

Colonialism once was a widespread phenomenon. Around the times of the First World War, there was no nation on the globe that was not either colonized or colonizer. The independence of India in 1947 marked the start of a process of decolonization in the Indian sub-continent. The process of decolonization is far from over for the areas such as Tibet, Kashmir, Sarhaoui, Palestine, etc., and regions with the majority of ethnic groups like the Kurds (in Iraq, Iran, and Turkey) and the Tamils (in India and Sri Lanka). The concept of decolonization, the aftermaths of colonialism, and notions such as post-colonialism, neo-colonialism, hyper-colonialism, and digital colonialism are being fervently debated and evaluated in the literature on colonialism. Studying the phenomena of colonization is not one domain of a particular academic endeavor, rather has offshoots in so many fields simultaneously, i.e., economics, politics, psychology, cultural, and race studies. Young (2001, 2003) identified three aspects of (post) colonial studies; humanitarian or moral, liberal or political, and economic. The study of these aspects culminated in varied and contentious outcomes. Notions about colonialism are ranged from an evil business to a laudable job done by the most civilized people. The supporters of Imperial and colonial rule argued from the developmental (economic) perspective, (Marx & Engels 1968, Ferguson 2004) and thought of it as a milestone necessary to boost the growth of the colonized states and the people. This notion has been seriously challenged, by others (Patnaik, 2014; Throar, 2016) and highlighted the evidence of colonial looting of India. Some others highlighted the human and psychological cost of it (Fannon 2001; Mannoni 1956; Bhabha, 1994).

Colonialism has been defined in several ways by different scholars. The definition has a huge and confusing overlap with the way Imperialism has been defined. The main reason for this confusion has been the common objectives of both; the conquest and control over the resources of the occupied regions. Horvath (1972) has outlined four reasons for the failure of not having a good definition of colonialism and imperialism: 1) insufficient cross-cultural perspective, 2) lack of theoretical perspective, 3) lack of flexibility in the definition of colonialism, and 4) an ultra-conservative attitude towards words and their meanings.

The settlements established in the occupied region, have been considered as the demarcation between the two terms. Colonialism is thought to have established the settlements in the occupied lands, while Imperialism would do the same but without getting their own people settled in occupied territories. Despite the definitional difference, subjugation, control, and exploitation of human and material resources are the common grounds between the two. According to Horvath (1972) this common link established three types of relationship between the colonized and colonizers; 1) total *extermination* of the inhabitants of the region captured, 2) where