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Abstract:
This paper critically explores the role of colonial discourse studies in exploring cultural imperialism. It discusses the relevance of this academic field to our current understanding of the ideological dimensions of colonialism, imperialism, and globalization. Moreover, it outlines how related conceptualizations such as Orientalism, Said’s Orient and Occident, hegemony, and postcolonial theories are intrinsically linked to these studies. The significance of the study lies in illustrating, through reference to contemporary scholarship in this field, how the colonial discourse’s past, present, and future implications remain of enduring importance in contemporary social and political realities. Furthermore, it traces the writings of various third-world intellectuals that try to uncover the colonial discursive practices in the colonial context and shows how these practices are to create and sustain otherness. Finally, by examining how this field incorporates and synthesizes multiple disciplines, such as literature, history, linguistics, political science, anthropology, and sociology, this paper affirms the continued significance of this field in the contemporary world.
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Introduction

Colonial Discourse Studies (CDS) aim to examine how colonialism has influenced and continues to influence the contemporary cultures of the previously colonized countries. This academic field examines various discursive practices and modes of representation utilized by colonizers or imperialists to maintain colonial hegemony. CDS provides a considerable understanding of multiple aspects of colonialism that prevail in various discursive practices such as literary texts, historical books, broadcasting, and educational documents. The discovery of the colonial discourse is crucial because of the insight it can provide into the imperial past and present. In addition, we can learn how concepts and institutions were used to keep people under control.

Moreover, understanding colonial discourse can assist in identifying and challenging oppressive structures in the colonial context that are rooted in colonial legacies. By uncovering colonial discourse, we can learn more about cultures and histories that have been silenced or excluded from dominant narratives. This can open new perspectives on history and culture, fostering a greater mutual understanding between diverse nations and peoples. Finally, uncovering colonial discourse enables us to recognize how specific processes of colonization continue to shape our lives today, such as structural racism and economic inequality, so that we can act against them. In this paper, many pieces of writing by third-world and postcolonial critics will be scrutinized to answer the following questions:

1- How can studies of colonial discourse assist our comprehension of power relations and identity formation in postcolonial societies?
2- How does a colonial discourse analysis method enhance our knowledge of colonialism's cultural and linguistic dynamics?
3- How does creating the 'other' in colonial discourse contribute to the marginalization and exclusion of particular groups? In society?

Literature Review

CDS is a branch of a study investigating colonialism's impact on our worldview. Postcolonial theory, which originated in the late 20th century, provides the theoretical basis for this field. According to proponents of postcolonial theory, imperialism affected current conceptions of race, gender, and social standing. CDS has made significant contributions, including the idea of Otherness. The colonial discourse used otherness to emphasize the difference between the colonizer and colonized. This impression of otherness is typically based on color, gender, and social class, legitimizing the colonizer's position of authority. Typical applications of "otherness" include dehumanizing the colonized and creating a cause for violence and exploitation. One of the fundamental objectives of CDS is to demonstrate the unfair otherness that colonial discourse has constructed.

Examining how colonial discourse legitimized power and exploitation by building the self and the Other is a crucial aspect of this process. CDS examines how colonialism and colonial power relations are articulated in language and discourse. Postcolonial theorists have addressed the concept of otherness by proposing that European colonialism established a binary system in which the colonizer is the self and the colonized is the other. As a result, the colonial discourse emphasized the difference between the colonized and the colonizers and the latter's superiority. This was achieved through language, propaganda, and the media. Colonial powers actively constructed an image of the colonized as inferior, savage, uncivilized, and unruly. Studying colonial discourse has attracted substantial interest in recent years as researchers strive to understand its role in shaping colonial cultures and its influence on postcolonial society. The present study provides insight into how colonial discourse led to and sustained unfair othering. This literature review will examine the numerous CDSs conducted and how they have helped us comprehend the unfair otherness generated by colonial speech. This paper presents a literature review of studies that explore colonial discourse from different perspectives, focusing specifically on how unfair otherness is represented in texts.
Studies have shown that colonial discourse employed various linguistic strategies to represent the colonized as the other. Blommaert and Verschueren (1998), for example, argue that linguistic approaches were used to establish a relationship of superiority and inferiority between the colonized and the colonial powers. Such language constructions, they claim, reflected dominant discourses within colonial contexts.

Similarly, Said’s (1978) seminal work Orientalism revealed that the West had created a discourse about the Orient that depicts it as inferior, exotic, and feminine. In his work, Said explains how Orientalism's discourse has justified European colonialism by portraying a skewed picture of the Orient as inferior, uncivilized, and barbaric. This thing demands colonization to civilize it. In addition, Spivak (1988) underlines how colonial discourse renders the colonized invisible and mutes their voices. She contends that colonial discourse may generate subalterns not found in Western discourse. Her work examines how colonial authorities suppressed and quieted the voices of colonized people. According to her, the pervasiveness of colonial rhetoric has muffled the representatives of the colonized people. Spivak's study has altered our view of the relationship between language, authority, and representation during the colonial period.

The work by Loomba (1998) is only one of several that emphasized the importance of analyzing how colonial speech is transformed and how it might lead to resistance or internalized colonization among the colonized. The Wretched of the Earth by Frantz Fanon (1963) is another essential text in this field of CDS. Fanon contends that colonialism is more than merely a material and political structure. He describes how the colonizer's language may cause the colonized to feel shame and inferiority, leading to psychological damage that can be carried down through generations. Thanks to Fanon's works, the psychological repercussions of colonialism on postcolonial nations are more recognized.

In conclusion, researchers interested in the influence of language and representation on colonial cultures have discovered colonial discourse to be an affluent area of research. The works of authors like Said, Spivak, and Fanon have improved our understanding of the relationship between language, authority, and individual expression throughout the colonial period.

By examining how colonial powers used language to create a sense of otherness about the colonized people, scholars have uncovered the unfair otherness made during the colonial period. This review has explored various perspectives on CDS and how it reinforces unfair otherness. It highlights the necessity of examining how language and discourse are used to position the colonized as the ‘other’ and to strengthen colonial power relations. The present study is essential in understanding the legacy of colonialism and its impact on postcolonial societies.

**Colonial Discourse Studies**

CDS seeks to identify the colonial hegemony that sustains European colonial authority and control over colonized peoples; just like the first step in curing a specific pain or sickness is recognizing it—whether mental or material, the colonial attempt is viewed critically. Discourse analysis makes it possible to see how evident and hidden components of a text are related. It helps us to comprehend how language, literature, culture, and the institutions that govern our daily lives exercise power. According to Loomba (1998), the purpose of CDS is to conduct an in-depth investigation of colonial philosophies of knowledge and their link to colonial institutions' histories.

Colonial Discourse (CD) offers new perspectives on colonialism, highlighting the role of various cultural, academic, economic, and political factors in colonialism's inception, maintenance, and eventual demise. To widen the scope of colonialism research, this study explores the point of convergence between information and authority. Rather than relying exclusively on "a narrow and technical understanding of colonial authority" (Loomba, 1998, p. 47) [(CDS)] demonstrate how it functioned through the establishment of a "discourse." For example, Viswanathan (1992) and Johnson (2011) analyze how studying English literature and other English-related topics was institutionalized in colonial-era nations such as India and South Africa. In addition, postcolonial intellectuals view violent colonialism as an assault on the colonized people's cultural heritage, beliefs, and ideologies.
Although earlier critics such as Fanon and Cesaire discussed colonial activities, CDS acquired prominence in universities after the publication of *Orientalism* by Edward Said in 1978. R. Young claims that the accomplishment of Edward Said articulates the idea that colonialism operated not only as a kind of military control but also as a discourse of dominance (Young, 2016). Without Orientalism, colonial discourse analysis and Postcolonial Theory might not have been as cohesive or created as they were.

After reading Michel Foucault’s theory that humans create knowledge, Edward Said (1978) wrote *Orientalism*. In it, he argued that learning about the East could never be neutral or objective because Europeans made it with ties to colonialism. Furthermore, Foucault's (1970) thesis that discourse is an epistemological device that generates its objects of knowledge by the formation of the practice of a particular language register, as opposed to merely stating the world as it is, was adopted by Said. Thus, he examines the books of Orientalists to determine how these texts may produce not only knowledge but also the world they purport to depict.

Addressing literary and non-literary orientalist discourses, Said (1997) exhibited how the West established the East as its external Other by generating recurring language representations. He discovers what more of an artificial division than a natural one between the Occident and the East is. For Said, this is evidence of Foucault's myopic focus on Europe and the West, especially in a postcolonial context, and his disregard for history and the mechanics of power. As opposed to being an ethnocentric model of how power is wielded in modern society, he argues that much of what Foucault has addressed in his work is more understandable when viewed in the context of a much broader picture, such as the relationship between Europe and the entire world. He does not seem to realize how thoroughly European ideas like discourse and discipline are or how they were used to administer, study, and reconstruct — and then occupy, rule, and exploit — nearly the entire non-European world simultaneously with the use of discipline to employ vast quantities of details and humans (Said, 2021).

Although Foucault's idea of discourse is a cornerstone of CDS, it has been argued that Foucault overlooks colonial expansion as an aspect of European civil society and the potential effects of colonialism on the power/knowledge structure of the modern European state. Foucault does not emphasize the Western role in representing the East, and Said's *Orientalism* focuses on this aspect. In Western depictions of the East, *Orientalism* finds an absolute and systematic distinction between the West, rational, developed, human, and superior, and the Orient, aberrant, underdeveloped, and inferior. (Said, 1978). Said contends that the West/East dichotomy is present in Dante, Nerval, Flaubert, Scott, Kipling, Cromer, Balfour, and Kissinger. Novelists, poets, playwrights, and travelogue writers contributed to and enriched this worldview in the same manner as statesmen (Cromer), anthropologists (Silvestre de Sacy), and philologists (Earnest Renan). Said asserts that even the most innovative writers of their time were limited in what they could experience or speak about the East (Said, 1978).

In addition, the image of the Orient remains unchanged over time. Orientalism's tactic relies on flexible positional supremacy, which places the Westerner in a stronger position vis-à-vis the negative Orient. Said asserts that the repetitions of these representations shaped a specific repertoire in the Western mind. According to Said, academia, institutions, and governments accord texts their authority. These writings have the power to produce new information and the worlds they purport to describe. Such knowledge and reality accumulate over time to form a tradition, or what Michel Foucault calls a discourse, whose material presence or weight, rather than the originality of a specific author, is responsible for the texts that result (Said, 1978).

Said (1979) believed that Cromer's racist attitude toward Orientals is rooted in a lengthy heritage of Orientalism, which gave him the vocabulary, imagery, rhetoric, and symbols to express himself. The Oriental repertory ensures that any observer of the Orient can only see and write what his culture has conditioned him to see and write.

Over time, however, the Orientalist discourse of Aeschylus, Euripides, Dante, Sacy, Lane, and others has attained an uncontested strength and authority over the Orient. Said contends that knowledge...
[about the Orient] no longer necessitates a reality application: knowledge is what is silent, without comment, transmitted from one book to the next. Concepts are spread and circulated anonymously, repeated without recognition, and metaphorically become fixed ideas: what matters is that they exist and can be repeated, echoed, and reechoed without critique (Said, 1978).

Regardless of the veracity of the portrayed Orient, the continual intertextuality between Oriental writings and the recurrence of their representations develops the very reality of their objects. Orientalism can now obtain its credibility. No one needs to see the Oriental to understand who he is, as reading one or more Orientalist literature suffices.

However, the most crucial subject explored in Orientalism, regarded as the book's thesis, is the relationship between producing knowledge and exercising power. Said argues that depictions of the 'Orient' in European texts, travel books, and other discursive practices contributed to the development of European culture and the maintenance and expansion of European hegemony over other countries by creating a dichotomy between Europe and its 'Other.' Said's writings aim to demonstrate how the so-called "knowledge" of non-Europeans facilitated Europeans' continued dominance over those peoples. In other words, Orientalism is a Western way of controlling, reorganizing, and having power over the Orient. According to Said, it can be investigated and analyzed as the corporate institution for doing so (Said, 1978).

Said shows how this discipline grew alongside European colonization of the "Near East" and was supported by several other disciplines, such as philology, history, ethnography, philosophy, archaeology, and literature. All these fields are dominating the Other.

In the previous work, The World, the Text, and the Critic, Said mentions Vico's notion that knowledge is making and that humans can only know what they have created. Thus, the Europeans understood and controlled what they created: the Orient. He argues that European culture is often defined against and by oppositional binaries. He asserts that Europeans have created a sense of identity based on their superiority and the ‘inferiority’ of any border not part of their culture. Edward Said articulates that European culture saw itself as masculine and the Orient (or colonized people) as feminine. This notion of opposition was further reinforced by the belief that the Orient was irrational and savage while Europe was rational and civilized. The idea was that Europe had everything under control, and its primary value was hard work. Said's main point is that Orientalism became a politicized way of viewing the world, perpetuating a dichotomous understanding of the familiar and the exotic(Said, 2021). According to Childs and Williams (2014), the operation of the will plays a significant role in this regard. This is because power and knowledge act in the case of Orientalism as a mechanism of a Western "will to knowledge," which produces texts and knowledge about the East. However, the superiority of the West over the East is the only reason why the generation of such a large amount of knowledge is even possible. This is exemplified by Europeans' freedom in traveling, conducting business, researching, excavating, interpreting, and analyzing the East. These activities produced knowledge that could be used to justify the Western colonizing of the East. In addition, the success of such actions affirmed the truth of the knowledge created and promoted the idea of further production.

Hence, knowledge of and control over the colonized territories is interdependent activity. There are reoccurring depictions of colonized countries in texts that cannot be pinned down to the ideas of a single author but rather to more systemic belief frameworks shaped by discursive frameworks and granted authority and power by imperialism's power dynamics. However, (CDS) plays a crucial role in resisting colonialism. One of the fundamental achievements of colonial studies is establishing that, in the instance of British colonialism, it was not only a peripheral activity on the periphery of English civilization but rather essential to its cultural self-representation(Young, 1995). It is the initial step in what Tiffin and Lawson call "describing the Empire" (Tiffin & Lawson, 1994, p. 9).

According to Mills (1997), for post-colonial critics, colonial discourse does not relate to works with identical subject matter but rather to a set of practices and procedures that produce these texts and the systematic organizing of the thought underpinning these texts. So, colonialism is seen as a way of talking
about things that interpellate colonial subjects by making them part of a representation system. Colonialists think that the colonized cannot represent themselves. Hence, they must be represented by foreigners who are more knowledgeable about them. In these depictions, the colonized are shown as feminine and mute. Since only empty spaces may be inhabited, the space has to be made vacant by dehumanizing or disregarding its residents. Consequently, the theme of land was dissimulated into the topic of barbarism, a feature of all colonial encounter narratives. Also, these depictions influenced which nations were deemed susceptible to colonial expansion and needed the civilizing influence of European powers (Andrien & Hulme, 1993).

CDS are the critical reading methods that connect colonial material actions to the project of colonial discourse. For instance, Said's (2008) Culture and Imperialism explores the interrelationship between imperialism and culture. He suggests reading European texts alongside their settings. He insists that imperialism's global connections and goals were not concealed. The main lines of the culture are sufficiently distinct for us to see the careful notations made there, as well as how little focus has been paid to them.

There was no separation between European culture and the colonial enterprise. On the contrary, it was heavily involved in conquering faraway lands. Consequently, Dickens and Thackery are viewed as London authors whose historical experience is informed by the colonial projects in India and Australia of which they were so aware. According to Said, canonical authors, including Jane Austen, Rudyard Kipling, E. M. Forster, Joseph Conrad, Charles Dickens, and Thomas Hardy, are allies of colonialism. Even Daniel Defoe's Robinson Crusoe, at the beginning of the English novel tradition, is a work whose protagonist is the builder of a new universe, which he dominates and reclaims for Christianity and England, as noted by Edward Said (Said, 2008).

Literature is still an essential part of the culture for postcolonial critics, who have found that it helps justify colonial interference in colonized lands to make the people there less backward, ignorant, and barbaric. Literature, particularly the novel, has served colonization. There is an undeniable Eurocentrism in English writing, in which the English writer is motivated to demonstrate the superiority of Europeans over other peoples.

Jan Mohamed (1985), a postcolonial critic, demonstrated how colonialist literature divides the universe into two opposing parts. One side comprises the white, superior, civilized, intellectual, and logical European world. On the other hand, there is the world of the indigenous, which is black, inferior, barbaric, emotional, and sensual. This literature is dominated by the Manichaean allegory that contrasts the stereotypically presumed superiority of the good European to that of the evil native. According to him, in the Manichean universe of conquerors and colonized, of master and slave, distance tends to become absolute and egalitarian rather than quantitative and relative. According to him, these alleged prejudices are essential to colonialism.

Jan Mohamed (1985) contended that the colonialist discourse's overt goal is to "civilize" the savage by exposing him to all the benefits of Western cultures. The covert purpose is entirely and ruthlessly exploiting the colony's natural resources through various imperialist material practices. This explicit goal, which is present in all colonialist literature, is accompanied by a more strident emphasis, in fact, a fixation, on the barbarism and evilness of the indigenous in colonialist texts, which should serve as a warning that these texts are intended to justify imperial occupation and exploitation.

The colonialist literature is inextricably linked to the material activities of imperialism; it does to the native's linguistic presence what the material actions do to its physical existence. The author degrades the native so the colonizer can use him more efficiently. Even racial disparities are moral distinctions in colonialist literature. The colonized is black, so he is barbaric and must be subdued to become civilized. For Jan Mohamad, an example of a Manichaean allegory may be found in Heart of Darkness, in which Conrad figuratively refers to Africa as the heart of darkness and evil. Using light and dark imagery, this
metaphor functions concurrently on the pseudo-religious, political, and psychological levels. For Conrad and other colonialist writers, the idea of Africa [the heart of darkness] remains the shadow of the British self-image (Jan Mohamed, 1985).

However, Jan Mohamad's attitude towards imperialist literature aligns with Chinua Achebe's. Achebe explores the binary oppositions in European literature, especially Heart of Darkness by Joseph Conrad. In this regard, he contends that the Western psyche has a strong urge to place Africa in opposition to Europe as an entity of difference that is both distant and oddly familiar. This allows Europe to be seen as a place of higher transcendence in comparison (Achebe, 2016).

For Achebe (2016), Heart of Darkness by Conrad is superior to all other works in depicting the desires and needs of the West. Africa is portrayed as the "other world" and the antithesis of Europe. Achebe claims that Conrad was a steadfast racist (Achebe, 2016). Critics of his writing tend to gloss over this fact because white racism against Africa is a common way of thinking in European traditions. Brantlinger (1985) claimed that Achebe is erasing Conrad's masterpiece from the curriculum, where it has been one of the most frequently controversial works of contemporary literature in English-speaking schools worldwide.

Achebe contends that, in creating his novel about Africa, Conrad worked in an archive where he was not the first or the last. As Brantlinger (1985) suggested, much of the horror described or implied in Heart of Darkness is not based on what Conrad witnessed but on his study of the literature that exposed Leopold's brutal system. Conrad also claimed to avoid creating the vision of Africa in his works. It was and is still the standard Western representation of Africa, and Conrad only added his odd mental abilities (Achebe, 2016).

Brantlinger (1985) argued that Joseph Conrad's depiction of Africa in his works demonstrates a Victorian Orientalist and imperialist perspective. Conrad's focus on cannibalism, his portrayal of African cultures as violent, lustful, and mad, his use of brutality, death, and darkness as metaphors, and his idea that traveling in Africa is reminiscent of journeying back to primitive, childlike, but also dystopian eras of life are all evidence of this prejudiced approach towards the continent. It is the same repertoire of representations that Said refers to in Orientalism. All writers draw their knowledge from this repertoire and contribute their texts to the same repertoire to enrich the constructed reality of colonized people.

Spivak (1985), a postcolonial critic with a feminist interest, displayed how the emergence of European feminism reproduces the axioms of imperialism by ignoring Third World women by approaching Jane Eyre. Spivak traces the process by which Bertha Mason's erasure accompanies Jane's emergence as a colonial woman. She observes that the indigenous woman is excluded from any involvement in this emerging norm because the female individualist, who is not quite masculine, expresses herself in shifting relation to what is at risk. However, this account shows nothing but the psychobiography of the militant female subject when viewed from an isolationist viewpoint in a metropolitan setting.

Native women are marginalized by Western feminism because they are categorized as colonized. Additionally, she is portrayed as an animal-like figure. Therefore, European literature and European authors indulged in colonialism. Even women of Charlotte Bronte's generation could not avoid indirect involvement in imperialism (Lovell & Miller, 1992).

Therefore, literature is a significant weapon for the colonial mission. By depicting the colonized as inferior, barbaric, fragile, and feminine, colonization is motivated and justified based on bringing them from the shadow of barbarism to the light of civilization. In addition, literature serves as a means for the colonizer to extend his epistemic hegemony over the colonized. The colonized is intimately familiar with his master. The colonialist mindset places much value on convincing itself that it knows the natives. This implies two things: first, that the native is very simple, and second, that understanding was required for control, with control consisting of ample evidence of knowledge (Morrissey, 2005). The colonizer knows everything about the native and has complete control over him. After being conquered by the colonizer's armies, the colonized must be culturally assimilated to embrace the colonizer's hegemony.
The colonizers used literature as a hegemonic weapon to exert psychological dominance over the native population. Through education, European literature instills European ideals in the native mind. The widespread dissemination of "Shakespeare's Books" within the educational and cultural spheres has been a powerful hegemonic force throughout the history of the British Empire. Shakespeare was still being taught in the local schools long after the colonizer's army had left. Shakespeare upheld the idea of England's cultural superiority and refinement, which was crucial to the ruler's political interests. That formal education of colonial subjects was constrained by the claims and canons of a faraway European center was highlighted by Gilbert (1996), who noted that this situation persisted for decades during (and often after) imperial control. Studies in 'English Literature' were given special status in colonial schools because of their ostensibly 'humanitarian' goals of 'civilizing' native students by instilling in them British tastes and values that paid no heed to the local context. So, people in the West Indies, Kenya, and India who had never encountered a daffodil were introduced to William Wordsworth's poem "I Wondered Lonely as a Cloud" (Gilbert, 1996, p. 15).

Even teaching European literature establishes a standardized version of urban values as the norm and marginalizes all other variants. The local particularity is disregarded. Even the English language was tied to the expansion of the British Empire. Language control is one of the critical characteristics of imperial oppression. In addition, the concept of universalism is a component of the Empire's technology. According to colonialists, English literature can transmit universal values. English literature's 'universal' discourse was consciously chosen as the medium for educating the Indian elites on civilized moral principles. The assumption of universalism is fundamental to constructing colonial power because those in political dominance are characterized by universal human characteristics (Fox, Ashcroft, & Griffiths, 1991).

According to Achebe, the universalist myth influences colonialist criticism that demeans post-colonial texts by asserting that "European" equates to "universal." In contrast to the history of Britain and France, which is emphasized in colonialist education, not only is the text denigrated by colonialists but so is the history of the indigenous people (Morrissey, 2005).

However, CDS characterizes the rhizomatic nature of imperialism. Bill Ashcroft suggests that imperialism's centers are interconnected worldwide. It resembles a parasite. It appears monolithic, however, because all these locations agree on their vertical structure. Each British combatant stationed in the colonies will represent a connected center (Ashcroft, 2014). Spivak (1985) argued that the British soldier consolidated Europe's sense of self by compelling the native to carve out space for the Other on his home turf. Effectively and violently, he is transitioning from one discourse to another.

Imperial endeavor itself is heterogeneous. It was accomplished by policymakers, combatants, missionaries, philologists, historians, and men of literature. Each is a rhizomatic center that bolsters the strength of the imperial metropolis. In the end, (CDS) examined various colonialist texts because the texts of the Empire must be described as anatomical components of the Empire (Tiffin & Lawson, 1995). Even the description within the travel text is never a neutral act of solely producing information; somewhat, it is always influenced by the power dynamics of the colonial context. Colonial authority enables the production of knowledge and defines authoritative speaking positions. Being a colonial subject enhances one's reputation as a knowledgeable subject. This led to a profound comprehension of colonialism and its various instruments. Colonial discourse analysis is the basis for questioning the categories and assumptions of Western knowledge. Consequently, this paved the way for additional post-colonial resistance strategies that sought to dismantle the colonial paradigm.

Conclusion

Colonial Discourse Studies are crucial for comprehending the power structures and processes underlying the production of the "Other" or "Oriental." Such investigation is necessary for understanding the power dynamics of the colonial environment and the diverse ways in which the cultural identity of the colonized is established. By studying and analyzing colonial discourse, one may evaluate how language is
used to establish and sustain power relationships between colonizers and colonized people. It explains how the colonizer might use discursive practices to entrench the dichotomy in which the colonized are destined to be seen as inferior to the colonizer. The present study sheds light on the colonizer's habit of attributing negative characteristics to the colonized and generating an unfair otherness to support his assertions that the colonized must be civilized to be included in the colonial setting. This study encourages the decolonization of language and cognition by proving that colonial discourse may be challenged and eventually conquered. This study finds that we may progress toward a more just and equal society by concentrating on language's role in perpetuating power inequities.
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