



*Colonial Voices between Postcolonial and Imperial Minds*

HIMRI Sarra<sup>1\*</sup>, GRAZIB Mohamed<sup>2</sup>, CHAAMI Amine<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Laboratory of Languages. Ain- Temouchent University (Algeria), Email:  
[sarra.himri@univ-temouchent.edu.dz](mailto:sarra.himri@univ-temouchent.edu.dz) /[sarastar\\_27@yahoo.fr](mailto:sarastar_27@yahoo.fr)

<sup>2</sup>Moulay Tahar Saida University (Algeria), Email: [mfgrazib@hotmail.com](mailto:mfgrazib@hotmail.com)

<sup>3</sup>University Center of Aflou (Algeria) Email: [aminechaami87@gmail.com](mailto:aminechaami87@gmail.com)

Received: 01 /04 / 2023 Accepted: 26 /06 / 2023 Published: 31 /10 / 2023

**Abstract:**

As a clear response to the long-standing mis-representation and marginality in most of the colonizer's writings, post-colonial authors either from Francophone or Anglophone worlds try their best to stand harshly against all stereotypes and distorted images they have, and for a long time, been stigmatized by. In doing so, they invest all their efforts as well as creativity to break the cycle of unbearable silence and fight back their marginality to retrieve their respectable position yet dignity again. This can be achieved through re-telling the [hi]story by their own voice. The aim of this article is to shed more lights on the voice of truth through conducting a comparative study as far as the story of the colonizer and the colonized is concerned, because relying on one story leads to neglecting the other one. That is why, it is quite important to take both stories into consideration in order to reach the so-called a balance of stories.

**Keywords:** *Colonized; Colonizer; [Hi]story; Post-colonialism; Voice of Truth.*

---

\*Corresponding Author.

## I. INTRODUCTION

During colonial era, colonial writers have been equipped with endless freedom as well as privileges to recount stories and adventures without any difficulty. These writers, in fact, harshly start writing their masterpieces on the expense of the colonized ones, as they have been regarded as savages and cannibals. Moreover, in his voyage to West Africa 1561, the English Merchant, John Locke violently refers to the blacks as “beasts who have no houses, no heads, with their mouths and eyes in their breasts”(Adichie,[https://www.ted.com/talks/Chimmamanda\\_Adichie\\_the\\_danger\\_of\\_a\\_single\\_story](https://www.ted.com/talks/Chimmamanda_Adichie_the_danger_of_a_single_story)). For Locke, These categories of people are no more than savages and beasts, for the reason that they have no houses. The same thing for the famous British novelist, Joseph Conrad, in his novella Heart of Darkness when he harshly portrayed Africa as “one of the dark places of the earth” (1899:48), and its African people as “enemies, criminals, workers- and these were rebels. Those rebellious heads looked very subdued to me on their sticks.... cannibals splashing around and pushing” (1899:06-07). For whites, Africans are nothing more than savages and criminals. That is why; they deserve all what is happening to them.

There is a reaction for every single action, and the same thing for colonizers. In other words, the conquest movement does not come out of the blue, because these invaders regard themselves as the missionaries of God in earth; they are the ones responsible for civilizing those savages. Rudyard Kipling writes a poem entitled; The White Man’s Burden in which he profoundly praises the white people for their sacred mission in taking care of blacks or rather people of colored skin.

For that reason, people from colonized countries were completely silenced as well as prevented from writing anything concerning their situation at that time. In his book Black Skin White Masks, Fanon refers to colonized man as “the man [who] has no ontological resistance in the eyes of the white man” (1952:139). Colonial period, therefore, is entirely the hardest period for those oppressed people.

Shortly after the Liberation Movements in Francophone and Anglophone countries, another new era comes to emerge. It is known as post-colonialism, which comes automatically after colonial period. It is a blessing, in fact, especially for the downtrodden and oppressed people whom experienced marginalization, mis-representation, and all kinds of stereotypes. This period comes to voice up the long -standing silence, to bridge the gap between the past and the present, and to re-write and re-narrate the [hi]story from the subaltern voice.

### 1. The Danger of One- SidedStory

In the light of the sudden changes happening in the world, it is not surprising at all to hear many stories from different perspectives and with quite intended objectives. However, the problem does not lay in here; it rather lays in, who tells the story? And on which basis he builds his opinion? The questions are simply answered by the word of power. In other words, power in its simple meaning is referred to domination and endless control. If the one who tells the story possesses this ultimate power he will, for sure, conduct the wheel of history and the same thing happens with colonial power.

According to Adichie, both the single story and power are interrelated; they are two sides of the same coin, where it is impossible to talk about single story away from power. In other words, for Adichie, the single story always exists along with power, since it “is the ability not just to tell the story of another person, but to make it the definitive story of that person” (Adichie,[https://www.ted.com/talks/Chimmamanda\\_Adichie\\_the\\_danger\\_of\\_a\\_single\\_story](https://www.ted.com/talks/Chimmamanda_Adichie_the_danger_of_a_single_story)).

From the colonial era onwards, only the colonizers have all the legitimate rights to tell stories and write the history by themselves and surely according to their mind-set

providing the world with a glimpse of events with some hidden details and missing parts, although real facts are much needed to complete the puzzle of events. The colonial power, in this respect and from its point of view, has all the right to say whatever suits their needs and quench their eagerness for power and fame, because history is always written in favor of the victors. What about the missing parts of thousands of stories and the hidden facts of events left behind? A couple of questions arise, yet the most important one is, who is the victim is and who is the villain? This means that another story must be unveiled and heard.

Accordingly, a single story is not completed unless it is equally told with the other story. In her famous speech known as *The Danger of a Single Story*, the Nigerian novelist, Chimamanda Ngozi Adichie, claims that it is quite important to listen to the two sides before accusing any side, especially if this story was already told by the victorious. Indeed, the story should be told by the two voices otherwise, it will be regarded as inadequate as well as irrelevant. The single story as Adichie points out “creates stereotypes, and the problem with stereotypes is not that they are untrue, but that they are incomplete. They make one story become only story” (Adichie, [https://www.ted.com/talks/Chimmamanda\\_Adichie\\_the\\_danger\\_of\\_a\\_single\\_story](https://www.ted.com/talks/Chimmamanda_Adichie_the_danger_of_a_single_story)). A single story for Adichie is inextricably dangerous for the reason that it “can be used to dispossess and to malign, stories can also be used to empower and to humanize. Stories can break the dignity of people, but stories can also repair that broken dignity” (Adichie, [https://www.ted.com/talks/Chimmamanda\\_Adichie\\_the\\_danger\\_of\\_a\\_single\\_story](https://www.ted.com/talks/Chimmamanda_Adichie_the_danger_of_a_single_story)).

Adichie’s famous speech shifts the world’s attention to a very important point about single stories and how they are served to talk about negative things and never pay attention to the other things. Furthermore, she points out that why the west always talks badly about Africa and its people while neglecting the core issues about the daily suffering of innocent people from “fighting senseless wars, dying of poverty and AIDS, unable to deal for themselves, and waiting to be saved by whites” (Adichie, [https://www.ted.com/talks/Chimmamanda\\_Adichie\\_the\\_danger\\_of\\_a\\_single\\_story](https://www.ted.com/talks/Chimmamanda_Adichie_the_danger_of_a_single_story)). She addresses those people of authority to rethink again and try to search for a dire solution about this real catastrophe, instead of dehumanize and enslave them. It is, then, evidently true that those stories are unquestionably the production of the West, because they do not believe in the equality between the West and the East. For them, the Third World is the right place of the other.

In her mind-set, Adichie accuses the West as being the only ones responsible for distorting the beautiful image of Africa and Africans. To illustrate her position, Adichie talks about the British Merchant called John Locke, who travelled to South Africa and described Africans as “beasts who have no houses” (Adichie, [https://www.ted.com/talks/Chimmamanda\\_Adichie\\_the\\_danger\\_of\\_a\\_single\\_story](https://www.ted.com/talks/Chimmamanda_Adichie_the_danger_of_a_single_story)). Countless stories were unfairly told about those innocent victims. Adichie blames them as being harsh and cruel when it comes to mention oppressed people. It is a matter of fact that the West basically builds their assumption on Albert Camus’ conception of slavery. For him, “every man needs slaves as he needs fresh air” (Camus, 1942:26). Hence, there is no escape from this bitter truth and reality as well.

The single story, therefore, is a double-edged sword, of course, if it is used on the wrong way, especially in the margin/ center case. In this respect, Adichie shows in her speech the dangers of single stories and their negative consequences as they can “rob people of dignity. They make our recognition of our equally humanity difficult, they emphasize how we are different rather than we are similar” (Adichie, [https://www.ted.com/talks/Chimmamanda\\_Adichie\\_the\\_danger\\_of\\_a\\_single\\_story](https://www.ted.com/talks/Chimmamanda_Adichie_the_danger_of_a_single_story)).

story). Adichie is right in every single word she has uttered, because those stories create a state of imbalance, where there is no equality but rather two extremely opposed poles, superior and inferior, and no middle ground is found.

### **1.1. Lifting the Curtain out of the Imperial Voice**

As far as colonialism is concerned, the colonized voice has been largely and completely ignored for the solely reason that he is inferior or rather he is nothing more than other. Thus, it is completely condemned to keep silent and uttered no single word, simply because he is invisible. The colonizer, on the other hand has the absolute freedom and privilege to speak and to write all whatever he wants. In doing so, a lot of stories will come to emerge not only to amuse worldly readers, but also to praise their presence as gifts from God to civilize, cultivate, and to maintain peace in this earth. The world will inevitably believe in these stories, because they were told by powerful voices; the western voices whose works and for a long time were incredibly regarded as the best model for western cannon. For this reason, none has even the right to judge them, simply because they are the power and the absolute in the same time.

The novel of *Heart of Darkness*, for instance is written by the British novelist Joseph Conrad and portrays Africa as “one of the dark places of the earth” (1899:105) and its African people as “brutes”, and “flat noses”. In addition to that, he describes them as primitive, uncivilized ones in which they have nothing to do but to serve their white masters.

Due to the frequent production of Western novels and stories about the colonizer as superior and the colonized as inferior, these kinds of narratives are undoubtedly believed in as it is pointed out by Adichie; “I wrote exactly the kinds of stories I was reading”, and the kind of stories at that time are mostly written by colonizer. No wonder, then, if those narratives respectively praise the imperial power on the expense of the colonized. Eventually, all stories are important, especially Western ones whether they are true or false. That is why, Adichie, focuses much more on the single story and their negative consequences on the wretched colonized people.

As far as *Heart of Darkness* is concerned, many critics stress on the fact that this statement has a colonial sense. In his seminal work, which is entitled *Culture and Imperialism*, Said notes that: “[*Heart of Darkness*] beautifully captured the imperial attitude” (Milne et al, 2009:125). This statement portrays the different strategies, which are gradually adopted by Imperial Power to dominate Africa and its people. Besides Said’s opinion about Conrad’s novel, the Nigerien Writer Chinua Achebe, in his outstanding essay: *An Image of Africa* also accuses Conrad as being a racist novelist, because he describes African man as being: “savage who was fireman” (1977:43).

In analogy to what Achebe and Said have already said, York Tindall in his insightful work *Forces in Modern British Literature 1885-1956* claims that Conrad’s novels and stories “that without being imperialistic are colonial” (Tindall, 1885-1956). This means all what is produced by Conrad is undoubtedly racist, because if he does not write about imperialism he will for sure deal with colonialism. In relation to all what has been mentioned before, it is absolutely approved that Conrad is a racist novelist par excellence.

To draw Conrad’s steps, Rudyard Kipling also has deeply cherished the glorious presence of the whites in the colonized life, because they are heavily handed with a sacred mission towards those primitive people. In other words, Kipling in his astounding poem *The White Man’s Burden*, draws the world’s attention towards the fact of the whites and their sacred mission in colonized countries. In doing so, Kipling is indirectly justifying the wrong deeds of colonial Imperialism and endorses their steps to do more than that, of course, in the light of civilizing those uncivilized ones. To justify his colonial point of view, Conrad claims that “The conquest of the earth, which mostly means the taking it away from those who have a different complexion or slightly flatter noses than ourselves” (1899:43). He harshly stresses the point that those people with “slightly flatter noses than

ourselves" (1899:43) do not deserve to have freedom, because they were naturally born just to serve their white masters. In analogy to what has been claimed by Kipling, Fanon also maintains "Europeans has only been able to become a man through creating slaves and monsters" (1963: 84), because the only way to reach power is to enslave the oppressed people. That is why, the West always create stories that serve to distort the image of indigenous people in order to veil their savagery and evil side.

### 1.1.1. The Stranger as a Single -Side Narration

Imperialism in its widest sense, does not refer to Britain only, but the whole Europe; Spain, France, and the like, because European countries had conducted a series of imperialistic invasion towards Third World countries. Africa, for example, is the main continent which was basically the crux of all tragic scenes of colonialism, whether in the South or North. As it is clearly stated earlier about the British colonial in South Africa, North Africa also deeply suffers from French invasion, especially Algeria.

Moreover, due to the long-term conquest of Algeria by the French colonizer, Algerian people were totally coerced to embrace a culture extremely opposed to theirs what automatically leads to peril clashes in culture, identity, and language. The same thing happens with Algerian colonized people, where they were savagely and badly treated by French colonizers. They were marginalized as well as stigmatized as being savages and uncivilized ones whom have no right to speak. In this regard, the French novelist Albert Camus seriously deals with the case of Algeria in most of his writings, of course, from his mind-set as a French colonizer.

As an emphasis to what has been already mentioned, it is likely to say that the novel of *The Stranger*, which is written by the great author Albert Camus, can be undoubtedly the best work which perfectly embodies the danger of single story. For it portrays directly the image of the colonized by the colonizer.

The Stanger's novel revolves mainly around a French protagonist, named Meursault, who is jailed not for the crime he has committed towards an Arab civilian, but for his misbehavior during his mother's funeral. From this point, one can deduce that there is no justice between France and Algeria, or rather there is no equally chances between the colonizer and colonized. According to Camus, Meursault is innocent and all what drives him to commit the crime is "because of the sun", which means that he "hadn't intended to kill the Arab". In his existentialist view, Camus repeatedly stands by the side of his protagonist, for the reason that no one could keep his moral values when he is in a real danger: "no code of ethics and no effort are justifiable a priori in the face of the cruel mathematics that command our condition" (1942: 68). This means that, if someone comes face to face with a problem that may thread his life he has no alternative chance but to react in order to save himself.

To illustrate this point, Meursault says that "I took a step, one step forward. And this time, without getting up, the Arab drew his knife and held it up to me in the sun. The light shot off the steel and it was like a long flashing blade cutting at my forehead" (Camus, 1942: 59). It is true that the Arab wants to kill Meursault; or rather, an Algerian colonized tries to take off the French colonized life. That is why Meursault takes the initiative step and gets rid of the Arab. In this sense, it is quite clear why Meursault shots this man and he has all the right as Camus already points out. Therefore, from the colonizer's opinion the Arab or the colonized Arab is the guilty not the colonizer, because all what the colonizer did is just tried to get rid of everything that may possibly disturb his peace of mind.

Through his novel, it can be clearly deduced that Camus is in favor of imperialism and colonialism, and he is indirectly proved with concrete evidence that all colonized men are

savage and uncivilized by nature. Hence, it is not surprising at all for those kinds of people to receive ill-treatment by imperial colonizers for sincerely liberating them from their savagery and turning them into human beings. It is after all an excuse brought by westerners to veil their real intention towards their quench for power.

On this basis, imperial forces would never be accused for the profound damage, whether physically or psychologically, they do for the colonized people, and all what matters is how to convince the whole world that these kinds of people are savage, ungrateful, and all they need is to be inferior and slaves. Moreover, for Stephen Morton, “in the structure of the western thought, the “other” is relegated to a place outside of or exterior to the normal” (2003: 37).

*The Stranger*, especially the trial scene, perfectly resembles the cruelty and indifference of the colonizers towards innocent, oppressed people the fact that Camus wants to hide. Moreover, through the story, its interesting events, and its characters, one can come to a satisfied conclusion that Camus’ inner self is overwhelmed by his colonial thoughts. For more emphasis, Meursault whatever does anything wrong, instead of being guilty, he is always innocent either in killing the unnamed Arab or his misbehavior towards his mother’s funeral. When it comes to talk about killing the Arab, for instance, Camus says that this crime is not a planned act, and Meursault is once again innocent man. However, the stream of incident refers completely to the opposite. To confirm his deed, Meursault says that “the trigger gave; I felt the smooth undersides the butt... I knew that I had shattered the harmony of the day, the exceptional silence of a beach where I had been happy. Then I fired four more times at the motionless body” (Camus, 1942:59). Interestingly, Camus regrets the case of Meursault, because what condemns him is not the crime of killing in itself, but rather his endless honesty: “lying is not only saying what isn’t true. It is also, in fact especially, saying more than is true” (Camus, 1942:118).

If readers have to read the novel, they will absolutely agree with Camus about his protagonist, because all evidences are in favor of the French colonizers and of course against the Arab savage people. Furthermore, For Camus, Meursault is the most honest person in a dishonest society and his execution is totally wrong. However, the truth is what O’Brien has said about Camus and his protagonist. According to O’Brien, Meursault ‘s act of killing refers to’ the subconscious realization of the obscure and puerile dream of the ‘poor white’ Camus never ceased to be” (1970:34). This again reveals Camus’s real intention and the amount of wrath he holds for Arab people.

In this regard, O’Brien actually stresses on a very important point concerning the inner psyche of the author, because it is a matter of fact that all fictional characters are mirrors, which perfectly and unmistakably reflect their authors’ inner thoughts and inner psyches as well. In other words, Camus clearly disguises in the Image of Meursault even though he appears as an honest one, whose solely aim is to fight for colonialism and wretched yet oppressed people. However, his hidden intention is clearly embodied in his French hero. What once again emphasizes his eagerness for colonialism and superiority. In analogy to O’Brien’s mind-set, Pierre Nora (1961) also considers *The Outsider* as nothing more than a revelation of the pied-noirs real intention towards Arabs.

It apparently seems that, O’Brien Conor (1970) considers Camus as a colonist disguising under the mask of an anti-colonist and an oppressed defender, because his outrage is more than being repressed and controlled. This is what leads his evil side to emerge. For Conor, Camus profoundly believes in superiority over inferiority and colonizer over colonized, and all this can be clearly embodied in the Image and behavior of his protagonist Meursault and his clear reaction towards the Arabs. Another example, which interestingly ensures O’Brien’s claim about the hatred of Camus for Arab Algerian

people, is that all his Arab characters are nameless unlike the French ones. This means that Camus totally ignores the existence of Algerian people. Instead, he calls them “The Arab” (1942:58). Meursault is the protagonist and major character in this novel. In his Meursault character,

Indeed, the “Arabs” are nothing more than inferior, exotic, and nameless creatures. In contrast to nameless colonized people, all French people in the novel have names like; “Marie”, “Raymond”, “Meursault”, and “Emmanuel” (Camus, 1942: 20- 25-28- 31). This definitely means that Camus prefers colonizer over colonized, because he belongs to colonial power, and all what is imperial is, superior, intellectual, and civilized. All what is colonized is, therefore, inferior, savage, and primitive. In his novel, then, Camus conducts the binary opposition and provides the reader with a bit difference or rather the huge gap between the center and the margin or the self and the other that is why his Arab characters in all his novels, are nameless. Since they have no names, it means that they have no identity too, because names usually refer to identity. Referring to them as “Arabs” instead of calling them with their names, Camus in a way neglects the existence of the Algerian people even though they do exist. Furthermore, living in this world does not always mean that someone really exists, unless he has an aim to achieve in this life. However, the issue with “the Arabs” is that they live but they do not exist for Camus’ mind-set.

## 1.2. Revising the Colonized Voice

After a long-standing of humiliation and marginalization, people of former colonies, whom have gained their full independence from colonial power, try their best to retrieve all what was unfairly taken from them. To react against the never-ending silence, they are completely in a dire need to speak and to re-narrate the story from their point of view, as well as to re-examine the history, because the latter seems to really miss so many pieces of events and details about the stories of the colonizer and colonized per se.

However, the question, which rises itself, in this case is that, how can those people equally speak and what they are supposed to say? Both questions, in fact, are in a way relevant to the very insightful question once asked by Gayatri Spivak. In her essay, which is entitled “can the subaltern speak?” Spivak wants clearly to draw the world’s full attention to a very interesting, yet important point through her bold inquiry about the already marginalized and silenced people of former colonies.

Indeed, it is not that simple to urge someone to speak once again after years and years of silence, as it is clearly claimed by Camus’ protagonist Meursault: “I even find trouble expressing myself, I ‘m not talking so well” (Camus, 1956: 25). Hence, this is what exactly happened with those people. It is as if you bring a dead person to life again and this is quite impossible. Spivak’s question, therefore, is rather of great importance, because it sheds more lights on a bitter truth about the real suffering of these categories as well as gives them the chance to speak loudly and voice up their repressed words.

Besides Spivak, who has interestingly dealt with Subaltern issue, The Pakistanian novelist Ahmed Jamil also has been highly interested in this noteworthy theme. As a response to the question already asked by Gayatri “Can the Subaltern Speak?” Jamil on the other hand, draws further steps beyond Gayatri’s claim. For him, the most important thing does not precisely lay on whether or not the subaltern can easily speak, rather, whenever allowed to speak, can they speak for themselves? This means that in case they speak, is it possible for them to speak by themselves without the interference of others. Jamil’s point of view maybe derived evidently from the case of Friday, whose tongue was completely cut off by his master to and remain silent for the rest of his life.

For more emphasis, Friday is highly regarded as the prototype of silence and subjugation, because he cannot speak any more. For that reason, he cannot narrate his

story only through another voice; Susan's voice. Due to Friday's case, it is likely to say that Jamil's point of view is unquestionably right, because besides their ability to speak, Are they going to speak by themselves? For Friday, then, it is really hard to re-narrate his story by himself. However, what seems encouragingly great is that despite of his silence, Friday finally opts to tell his story of course through the help of Susan and this is what really matters.

It is not surprising at all to confess that it is incredibly hard to re-narrate the [hi]story for the reason that the author is a real dilemma; the necessity yet the difficulty of remembering. Moreover, while narrating the [hi]story from the colonized perspective, the writer is in a real struggle between the shreds of the past memories and the new events of the present. His old self will for sure cross path with his new one what leads finally to an identity crisis. However, the only way to get rid of this in between-ness is through writing, because writing is a self-healing which urges the author to finally reach reconciliation not only with himself but with his past as well. In this respect, Adichie also stresses the fact that the only thing, which amuses her most, is: "how many people are eager to write, to tell stories, to tell our many stories, [because] stories can be used to empower people...they can also repair that broken dignity" (Adichie, [https://www.ted.com/talks/Chimmamanda\\_Adichie\\_the\\_danger\\_of\\_a\\_single\\_story](https://www.ted.com/talks/Chimmamanda_Adichie_the_danger_of_a_single_story)). She, hence, encourages writers of former colonies to write even if they find it difficult, because the story by the colonized voice is of great importance, since it ensures the balance of stories.

Consequently, the Algerian novelist Mohamed Dib is among the brightest colonized voices whose echoes still reverberate in all Algerian people's hearts. He is among the oppressed category whom have experienced all sorts of torture and ill-treatment by the French colonizer. Moreover, Algeria, which is located in North Africa, also suffered from all forms of racism and hatred by the Imperial power. After gaining its independence, Algerian writers just like other writers of former colonies use the power of pen as a kind of resistance to rebel against the colonial vision and stereotypes and to ensure their existence.

The Liberation Movements, therefore, not only provide colonized countries with full freedom, but also give its people endless courage and power to fight against their marginality and slavery. Therefore, this latter perfectly coincides post-colonial era, which gives an extra-support to the oppressed to speak out loud and to voice up their repressed voices.

In doing so, Mohamed Dib has written an incredible stories and novels about the real suffering of his people during the colonial era and how they end up choosing revolution over peaceful solution. In his novel entitled *Al Hiriq* (L' Incendie), Dib has dealt with the very serious situation and the miserable condition his people were deeply suffered from. *Al Hiriq* turns mainly around Algerians who live in Telemcen, precisely in Boublen (a small village), where they are forced to give their lands to the colonizer. Shortly, after doing so, they start to suffer from poverty, disease, and the ill treatment by French settlers. Day after day, their situation starts to take another course, what makes things upside down and even worse than before. Omar is the protagonist of this outstanding novel where he is only 12 years old, yet he is mature enough to understand all what is going on between his people and French colonizer. Thanks to the severe situations and to the Algerian hero Hamid Seraj, that the Algerian people come to the conclusion that only through violence they will regain back all what was forcibly taken from them. Fanon also agrees upon the idea of violence as he best solution, because, for him: "the colonized man finds his freedom in and through violence" (1963: 86).



In this regard, Dib through his novel negatively questions the bad treatment of French colonizer to the real landowners. For more emphasis, Algerians work in their lands as slaves in return of little money to fight back poverty. They work in the farmer of “Monsieur Marcus”. To illustrate, two important events which refer to the settler’s mercilessness towards Arabs. The first scene is when the machine tears an Algerian worker apart and his blood spreads in all sides and the other workers stand over their speechless towards this horrible accident, but what really pains is the reaction of Marcus towards this event. Moreover, when informed about the dead body, “Monsieur Marcus” receives this incident with entirely cold blood to the extent that he orders his workers to carry on their work as if nothing happened and things are quite normal (Dib, 1954:78).

Indeed, the reaction of French colonizer was very cold what refers directly to the hidden hatred they hold for Algerians. It is once again the authority of the colonizer towards the oppressed colonized in which he does not be given all freedom to show his pain and sadness. The farmers, on the other hand, absolutely show wrath hatred towards French colonial, but do nothing simply because they are weak and have no right to speak at all.

The other painful scene is when French soldiers jailed the Algerian soldier Hamid Saraj and tortured him to death, because he is responsible in spreading awareness among Algerian citizens, and the one who urges them to fight back against this daily violence and the misery they live in (Dib, 1954:106-107). The two events, in fact, show how savage are the French colonizer. In this connection, William Galois says “French were obsessed with violence-in their thoughts, acts and records” (Steel, 2017:11). Dib’s novel *Al Hiriq* reveals the cruelty of French colonizers and who they violently treat Algerian citizens in their home land.

## 2. The (Re)reading of Stories: The Colonizer and the colonized Voices in Parallel

As a response to the stereotypes and marginalization of the downtrodden through stories recounted by westerners, Chinua Achebe angrily calls for equal narration in both sides; the center and the margin. In this regard, he urges to listen to both stories before accusing any one, or even distorting his image in this world. All his reaction can be clearly embodied in his noted book *Home and Exile*, which mainly consists of three outstanding lectures through them he angrily responded to the long-term stereotypes by west. “The Balance of Stories” is one among his influential lectures, which urgently calls for a re-examination or revision of stories narrated by colonizers, because, for him: “until the lions produce their own historian, the story of the hunt will glorify only the hunter” (Achebe, 2000:73). Indeed, the victors tell the majority of stories. For this reason, Achebe hopes from the bottom of his heart that the coming of:

“The twenty-first century is that it will see the first fruits of the balance of stories among the world’s peoples. The twentieth century for all its faults did witness a significant beginning, in Africa and elsewhere in the so-called the Third World” (2000:79).

Interestingly, this new era calls entirely for equal chances between the colonized and colonizer as well as reinforces marginalized voices to take the lead and challenge the western canons with their incredible pieces of arts which begin to threat the position of traditional ones. As a challenge of the west, colonized writers launch to narrate their stories from quite different angle. Where there is not only the voice of the center, but the voice of

the margin too. Indeed, there is no single story to be told, yet stories in balance which co-exist in the same mainstream. However, the task is not that simple because the wounds of the past is still bleeding, and its echo is still reverberating in the hearts of colonized people just as it is mentioned by Achebe when he says that: “this turn of events should not surprise us. Despite the significant changes that have taken place in the last four or five decades, the wound of the centuries us still long way from healing. And I believe that the curative power of stories can move the process forward” (2000: 83). However, it is hard to move forward, but it is a must to do so for the sake of better days. The wall, of years of silence, is finally broken, many untold stories re-narrated, and all what is marginalized by the colonial master must come to the center. Adichie notes that:

Now, things changed when I discovered African books ...because of writers like Achebe and Camara Laye I went through a mental shift in my perception of literature. I realized that people like me, girls with skin colour of chocolate, could exist in Literature. I started to write about things I recognized. (2009)

Regardless their color or cultural difference, people from all over the world were given equal chances to write. So, as a response to “*the Balance of stories*”, Adichie through her insightful speech shows a total agreement with Achebe, because for her stories are much more important, especially if they walk hand in hand in the same level; at least to never construct or even create completely wrong prejudices about any nation or a given folk of people. The subaltern is no longer marginalized and silenced; instead, he was given all the freedom to say whatever he wants and what he feels. So, for Spivak’s astounding question “Can the Subaltern Speak?” it is rather to say; yes, the subaltern can easily speak and none would speak on his behalf. It is, therefore, the opportunity for people of The Third World to claim their own rights and retrieve their own identity. According to Antonio Gramsci, “the old [day] is dying” (Gramsci, 1971 :33), and of course the better is yet to come.

It is worth saying that “the balance of stories” provides the reader with the exact history through; the voice of truth, the complete events, and the missing parts of the story, because history is incomplete unless both sides provide their own story. Therefore, things for sure will be totally clarified, because no single story would exist by itself. Chinua Achebe is right. For him, it is time to stand against all stereotypes and maintain equality between the West and the rest even if it seems impossible to do so. Consequently, the novel of *The Stranger* and *Al Hariq* refer to the fact that stories matter since they can co-exist together. They both embody the balance of stories, as they are old by two extremely different voices; the colonizer and the colonized. From both novels, then, the reader can easily deduce the voice of truth from both voices as well as to figure out the margin/center relationship.

## II. CONCLUSION

As far as [hi]story is concerned, there is always this kind of everlasting struggle between the self and the other, or rather the struggle between the colonized and the colonizer. Indeed, the two terms are an inextricably interwoven, because it is through the other that the one can completely see himself. When it comes to colonial vision, only through the other that he recognizes himself, because the other is a mirror of the self. Similarly, Camus also claims that: “every man needs slaves as he needs fresh air” (Camus, 1956:26). Central to the idea of the danger of a single story and the Balance of stories, the two novels prove

the need for both stories, because one story only will not lead to the voice of truth. In order to extract the real history, then, it is necessary to take into consideration both stories in parallel.

### References:

- [1] Ngozie, C.A. (2009). “*The Danger of a Single Story*”. TED. (9 February 2023/11p.m) [https://www.ted.com/talks/Chimmamanda\\_Adichie\\_the\\_danger\\_of\\_a\\_single\\_story](https://www.ted.com/talks/Chimmamanda_Adichie_the_danger_of_a_single_story).
- [2] Conrad, J. (1899). *Heart of Darkness*. USA. Coyote Canyon press.
- [3] Fanon, F. (1986). *Black Skin, White Masks*. London. Pluto press.
- [4] Camus, A. (1956). *The Fall*. New York.
- [5] Milne, M. Jennifer, A. et al. (2009). *Literary Movements for Students*. USA.
- [6] Achebe, C. (1977). *An Image of Africa: Racism in Conrad’s Heart of Darkness*. Penguin UK.
- [7] Tindall, W. Y. (1885-1946). *Forces in Modern British Literature*. New York.
- [8] Fanon, F. (1963). *The Wretched of the Earth*. New York. Grove Press.
- [9] Camus, A. (1942). *The Myth of Sisyphus*. New York.
- [10] Camus, A. (1942). *The Stranger*. New York.
- [11] Sartre, J.P. (1964). *Colonialism and Neo-colonialism*. Routledge. London and New York.
- [12] Morton, S. (2003). *Gayatri Spivak*. Routledge New York.
- [13] O’Brien, C. (1970). *Albert Camus: Of Europe and Africa*. New York. Viking Press.
- [14] Spivak, G. (1985). *Can The Subaltern Speak? Speculations on widow sacrifice*. *Wedge*, 7/8 (winter/ spring).
- [15] Refaat Abu- Enein, G.F. (2019). *The Colonized Mentality Suffering in Silence: How to Form a New Destiny*. Unrwa University. VI.7.p.339.
- [16] Dib, M. (1954). *L’Incendie*. Seuil.
- [17] Steel, R.D.(2017). *Violence in Algeria: From Colony to Independent Nation*. Oregon: Western Oregon University.
- [18] Achebe, C. (2000). *Home and Exile*. New York. Oxford University press.
- [19] Gramsci, A. (1971). *Prison Notebook*. New York.
- [20] Gohar, F. Iraq, I. Zaman, A. (2022). *A Subaltern Study of Ahmad Jamil’s The Wandering Falcon from The Perspective of Identity Crisis: A Post- colonial Analysis*. *Journal of Educational Research and Social Sciences Review*. College Women University Faisalabad. V2. P.05.