonial processes in the decolonized countries produces an outcome of a post-colonial culture whose basic features derive from the superior values and ideological thought and institutional practices of the old and expanding imperialist countries.

In opposition to this, post-colonial subjects might authorize a *return to traditions*, but they are usually confronted with an undecided and intricate identity while they struggle with the demands of a supposedly Western rationalized modernity, which is posed as the foil of their national or local identity (HICKLING-HUDSON, 2003). In such Westernized hegemonic and hybridized contexts, the original features of the national identity are melting and dissolving giving rise to a complicated and divided identity to emerge. This shapes the persistent ambivalent discourses that characterize post-colonial societies (LAVIA, 2006). The desire to regain an independent cultural identity is encountered by mainstream established institutions that are incorporated in the life and culture of the colonized country. The uninterrupted relational processes between the ‘center’ and the ‘margin’ have produced apprehensive, uneasy and edgy systems. It has also projected ambivalent, undecided and unresolved post-colonial culture. There are a number of apparatuses that have been employed to sustain such incessant connection. First world literature, for example, is instituted in higher education to invoke an enduring affiliation or connection between hegemonic centrist and colonized systems, between their associated colonial discourses and the strategic post-colonial assembling of them (ABU-SHOMAR, 2013b).

Drawing on this neo imperial politics, the key premise of this paper is to critically engage with cultural oppositional discourses that would resist such an enduring and ambivalent affiliation, especially the connection between higher institutions of post-colonial societies and their former colonial regimes. In the literature classroom, we search for further strategies and oppositional discourses to restructure and de-constitute the re-sides of the institutional colonial infrastructures. While literature on oppositional discourses is copious,
there is striking lack of studies that map out the imperialist development of textual strategies in the post-colonial classroom. As various patterns of subjection and suppression are being reiterated in the classroom, the need appears for counter-hegemonic discourses to be made visible and instituted, especially when approaching the Anglo-American master canonical text. As we will argue, we perceive the task to challenge this tradition as germinating from attempts to unravel the role of power relations in academic institutions that propagate and disseminate colonial legacies and discourses of universalism. On a pedagogical level, we explore the role of educators to remap and reconfigure the existing relations between the past colonial self and its post-colonial and, to a certain extent, post-modern conditions. We do not perceive our task in this paper to reiterate discourses of power relations that constitute such literatures. Several other scholars (e.g. VISWANATHAN, 1989; MUKHERJEE, 1995; WILLINSKY, 1998, 1999; LOOMBA, 2005; McQUAID, 2009) have done this task, and they were innovative in this field. We, however, wish to direct the attention to exploring further issues related to pedagogical practices and "textual hegemony, in particular.

Hegemonic Textuality

The tradition of the authoritative text and its informed representational devices as well as their utilization at post-colonial sites project strategic practices that defy the formation of discourses of resistance. Edward Said (1978) reminds us of what he rightly calls "representational devices", the ideological incorporation and production of literary texts, has shaped discourses of power relations. Specifically, post-colonial educational discourses are informed by two strategic processes: on one hand, processes that include the incorporation and integration of what is not American, and on the other hand, processes that include the institution, confirmation, substantiation, validation, legalization and verification of the American idea, or culture, and what it stands for. The ultimate outcome of such hegemonic discourse is the production of ideas and ideals that are subjected to Western and ethnocentric enlightenment ideals, acculturation and modernization. It is significant how such processes would lead, and actually have actually led to the American's cultural as well political interventions in the so-called ‘Third World’ countries all throughout the Twentieth century producing prominent schools, cultural movements and phenomena like post-modernism and globalization. After the dimes of the classical European colonial powers (England and France), these neo forms of acculturation are still at work to perpetuate and enforce the American cultural hegemony all throughout the Twentieth century life and culture. For an oppositional discourse to work, we perceive the necessity to deconstruct and de-constitute "the power of textual representations" in these contexts exposing their "ideologies" and "technologies" and (their operation in institutions like universities) through which these ideologies have been publicized, "disseminated" and "rendered normative" (ASHCROFT, et al. 2000, p. 86). In the following section, we probe the strategies and tactics that a critic and a teacher of literature can utilize to decolonize and de-constitute these practices.

Before enlarging in our argument regarding hegemonic textuality, it is necessary to establish an understanding of the concept of hegemony and counter-hegemony. We deem this argument necessary as many scholars confuse the concept of hegemony with other similar ones such as domination, power, ideology, etc. Cultural hegemony is understood to mean ‘domination by consent’ (ASHCROFT et al., 2000, p. 116). Fundamentally, hegemony is the power of the ruling class to convince other classes that their interests are the interests of all: “Domination is thus exerted not by force, nor even by active persuasion, but by a more subtle and inclusive power over the economy, and over the state apparatus such as education and
media, but by which the ruling class’s interest is presented as the common interest and thus comes to be taken for granted” (ibid, p. 116). Lears (1985) argues that ‘hegemony’ is not workable without the ‘consent’ of the subordinate. We highlight the concept of consent as we wish to understand the complicity of subordinate cultures and how certain beliefs and academic traditions, such as the American literary text, has been perpetuated for so long in the post-colonial educational contexts.

According to Lears, the concept of hegemony has little meaning unless paired with domination and consent. The “ruling groups do not maintain their hegemony merely by giving their domination an aura of moral authority through the creation and perpetuation of legitimating symbols; they must also seek to win the consent of subordinate groups to the existing social order” (ADMSON, quoted in LEARS, p. 269). Lears argues that consent, for Gramsci, involves a complex mental state; a ‘contradictory consciousness’, a mix of approbation, apathy, resistance, and resignation, which varies from one individual to another, and that makes hegemony a complete success. The notion of ideology is crucial to Gramsci’s cultural model of hegemony and consent. Spontaneous philosophy embodies all forms of sentiments and prejudices which bear subjective meaning apart from the public realm of power relations, yet it can never be separated from that realm. In a given group, values and attitudes develop in a mobilised manner, and some values are more congenial than others. Therefore, each group selectively refashions the available spontaneous philosophy, develops its new and particular world view, or what Gramsci called ‘historical bloc’. For a historical bloc to become hegemonic, which is not always successful, it needs to form alliances with other groups or classes. Therefore, the keys to successfully achieving cultural hegemony are ideological and economic: the leaders of a historical bloc must develop a worldview that appeals to a wide range of other groups, and they must be able to claim that their particular interests are those of the society at large (ibid).

Gramsci’s concept of cultural hegemony shows how Western forms of knowledge as well as adopting these forms by a class of local elitist function to create hegemonic practices. As Hall (1995) argues, an understanding of hegemonic ideology represents the interests of unitary ruling class is not sufficient to prevail. It is rather achieved through constructing ‘new common sense’ around which people’s subjectivities or ‘spontaneous philosophies’ are articulated. Hall argues that ideology, in this sense, becomes a field of class-neutral elements within which the struggle of hegemonic discourses is articulated. Ideology, for him, becomes “a battle field where classes struggle for the appropriation of the fundamental ideological elements of their society in order to articulate them to their discourse” (p. 82). Therefore, since hegemony seeks to establish principles of diverse ideologies: “ideological categories are developed, generated, and transformed according to their own laws of development and evolution” (p. 83). Since the very idea of universality maintains a locus of power in the ‘class of cultural elites’ (BOURDIEU, 1989), post-colonial institutions meet expectations of ‘standards’ and elitism that intersect with the notion of universality. This class of elites, according to Guillory (1993), takes up the idea of standards and aesthetics as an autonomous category of value, and advocates the canon (or the authoritative American text, in our case) as embodying a unique value. Rather than meeting the demands of a changing world, proponents of this position insist on the idea of standardized American texts as exclusive representation, not only of their ‘high cultural approach’ but also of their claimed immortality and universalism.

Drawing on this understanding of hegemony, we argue that the concept of hegemonic textuality or the authoritative text as one that demonstrates the role of a set of canonized American texts in projecting neo cultured and imperialist processes of subjugation and
incorporation, and how these processes are deepened and materialized in post-colonial educational and cultural contexts. Working on such complicated processes, the construction of discourses of elitism would manifest how the authoritative text employs imperialist standards of value judgment producing power relations through specific processes of assimilation and integration which are exhibited and materialized in the post-colonial classroom. Working within different practices made obtainable by this hegemonic textuality, the Western centrist systems continue to situate post-colonial cultures at peripheral positions through the employment and maintenance of a number of neo imperialist processes. Ironically, while this tradition has lost its elitist status in Western academia, it is maintained and propagated in the academic and educational institutions of post-colonial contexts. It is striking how the general pedagogical (academic, educational) rules, objectives and the acceptable class procedures in post-colonial institutions are made conformed to such hegemonic cultural processes. Thus, we realize hegemonic textuality as underlying different forms of cultural interference and practices of repression and violence in the literature classroom should be de-constituted in educational settings.

The impact of such hegemonic textuality is broad and many-sided. Loomba (2005) suggests that Anglo-American colonialist texts provide students with a high sense of "false consciousness" and self/other integration and project discourses of power and authority that target alienated and marginalized groups or masses. Furthermore, in breeding the fixed and binary opposition representational relations in the classroom, such processes place the post-colonial text at central or focal position characterizing it as different, canonical, hegemonic, legitimate and officially recognized with high mission. Cultural differences made obtainable by such representations (or provided by the hegemonic textuality in canonical works) bequeath the colonial discourses with the necessities of power that counter discourses seek to eliminate, or try to bring to an end. And by time, as the range, amount and strength of these texts have become increasingly acknowledged, recognized, and widespread, incorporated in the post-colonial culture, (i.e. canonized) especially on university level, they become an essential part of the social and cultural lives of the post-colonial cultures (Abu-Shomar, 2013c). Therefore, since imperialist ideologies seek to establish textual hegemony in educational settings; educational categories and their outcomes are expanded, renovated and employed according to the development, advancement and acceptance of colonialist laws in post-colonial conditions.

In a similar vein, identifying the ways in which the canonized and universalist text is part of the colonizing political agenda has established the basis of discourses of resistance by a number of prominent post-colonial critics. Both Giroux (1992) and Spivak (1995) view the formation of a canonical work as a form of cultural and political production and call for a challenge to the social uses that the canon has served in order to change the impact of power relations. Giroux asserts that the issue of canon formation must be engaged in terms that address the historical formation of the canon and the pedagogy through which it is taught and how these pedagogies have either provided or excluded the conditions and knowledge necessary for marginal people to recover their own histories and to speak and learn in places occupied by those who have the dominant power to shape policy and act (p. 96). In response to the universalist claims of the Western writer, and their effect on generating colonial discourses Jan Mohamed considers the impact of such claims on the identity of the colonizer:

Faced with an incomprehensible and multifaceted alterity, the European theoretically has the option of responding to the Other in terms of identity or difference. If he assumes that he and the other are essentially identical, then he would tend to ignore the significant
divergences and to judge the other according to his own cultural values” (quoted in ASHCROFT et al, 1999, p. 18).

Cultural differences provide the self with the necessities of power that discourses of resistance seek to eliminate. For Jan Mohamed, rather than being an exploration of the ‘other’, colonialist literature merely affirms its own colonialist structures: “By depicting the outer limits of ‘civilization’, it simply codifies and preserves the structures of its own mentality” (ibid, p. 19).

To probe further, a consideration of classroom practices also provides an understanding of the ways informed interpretations of literary meanings are achieved through complicated ambivalent discourses. This breeds ‘the doubleness’ of colonial discourses. For Parry: “What is articulated in the doubleness of colonial discourse is not the violence of one powerful nation writing out another [but] a mode of contradictory utterance that ambivalently reinscribes both colonizer and colonized” (In ASHCROFT, et al., p. 45). The effect of this indigenous intrusion in the classroom is the displacement of the traditional yielding colonialist representations that are locked in textual analysis, as it has been the case the place of difference and otherness, or the space of the adversarial, within such a system of ‘disposal’, is never entirely on the outside or implacably oppositional (ibid).

Marshall et al. (1995) examining the power relations inherent in teaching literature, concludes that classroom discussions are products of the teacher’s previous academic experience. Classroom practices and discussions have their own conventional ways of talking about literature that affect students’ understanding and represent a type of tacit curriculum in conventional modes of literary knowledge (EAGLETON, 1996). Such discussions hinder examining ideological assumptions since students develop an implicit, but informed, understanding of response to literature (MARSHALL et al., 1995). Furthermore, ‘doing’ English is based on ideological assumptions, which can be defined as cultural models (GEE, 1996). Cultural models, according to Lee, are simplified emblematic visions of an idealized or normal reality that varies across cultures. Cultural models are ideological because they involve what is considered valuable and act as though they represent reality. If cultural knowledge is the basis of meaning-making, then these assumptions or master myths can limit ways of thinking, since culture can best be seen as the source, rather than the result, of human thought and behavior (FREIRE, 1994). The case for a post-colonial cultural model is nonetheless contestable and ambivalent as it cleaves to and from the center: cleaving to by means of adopting hegemonic ideologies, and cleaving from by using these ideologies as possible discourses of resistance.

So far we have argued that hegemonic textuality, as exhibited in American canonical works - being predicated on the significance of hierarchical difference in cultural relations and accompanied by universal and collective thought worldwide - are textually and ambivalently connected with neo forms and processes of domination and hegemony from an advantageous and Westernized point of view. These processes are connected with or allowed by what we call categorical laws; a number of commandment acts of the imperialist textual strategies which are politically employed in academic productions. These are inherently related to idea of the supremacy and dominion of the American culture, what becomes known as the American cultural hegemony that is being incorporated in the post-colonial text and context. Such cultural phenomenon becomes political when it is related to the formation of post-colonial English departments, specifically in the selection of anthologies, books, novels, plays, poems, etc., and other material that are traditionally posed as very indispensable and essential components for educational systems. Such political intrusion in academic textuality and classroom mechanism is highly conformal to the American rising imperialist ideology.
which has affected so much of the modern and post-modern cultures. The selection of texts, together with the appropriate critical theories, enhances and constitutes discourses of resistance within post-colonial cultures, as well as within Western cultural and academic productions. In response to this neo-form of colonization, the idea that the American cultural hegemony becomes very functional through hegemonic textuality- as it has the capacity to sustain and inform old colonial and imperialism traditions in post-colonial educational contexts- should be de-constituted through the development of policies and practices that institute counter-hegemony and resistance as integral components in cultural discourses.

In this “long tradition” in the English departments of post-colonial societies, American policies are highly sustained by what became agreeable strategic procedures in post-colonial educational practices. It is unique how such endorsement of power relations in such societies is achieved and perpetuated by the approval and consent of colonial subjects. Such authorization, which carries the signature of colonial subjects, extends and broadens the implementation of power, supremacy and influence not through military force or colonization, this time, or use of tactical plans, or other political or armed strategic means, but through colonialist and or neo colonialist discursive practices incorporated significantly in post-colonial systems of education. In educational institutions, especially in English departments, spread all over the modern world, teaching American literary productions becomes an indispensable precedence or main concern in which literary material, supposed to be organized for artistic, creative and imaginative outcomes, are being imbued with a colonialist character and dealing with diverse aspects of Western culture (the American one this time) and their ways of lives (BALZER, 2006). In a post-colonial university classroom such processes generate a reproduction of colonialist or imperialist educational or structural politicized systems which are intellectually as well as culturally uninspiring at any way. However, they are filled with political strategies and power relations, which proved politically miscellaneous, they are not easy to locate as they are dense and knotty, consisting of diverse components or heterogeneous aspects related to the complexity of the hegemonic American culture.

More distinctively, the American cultural hegemony has been established in the constitution of educational systems the fact that has resulted in an opinionated and chauvinistic academic education at different college departments in post-colonial cultures. Rather than molding the national consciousness of the post-colonial subject, giving it form and identity before its colonizers, English departments project a neo cultural hierarchical structure that produces various forms of colonial rule of subjugation whose main function is the perpetuation and upholding of old colonial regimes and the maintenance of post-colonial subjects under ongoing forms of control and governance. For example, in several processes of classification and division of literary material and textual analyses according to principles of canonicity and universalism, English departments reiterates colonial goals and procedures. Under the aura of modernization and social improvement, advancement and justice of and for postcolonial subjects, and by the use of Americanized ideals, trends and cultural and political movements, hegemonic textuality has incorporated various processes that subdue, restrain and control representational relations and techniques in the colonial text. Such neo power structurality also paves the way for the emergence of blatant as well as hidden forms of control and governance that subjugate post-colonial subjects to Western thought and culture or according to the terms of what is known as "coloniality of power". It is significant how the operation of power textuality enables the new masters to send commandments, make proclamations, and conduct evaluation and various declarations from within educational institutions with which a new assembly of colonial rule and formation override postcolonial classrooms.
Mapping the coloniality of power in the post-colonial literature classroom

We understand the coloniality of power as indicating the integration of the legacies of Western colonialism in the ideological structure of post-colonial educational systems, and the incorporation of hegemonic forms of knowledge that advanced noticeably in post-colonial literature and studies. We use the concept of coloniality of power to delineate the racial, political and social hierarchical orders or disorders imposed by Western colonial movements in post-colonial educational systems, and the propagation of these practices by local elitists. Specifically, coloniality of power describes the existing traces of past colonial experiences in contemporary post-colonial societies which are exhibited in the different forms of educational programs and scholarships that outlived formal colonial movements and became integrated in succeeding social orders, most obviously in university and college education systems of the decolonized countries. During the Twentieth and Twentieth first centuries this process has started to acquire a prescribed value approval from the rising American hegemonic culture in the continuous processes of "disenfranchising" the other post-colonial societies (POPATIA, 1998). The American imperialist system produces a higher "persistent categorical and discriminatory discourse" (ASHCROFT, et al., 1999) that has become incorporated in the social, educational, cultural and economic structure of the post colony, and that continues to be reflected in post-colonial studies and literary education at English departments spread all over the world.

The American categorical and discriminatory discourse is connected with different apparatuses, which have become a priority for post-colonial critics, and have continued to reflect the ways with which the older imperialist ideology passed into neo-colonialist configurations in the educational structure of postcolonial cultures. For Ashcroft (1999), "education is [...] a conquest of another kind of territory – it is the foundation of colonialist power and consolidates this power through legal and administrative apparatuses" (p. 425). Education also becomes "a technology of colonialist subjectification [that] establishes the locality English or British as normative through critical claims to 'universality' of the values embodied in English literary texts" (p. 426). Coloniality of power is thus reproduced in the high philosophy of education: in its technology, the established curricula, syllabuses and the selected texts, but more fundamentally through basic assumptions and beliefs about the goal of education and its relation to other components and institutions within post-colonial cultures. Drawing on this, the enforcement of the American canonical classical text in higher education curricula becomes a medium for imperialist advancement, political encroachment and intrusion, and a political strategy of colonial expansion and domination.

The role that educational institutions has been playing in enforcing neo imperialist forms and ideologies makes oppositional discourses or discourses of resistance an essential noncompliant and insubordinate approach in post-colonial cultures. This would bring up indistinct and not heard neither approached components in colonial discourses. This act includes searching for the political schema or the historical/geographical background of the artistic text, which is located not only in the ultimate impact of self/other representations in the text or in the power of the canonicity or universality of the American text, but in the interaction of many components that construct the American cultural hegemony. In other words, discourses of resistance should be able to unravel the ways with which modern and postmodern ideologies engaged textually with colonial and imperialist processes in the post-colonial textbook. Like earlier European modes of imperialist thought and strategies, precepts of American Twentieth century ideology- which is based on modern and contemporary
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Theories – specifically Marxism, Post-structuralism and Post-modernism – have, on the one hand, offered new possibilities for the emergence of the American imperialist dogma to materialize in canonical literary productions, and on the other constructed various forms of coloniality of power in various aspects in post-colonial cultures. In the Arab world, for example, learning English comes through the incorporation or inclusion of American canonical works such as masterpieces of classical figures like Mark Twain, Henry David Thoreau, Ralph Waldo Emerson, Nathanial Hawthorne, Herman Melville and others. This makes it necessary to address issues related to the function of the ‘authoritative text’ and the capacity of canonicity to be engaged with establishing new forms of hegemony and domination, or what Gramsci’s calls a ‘domination by consent’.

In reinforcing the older forms of representation and in implementing a neo-colonial tradition, literary practices in post-colonial cultures adopt and propagate universalism and timelessness of the American literary text. As Christian (1987) notes, this practice is adopted to be engaged with the old hierarchical divisions leading to the institution of "a neo-colonialism in literary studies" (CHRISTIAN, 1987). American canonized and anthologized texts representing American culture are supposed to construe idealism and universalism in the sense they are assumed applicability to the entire cultures and civilizations in the globe. Specifically, investigating how coloniality of power operates in these contexts, we argue that that the inherited colonalist space is extended in the classroom, as well as a conception of the indigenous culture as a political agent in structuring an intriguing and complicit discourse which is highly needed in the imperialist cultures in this stage. The indigenous native groups start to feel protected in the authoritative and reliable power of such textual canonicity and universality especially as they are being validated by international or national legislations and organizations. The universality of such type of texts, which imbues the post-colonialist text with authority and various forms of primacy and validity imposes a colonial educational strategy which is characterized by embedded inherited, but in many discursive practices, unveiled configurations or structural formations of power, control and discrimination.

Ironically, despite the idealistic universality proclaimed in the American literary production, critics (and/or teachers) can show how such textuality is based on similar traditional structures and practices of power that seeks to re-produce the old dominant colonial system. Such literary works, even artistically or metaphorically disguised with democratic and enlightening ideals, are linked with a dominant colonial discourse which is basically structured by fixed binary oppositional relations: Americans are ranked at the top and those other (to which the text is addressed) are at the bottom due to the hierarchical or differential representation strategies employed in the text. Coloniality of power is, thus, exhibited in some stereotypical traits, of both the colonizer and the post-colonized subjects, which are structurally incorporated to construct, not a universal culture in the idealistic sense of the concept, but a classificatory third world one which will be always ranked and depicted as inferior and eternally different. It is precisely "cultural difference" rather than a worldwide "cultural identity" which is installed in this transgression or violation of the communicative aspect of human relations. For (ASHCROFT, et al., 1989 p. 51):

identity itself is the function of a network of differences rather than an essence. … It is this silence, the metonymic assertion of the post-colonial text's difference, which resists the absorption of post-colonial literature into a universalist paradigm. We can thus see how important is the cross-cultural literary text in questions of signification.

Furthermore, English literature devises representations in the text which are "organized" and "structured" in a discourse of power relations according to universalist ideologies and "cultural and institutional capital" (BOURDIEU, 1989) that reflect the cultural and historical advancement of the American civilization. In this regard, concepts like
universalism and canonicity focus on the "unitary" and "homogeneous" aspects of the human nature. Literary criticism manifests how they form a discourse of power relations as they become strategic means of imperial rule and domination. In the incorporation of such Western hegemonic thought in the academic text, such concepts produce a pattern of representation of other cultures and people that are frequently manipulated and intervened in for some political purposes. Through the incorporation of hegemonic ideas like universality, and canonicity in the American text, English literature, thus, has the power to communicate universal thought and values, in Sharpe's words (1989), "securing the dominant narratives," and not allowing "a consideration of literatures other than the Trans-Atlantic."

The idea of the universality of the American literary text enhances the Americanization of the experiences and cultures of the other. This is one more way to say that the American literary production is only reflected in post-colonial cultures from an American positivist perspective. Accordingly, it is not the artistic impulse which is found at the basis of the American colonial/ canonical text. The rising of the American cultural hegemony with its historical and political implications and complications during the 20th century, plays the principal role in structuring the American cultural production in the post-colonialist text. This idea has resulted in having power structured in and outside the discourses of the post-colonial text.

Western hegemonic thought, manifested clearly in the American cultural hegemony, validates the production of Western democratic movements and trends like humanism and globalization which also reflect the suppression of cultural difference among "the human race." This last expression has acquired a universality of meaning when it is referred to as the "family of the human race" with which the entire global nations and countries are strictly organized into one family. On a pedagogical level, reading the universal discourses of the American text has been profoundly enclosed and enfolded with this "supposed universal human nature," what Aijaz Ahmad (1987) calls "worldism," the fact that was clearly reflected in the rising American ideology during the twentieth century and only from a Western vantage point or perspective. Thus, the development of such hegemonic cultural trends demonstrates how power relations operate in educational institutions which is not only restricted to literary productions, and not without any value for resistant and indigenous groups. The reproduction of colonial power eliminates the cultural distinction between different cultures and societies; such reproduction of colonial power in the classroom, as being authorized from a universal or global perspective, is controlled by old discursive practices of domination and authority and as such should be invalidated or revolutionized for a number of reasons:

First, the literary tradition in most post-colonial educational systems, which is only based on the concept of the American cultural hegemony undermines concepts like native culture and national identity. This creates class practices that include the continuous restitution, perpetuation, propagation, regeneration and restoration of old colonial systems that repudiate to investigate or deconstruct self/other inquiry and cultural representational analysis from an individualistic or nationalist perspective. As Hulme (1986) argues, "This discourse becomes hegemonic in the sense that it provides a popular vocabulary for constituting 'otherness' and was not dependent on textual reproduction" (in ASHCROFT et al, p. 365).

Second, the dominance of textual universality or canonicity the fact that implies the continuous renewal of old colonial systems, which also involves the reversal processes of cultural identity formation. This, on its part, hinders the development of new forms of subjectivity, of pleasures, of moderation far away from colonial acquiescent, yielding, subservient, passive and compliant practices, cultural representations or discourses. In discussing the idea of Universality in literature Larson (1973) argues that the word 'universal'
is limited. For him universality is a pejorative term, and when we talk about universal experiences in literature it is the Western tradition that is in the backdrop of mind.

Third, the literature teacher should be enabled to confront the collective values likely to be accepted as universal truths, as conveyed by the classical or canonical texts and critical theories which, - are also maintained by Western hegemonic textual, theoretical and speculative strategies. Critics and teachers should be made aware of the significance of the peril, menace or nuisance of the idea of universality and the effect of its operation in the classroom which holds back and obstructs the evolution and structural formation of oppositional discourses. This is again one form of "ethnocentrism" that creeps into the Western text and shapes dominantly the coloniality of power that teachers bring into post-colonial classroom settings.

Therefore, we perceive resistance discourses as those practices which are organized in a form of teaching revision technique that teachers develop and maintain in order to determine or undermine the constitutionality and continuity of certain colonial laws, structures, theories and values. The teachers' role becomes primarily the investigator of the very system of colonial values to which the text refers and with which it constitutes the tools of representation and accultaration in the literary text as well as in the post-colonial culture. The risk of reproducing or imitating older forms of colonization is always present and has become an exigent and demanding Third World higher education reality. Post-colonial critics, as well teachers would have to confront the collective values likely to be accepted as universal truths, as conveyed by the cultural representations of the classical or canonical texts which are also maintained by Western/American hegemonic other non- textual theoretical and speculative strategies.

Nonetheless the imposition of the American authoritative text on post-colonial cultures has initiated innovative forms of power relations, which are justified by Western idealistic practices of democracy, egalitarianism, social equality, theories of humanism and individualism. Such discourses of power, or what Chinua Achebe (1988) calls "Colonialist Criticism," have been intended to replace the alleged claims of the totalitarianism and extremism, fanaticism and radicalism of post-colonial cultures. Such imposition of power relations which exemplifies the integration or elimination of difference has placed the marginality of post-colonial culture as the starting point of analysis rather than its ending point or outcome. Instead of the assimilation or incorporation of other forms of positivity and understanding that might characterize cultural representations, (post)colonial discourses display certainty, acceptance, or affirmation of such hegemonic structures (on part of the indigenous cultures) exclusion rather than repudiation, negation and ultimately exclusion. Moving forward in direction of advancement, progress and social development, post-colonial cultures are controlled (and hindered) by the laws imposed by colonial authority and educational practices rather than by the resistance to such neo laws of compliance and conformity (ABU-SHOMAR, 2013a). Any discussion of coloniality of power should focus on the idea that there cannot be any grand totalizing liberation from old colonial systems with their continuous deprivation of the consciousness of the self, without the articulation of oppositional discourses that repudiate to constitute (rather than rearticulate or assimilate) the old effects and traces of colonization. According to Ashcroft et al. (2000), reflecting on Aijaz Ahmad's "Jameson's Rhetoric of Otheress and the 'National Allegory'":

The value of post-colonial discourse is that it provides a methodology for considering the dialogue of similarity and difference; the similarity of colonialism's political and historical pressure upon non-European societies, alongside the plurality of specific cultural effects and responses those societies have produced. (56)
Drawing on these observations, a post-colonial critic or teacher should be made aware that in post-colonial educational settings, the old policies of colonization or what has been called regressive imperialism, have been replaced in countries with postcolonial cultures by what is being called now "progressive imperialism." While previously, these policies were identified with pure conquest, unequivocal exploitation, extermination or reductions of undesired peoples and settlement of desired peoples into those territories, they are now veiled with the notions of universal and idealized progression. This new form of imperialism is founded upon a cosmopolitan view of humanity that promotes the spread of civilization to allegedly backward societies, the elevation of living standards in conquered territories, and the allowance of conquered people to assimilate into imperial societies and cultures. It seems that the American cultural hegemony all throughout the Twentieth/first centuries is acquired in post-colonial cultures in similar neo imperialist processes. For example, the American canonical text strategy is based on an exemplary thought which is being authorized, endorsed and empowered in the text, as it upholds claims to democracy and idealistic living that would give humanity the utmost or the fruit of the American civilizational experiences all throughout its history. There is emphasis in post-colonialist educational institutions on promoting Western academic disciplines and specialties (as part of an integral process of "neocolonialism" formation). In its attempt to constitute hegemonic formations according to the rising imperialist ideologies and their hegemonic discourses, "Neocolonialism" becomes the traditional colonialism which tend all the time to provide a "vocabulary for constituting otherness," as well as the constant development of strategies like contextualization, normalization and textual amendment or revision as directly linked to the old and imperialist traditions within the Western discursive sphere producing what Hulme (1986) has called "textual authority" or in Jameson's terms the "global American postmodernist culture."

Exploring possible strategies of resistance

In the last section of this paper and based on our examination of the hegemony of the American literary tradition, we propose possible strategies that resist 'textual authority', 'canonical ideologies' and hegemonic practices as well as discourses of American globalized culture or any similar practices we refer to as colonilaitly of power. Resistance and dissent discourses in the literature classroom can take several forms and processes that combine the work of the critic and the educator. We propose some of these processes beyond the colonial construction of a Euro/American world, specifically within an oppositional framework that attempts to forward the discourses of pedagogical resistance beyond the classic and theoretical arguments and mainstream narratives. These processes aim to reveal the insidious face of hegemonic canonical text with all its cultural bearings. Strategies and discourses of resistance should be also developed beyond the conventional master narratives that claim standardization and universalism from an ethnocentric perspective. In our propositions of these strategies, we mainly draw on our professional outlook and teaching experience in the English departments in several post-colonial contexts.

In this regard we forward the concept of interpellation as a kind of politicized textual intervention strategy and cultural intrusion that will be made recognizable and confronted when textual resistance is incorporated in the classroom and instituted as part of the educational process. For us, interpellation describes the process by which imperialist ideology embodied in major canonical texts reflects the dominance of the colonizers' social and political institutions and is required essentially to constitute the individualized nature of colonial subject's identities through the employment of the very same processes of colonial
and imperialist strategies in academic situations and institutions. Relying on this understanding, a post-colonial pedagogical strategy should describe the ways the imperialist ideology/strategy addresses the relation between literary texts and the political world that produces them, and to say this is to recognize that political nomenclature (the categorization or classification) of such processes. Interpellation should be found most effective when teaching literary canons, which exhibits the production and replication of similar imperialist processes that are enforced in cultural hegemonic institutions and continue to police cultural relations in most of the modern or post-modern worlds. Several agents in academic and educational institutions including critics, policy makers and teachers should address these issues and institute resistance in higher philosophies, in university curricula, and pedagogical strategies. Three different techniques can be employed in this regard:

Firstly, in higher education level, it becomes essential to (re)connect or contextualize national or regional formations within their historical and cultural settings. This means that processes of cultural and historical recreation should be resituated and textualized together with the hegemonic master narrative in the text. This strategic act can be complicated when reversal processes of colonial (de)contextualization or narratives of deliverance from the inherited colonial enterprise are made to accompany such resistant processes.

Secondly, post-colonial textual analysis should aim to situate the overriding and intervening (or the canonical and universal) academic text within its colonial discursive settings and structures. The learner should be made aware of how the colonialist enterprise is always accomplished from a colonialist superior ‘privileged position’, a standpoint that is only achieved in constituted structures as the complicit binary opposition relation that poses the colonial subject as the inferior ‘other.’ University learners are challenged, themselves, to investigate the means by which textual strategies and analyses impose and maintain colonial codes and system in the master text; the idea that will result in the incorporation of postcolonial subjects into the neo colonial discourses of resistance.

Thirdly, post-colonial critics are required to raise issues about the utility and function of resistance in a literary text. This includes responding to essential questions of a) how a text, which is grounded in idealistic attitudes and universal assumptions, produces cultural hegemony and colonialist relations, and b) how literary and textual analysis in the university classroom proves pedagogically failing when canonical literary works constitute a holistically pedagogical/imperialist discursive practices merged under the name of classical literature. In other words, critics and teachers should be able to find oppositional strategies that respond to processes of canonicity in the classroom. They should communicate how these processes subjugate and suppress the specificity or the historicity of the colonial instance, and how they inform discourses of power whose main features or relations are ‘inclusivity’ and hegemony, and the supremacy of the universal and the global idea. The ability to interpret imperialist traditions and structures and communicate them to English language users with varying levels of English literacy and situated in complicated post-colonial cultures becomes a pedagogical strategy and a stipulation of resistance discourses in the classroom. Thus, under these circumstances, the cultural space constructed in the classroom should be noncompliant to the Western dominant discourses. Nonetheless they become enclosed, restricted and refractory, unless teachers integrate concepts of resistance and altercation, oppositional strategies and processes of disapproval and dissatisfaction that should accompany the positivist reception implemented in postcolonial subjects at different discursive practices in the classroom. As Lee (1977) contends, “Post-colonial literatures/cultures are thus constituted in counter-discursive rather than homologous practices, and they offer ‘fields’ of counter-discursive strategies to the dominant discourse” (p. 22-3).
Fourthly, for a resistance discourse to work, educators and teachers should seek narratives which liberate the post-colonial subject from its predetermined and rigid status as the ‘other’, moving it into a position of 'hybridity' (BHABHA, 1994) or into an oppositional standpoint from which it is enabled to acquire agency. In this regard, self-consciousness would enable the colonial subject to resist, repudiate and disclaim ‘colonial authority’ (PARRY, 1987) which becomes the major feature of post-colonial textuality. From within discourses of resistance, the text should not yield to the totalizing notions of cultural hegemony that disallow resistance strategies in the classroom, nor does the structural politics of the colonialist text be allowed for the continuity of the unobstructed operations of textual ‘aggression’ and violence. Additionally, challenging notions like literary universality, canonicity, post-colonial critics and teachers are engaged in the formation of counter-discourses. Specifically, in the opposition to kinds of analyses that ascribe, or attribute, “intentionality” and "unidirectionality" to colonial power, - a post-colonialist strategy should employ and articulate both the historical and the ahistorical in the text liberating the colonial subject from the fixed position as a passive object of discursive and inbuilt domination (FIEDLER, 2007). By revealing the oppositional and the intriguing (various forms of conspiracy, scheming and intriguing in the text) and by focusing on the multiple and the contradictory in colonial discourses, a post-colonial critic demonstrates the limits and scopes of colonial and post discourses, that its relations are dialogic and the connections are historical and artistic rather than political. We deem these processes as two primary features that should characterize resistance discourses.

In addition to these processes, a post-colonial oppositional approach in the classroom should be dialogic, generating what Bakhtin (1981) has called "dialogic Literature." This means that it should carry on “a continual dialogue with other works of literature and other authors. It does not merely answer, correct, silence, or extend a previous work, but informs and is continually informed by the previous work” (p. 126). Utilizing dialogic discourses, in Bakhtin’s sense, in oppositional discourses entails the significance of situating the post-colonial subject in the discursive representational practices. This act makes it essential to look for the post-colonial subject's ability to interrogate with the English book from within the dominant discourses of textuality. This could be articulated in terms of a subversive revolutionary, highly developed and avant-garde discourse of resistance that incorporates cultural interaction and revival of the consciousness of the self of the agency. The idea that literature, as well as, the post-colonial subject is ‘in communication with multiple works’ will also destabilize the hegemonic relations of the canonical post-colonial text. This is not merely ‘a matter of influence’, as Bakhtin argues, for the dialogue extends in both colonizer/colonized directions, and the colonial work of literature is as influential as the native text is. As such, dialogic literature would act in response to the political role of textual stereotypes and the fixed positions assigned to subjects in post-colonial discourses. Primarily, a post-colonial teacher’s role (an act that can be extended to critics too) becomes the liberation of the fixity and the desecrated inscription of the post-colonial subject as the debased other. This also includes the inauguration of the multiple positions of the colonized subject in post-colonialist discourses, which is also made possible by uncovering the neo-colonialist strategies in the master discursive narrative. This makes it possible for the post-colonial subject/intellectual to interrogate the Euro-American literary tradition in his own native terms.

Among the strategies that can be incorporated in oppositional discourses is the use of what is known as "reappropriation" technique (SPIVAK, 1995). In cultural analysis, reappropriation is the developed culture by which post-colonial societies reclaim and re-appropriate inherited colonial terms or traditions that were previously used in a way that disparage those groups. In this context, attempts should be made to re-appropriate
terminology referring to subjectivity and resistance including modern and post-modern entities like citizens, individuality, identity and others. The term reappropriation can also be extended in the classroom to include counter-hegemonic devices or terms, such as colonial subjects with no formal authority seizing a new liberated land or post-modern cultures and ways of life. This further describes the integration of subcultural colonial styles and forms, those from the hegemonic cultures, transforming them into mass culture through processes of assimilation and commodification: the post-colonial introduction of alternate lifestyles, thoughts (even conventions) and social practices and traditions. In employing such innovative strategies, it is certain that ‘the subaltern has spoken’, and her/his interpretation of the colonialist text is in a process of recuperating and recovering not ‘a native voice’ (SPIVAK, 1995, p. 144) but the traces of past experiences of injustices and colonization. According to Bhabha (1994) “the hybrid moment [exposes] “the uncertainties and ambivalences of the colonialist text [and] deny it an authorizing presence” (p. 93). Thus such a textual insurrection which interrogates the discourses of colonial authority is primarily located in the native's interrogation and reorganization of the English text within the terms of its own specific system of cultural meaning, a displacement which is not read back from the record written by colonialism's agents and ambassadors.

Thus, unraveling the historical and political elements in the postcolonial text is rather a vital task for the construction and incorporation of oppositional discourses in post-colonial confrontations or situations. Tiffin (quoted in Ashcroft, 1995) argues: “these subversive (insubordinate) maneuvers, rather than the construction or reconstruction of the essentially national or regional, are what is characteristic of post-colonial texts as the subversive is characteristic of post-colonial discourse in general” (p. 95). Colonial textuality is, thus, constituted in counter-discursive practices and movements rather than in homologous and standardized structures and they offer a field of democratic counter-discursive strategies to the ethnocentric dominant discourse. What is achieved, therefore, is not a homologous discourse that seeks to subvert the dominant with a view to taking its place, it is rather a heterogeneous strategic formation process in which different cultural components, including the national component are combined to produce oppositional discourses. These strategies continually invoke their own counter discourses at the same time as they expose, resist and modify the authority and power of the dominant discourses. For challenging the notions of canonicity and universalism in the literary text in university curricula and at post-colonial educational contexts, we invoke these textual strategies of interpellation as necessary traditions and constituents in the formation of a counter-discourse culture and education.

Conclusion

Literary education in post-colonial contexts has become a primary apparatus of imperialist domination in three different but interwoven ways. It establishes the colonial culture as "normative" (ASHCROFT, 1995, p. 425) through the repeated claims and in the adherence to collective and universal thoughts and values. Such claims and values are inherently embodied in modern and post-modern cultural productions including the literary textbooks, which leave a persistent impact on the body and mind of the post-colonial learner. Such forms of cultural hegemony, like normative education, depict the post-colonized learner as inherently opposite or different being with characteristics that burn with opposing and disparate meanings. The long-established sensual and mental images as 'wild,' 'barbarous,' 'uncivilized,' will depict the post-colonized subject as the eternal antagonist of the American man and woman. In a literature class, the post-colonized subject becomes the foil, a character who stagnantly
contrasts with the American character (usually the protagonist) in order to highlight the high qualities of the American hero. Canonicity and universality, which become primary aspects of the Western post-/colonial-modern discourses, thus, project imperialist ideals into the institutions of higher education, by time such ideals have started to replace national/religious values and ethos which are continually associated with extremism, radicalism and absolutism.

In the institution of discourses of resistance which operate in opposition to such cultural hegemony, post-colonial critics, educators, and teachers of literature should be made aware of a number of fundamental issues including historical periodization, national social and cultural constructions, political and ideological formations in the post-colonial text. Teachers should be able to trace how these ideologies are linked with the rising neo-colonialist imperialist configurations within the field of American literary production, which informed such textual canonicity and cultural capital or neo-coloniality or what we can coin as "canonliacity." In the level of the classroom, such configurations cannot be simply resolved at a level of self/other generality which has become adamantly an archetypal educational strategy. This ‘positivist reductionism’ (AHMAD, 1987) of colonial representation in the classroom is maintained by the personal artistic and poetic, individual testimonies, allegorical language and representative situations (or representational relations) from a culture that had long been posed as the archetypal paradigm for modern cultures and civilizations. Americans are adamant about keeping this hegemonic power in such texts with which they keep ties with the Post-colonial world, and protect their imperial industry and extend power and hegemony all over the globe. Nonetheless, the targeted post-colonial subjects were not utterly unyielding; they are compromising in attitude or opinion in class rooms where the urgings impetus of learning and their educational policies and approaches are achieved in the classroom for the maintenance and upholding of such high strategic neo-colonial constructions.

In brief, the colonial and superior ideals incorporated in the American canonical text exhibit the urgent need for a post-colonial oppositional strategy in the literature classroom, which will focus on unraveling the different ways by which the colonial and neo-colonial powers integrate "processes of patronage and control." Neo-colonialist cultures continue with controlling the post-colonial text through educational institutions that have incorporated processes of normalization of some aspects of American cultural hegemony, specifically in selecting, licensing, publishing and distributing the material regardless to the inscriptive practices, choice of form, subject matter, and genre, etc., which are also subject to such hegemonic power. These issues have received far less attention than they deserve. As Ashcroft reminds us: If "the written text is a social situation, […] the post-colonial text emphasizes the central problem of this situation” (p. 298), the post-colonialist text emphasizes the central dilemma which is colonization. Yet, the nonexistence of this dilemma in the analysis of the literature text which is supposed to constitute its entire discursive practices in the classroom is a major challenge in post-colonial cultures. In Ashcroft's words “… the absence of those 'functions' in the text which operate to constitute the discursive event as communication: the 'writer' and 'reader’” (p. 302) will disable resistance as an essential component in post-colonial discourses.
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