CHAPTER II

THEORETICAL REVIEW

There were two grand theories being used in this research, each was connected by the same issue, colonization, and three supporting theories. Words connecting them were the colonial periphery (centre and margin) and a mimic man (colonial subject). The colonial periphery or border was a term defined by Trinh T. Minh Ha where dividing two borders, the centre and margin leading to a new identity which was called a colonial subject or a mimic man according to Jenny Sharpe.

The centre would not be existed without the margin existence, when they interacted socially, a new identity appeared. In such circumstances which involving colonization, certain attitudes from the centre toward the margin were influencing the appearance of colonization systems such as politics, economics, and culture. Through those systems the colonization was implemented on the margin, the Indian natives.

2.1. Centre and Margin

The Western knowledge branches praised the concept of decolonization, and made issues of "the challenge of the third World". When they faced the challenge, naturally, they did not recognize it as a challenge.

> They promptly rejected it as they assigned it or referred it to other that, were assumed, “more adequate” whereabouts such as the counter-culture, smaller independent and experimental margins. (Minh Ha, 1991: 215)

In colonial periphery, the centre and the margins were determined through skin colours and race. Unfortunately, whether being aware or not, people accepted the margins as the margins accepted the centre. For without the margin, there would be no centre (Minh Ha, 1991: 215).

For the centre, the margins were sited for their pilgrimage. In contrary, the margin thought the sites were their fighting ground and sites of survival. When the margins reclaimed the site as their exclusive territory, the centre approved it, since the divisions between margin and centre should be preserved and clearly demarcated, if the two positions were remain intact in their power relation.

The centre itself was marginal (Minh Ha, 1991: 216). It was impossible to undertake a process of decentralization without being aware of the margins within the centre and vice versa, as well without encountering marginalization from both the ruling centre and the established margin. At many times the margins were rejected, and in some other times were necessary retrieved. Thus, they were both useless and useful. The irreducibility of the margins was the ceaseless war against dehumanization.

The consciousness of the condition of the marginality was actually the condition of the centre. To use marginality as a starting point rather than an ending point was also to cross beyond it toward other affirmations and negations.

There could not be any grand totalizing integration without massive suppression, which was a way of recirculating the effect of domination.

> Displacement involved the invention of new forms of subjectivities, of pleasures, of intensities, of relationship, which also implied the continuous renewal of a critical work that looked carefully and intensively at the very system of values to which one referred in fabricating the tools of resistance. The risk of reproducing totalitarianism was always present and one would have to confront, in whatever capacity one has, the controversial values likely to be taken on faith as universal truths by one's own culture. (Minh Ha, 1991: 217)

2.2. Colonial Subject or A Mimic Man

Identifying the sites of colonial resistance was interpreted as the site of resistance in the representation of British colonialism as a civilizing mission. Through a representative 'figures', the foreground of dominant discourses rhetorical strategies from which the truth-claimed of counter narratives were derived.

The first figure was the mimic man or colonial subject. It was a contradictory figure simultaneously reinforced the colonial authority and disturbed it (Sharpe, 1989: 99). Colonial subject was used specifically for Western-educated native in order to emphasize the subject status that a class of natives acquires by acceding to the authority of Western knowledge, the restriction of sovereignty to the colonizers alone, and the denial subject status to natives belonging to the subordinate or subaltern classes.

> The colonial subject was produced through a discourse of 'civility' straining to effect a closure in the case of subaltern, where the violence of the colonial encounter was all the more visible. A

> public display of civilized life were images that showed the natives being freed from despotic rule, raised from their ignorance, and saved from cruel and barbarous practices. These sketches tell of the civilizing mission, which was primarily a story about the colonizing culture as an emissary of light. Although the civilizing mission was generally associated with self conscious phase of imperialism, the idea of colonialism as a moral obligation to spread Western civilization appeared long before imperialism was named as such. The colonial subject was served as an ideological alibi for colonialism. (Sharpe, 1989: 100)

When the colonial violence was happened, it exceeded the limits of the civilizing mission. Further, the mythological proportions of the latter, the blinding brightness of its light, eclipse other stories of an East-West encounter. To think of the relation between the discourse centring on the production of the colonial subject and what it occluded as an eclipse was to see that the subaltern classes were not situated outside the civilizing project but were caught in the path of its trajectory. The colonial subject who can answer the colonizers back was the product of the same vast ideological machinery that silences the subaltern.

Sharpe quoted Bhabha's thought in describing mimicry as a trope of partial presence that masks a threatening racial difference only to reveal the excesses and slippages of colonial power and knowledge (Bhabha, 1985: 179). He explained that the menace of mimicry was its double vision which in disclosing the ambivalence of colonial discourse also disrupts its authority. The movement between fixity of signification and its divisions or ambivalence of colonial discourse demonstrated that colonial authority was never total and complete and its absence allowed the native intervention.

2.3. Colonization Systems

Colonization could be executed physically yet the resistance on it would be seen clearly. The other way to execute colonization was by influencing certain systems or aspects of life, such as politics, economics and culture. Both the colonialist and the colonialized have those aspects. Each side was trying to influence others through these systems.

2.3.1. Politics

Politic was related with power and authority (Rees,1971) both corresponding on human relationship. There were many ways to conduct politic, due to its' scope in human life. It might be applied through economic, social value, culture even religion. Politic as well discussed about the equality and justice, about peace and war.

In politic, people could be equal and unequal at the same time. According to Rousseau there were two categories

> (1) natural or physical such as age, health, bodily strength and 'qualities of mind or soul"; and (2) moral or political, depending upon a sort of convention, and including differentiations in wealth, esteem and power. (Rees, 1971: 3)

Politic, almost, controlled all life supporting systems and bit by bit led to war. There were classification on how the politics was conducted (Ceadel, 1987), which are:

1. Militarism

A view presumed that war was necessary to human development and therefore a positive good. All wars were justified, it argued, even aggressive ones. It viewed the international system as sheer anarchy: each state was engaged in a struggle foe survival, and there was no prospect of abolishing war even if it were desirable to do so.

Through war, politic was forced to gain power and authority. The superior would have all he wanted. The military with its people and resources were just a tool to gain them.

2. Crusading

Its aggression was conducted for the sake of peace, due to its distinctive features. It was a willingness under favourable circumstances to use aggressive war to promote either order or justice, and help to prevent or abolish war in longer term.

3. Defencism

A view accepting that aggression was always wrong, but insisted both that defence was always right and the maintenance of strong defences offered the best chance of preventing war. It was so called anarchical society which allowed sufficient trust between states for balance and stability often to be achieved, although not sufficient to make the abolition, as distinct from the prevention of

war a reasonable possibility. Defencism represented the application to international relations of conservatism and social democracy.

4. Pacific-ism

It viewed that war could be not only prevented but in time also abolished by reforms which will bring justice in domestic politics too. It ruled out all aggressive wars and even some defensive ones, but accepted the need for military force to defend its political achievements against aggression.

5. Pacifism

It viewed that war was always impermissible. It was non-violent versions of anarchism, socialism, certain religions and humanitarianism.

2.3.2 Economics

Adam Smith explained his conception of the nature in Wealth of Nations, which separated his views from merchantilists and physiocrats. The annual labour of every nation was the fund which originally supplied it with all the necessaries and conveniences of life that was annually consumed, and consisted always either in the immediate produce of that labour, or in what was purchased with that produce from other nations.

> The greatest improvement in the productive powers ol labour, and the greater part of the skill, dexterity and judgement with which it is anywhere directed,, or applied, seem to have been the effect of the division of the labour. (Smith, 1965: 1)

In a number of places throughout Wealth of Nations, Smith criticized the mercantilists for their concern with the accumulation of gold and identification of gold with the wealth of a nation. Smith believed that most mercantilists were confused on this issue. For him, wealth was an annual flow of goods and services, not an accumulated fund of precious metals. He also revealed an understanding of a link between exports and imports, perceiving that a fundamental role of exports was to pay for imports. He implied that the end purpose of economic activity was consumption position. This further distinguishes his economics from that of the mercantilists, who regarded production as an end in itself. Finally, in emphasizing labour as the source of the wealth of a nation, he differed from the physiocrats, who stressed land.

The division of the labour, however, so far as it can be introduced, occasions, in every art, a proportionable increase of the productive power of labour (Smith, 1965: 1). Smith held that the wealth of a nation was depended upon the productivity of labour and the proportion of labourers who were usefully or productively employed. The economy would automatically achieve full employment of its resources, he examined only those forces that determine the capacity of the nation to produce goods and services.

In a simple economy in which each household produces all of its own consumption needs and the division of labour was slight, very little capital was required to maintain (feed, clothe, house) the labourers during the production process.

> As the division of labour was increased, labourers no longer produce goods for their own consumption, and a stock of consumer goods must exist to maintain the labourers during the time-consuming production process. This stock of goods came from saving and is, in this context, what Smith called capital. (Smith, 1965: 1)

2.3.3 Culture

Edward Said in his Orientalism defined that culture meant two things in particular. First, it meant all practices like the arts of description, communication, and representation that have relative autonomy from the economic, social and political realms and that often existed in aesthetic forms, one of whose principal aims was pleasure.

Second, it was a concept that included a refining and elevating element, each society's reservoir of the best that had been known and thought by Matthew Arnold. He believed that culture palliates, if it did not altogether neutralize, the ravages of a modern, aggressive, mercantile, and brutalizing urban existence. In his *Culture and Imperialism* he stated that

> Culture came to be associated with nation or state; this differentiates 'us' from 'them', almost always with some degree of xenophobia. Culture in this sense was a source of identity and 'returned' to tradition. This accompanied rigorous codes of intellectual and moral behaviour that were opposed to the permissiveness associated with such relatively liberal philosophies as multiculturalism and hybridity. (Said, 1993: xiii)

Imperialism's culture was not invisible nor did conceal its worldly affiliations and interests. There was a sufficient clarity in the culture's major lines

for us to remark the often scrupulous notations recorded there and also to remark how they had not been paid much attention.

Western imperialism and Third world nationalism feed off each other, but even at their worst they were neither monolithic nor deterministic. Besides, culture was not monolithic either, and was not the exclusive property of East or West, or of small groups of men or women.

Because of empire, all cultures were involved in one another; none was single and pure; all were hybrid, heterogeneous, extraordinarily differentiated, and unmonolithic. Despite its extraordinary cultural diversity, the United States was a coherent nation.

The privileged role of culture in the modern imperial experience and little notice taken of the fact that the extraordinary global reach of classical nineteenth and early twentieth century European imperialism still casted a considerable shadow over our own times.

> Everything about human history was rooted in the earth, which has meant that we must think about habitation, but it had also meant that people have planned to have more territory and therefore must do something about its indigenous residents. At some very basic level, imperialism meant thinking about, settling on, controlling land that someone did not possess, that was distant, lived and owned by others (Said, 1993: 5).

The earth was in effect one world, in which empty, uninhabited spaces virtually did not exist. Just as none of us was outside or beyond geography and completely free from the struggle over geography. That struggle was complex and interesting

because it was not only about soldiers and cannons but also about ideas, forms, images and imaginings.

This century climaxed ‘the rise of the West’ and Western power allowed the imperial metropolitan centres to acquire and accumulate territory and subjects on a truly astonishing scale (Said, 1993: 6). When the Western powers were not in close, sometimes ruthless competition with one another for more colonies, they were hard at work settling, surveying, studying and ruling the territories under their jurisdictions.

American identity was too varied to be a unitary and homogenous thing; indeed the battle within it was between advocates of a unitary identity and those who saw the whole as a complex but not a unified one. This opposition implied two different perspectives, two historiographies, one linear and subsuming, the other contrapuntal and often nomadic.

> American attitudes to American ‘greatness’, to hierarchies of race, to the perils of other revolutions have remained constant, dictated, obscured, the realities of empire while apologists for overseas American interests have insisted on American innocence, doing good, fighting for freedom. (Said, 1993: 7)

Colonialism had largely ended but imperialism lingered where it had always been, in a kind of general cultural sphere as well as in specific political, ideological, economic and social practices. Neither imperialism nor colonialism was a simple act of accumulation and acquisition supported, even, impelled by impressive ideological formation that include notions that certain territories and people require and beseech domination as well as forms of knowledge affiliated

with domination. Out of the imperial experiences, notions about culture were clarified, reinforced, criticized or rejected.

> There had been a gathering awareness of the lines between culture, the divisions and differences that not only allowed discriminating one culture from another, but also enabled seeing the extent which cultures were humanly made structures of both authority and participation, benevolent in what they include, incorporate, and validate, less benevolent in what they excluded and demoted. (Said, 1993: 15)