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2.1 Preliminaries

This chapter is a thorough study of the imperial rhetoric by investigating the Relationship Between Imperialism and Culture in general and its application to literature in particular. In this, the focus is on the novel as a literary genre and its link to colonization. It is assumed that the ways in which different values permeate narratives reflect ideological considerations; and that colonial novels helped to reinforce the dominant ideologies of their time. Likewise, the novel form has been appropriated by non-Western writers and has become the artistic medium through which an oppositional voice to Western domination has been raised. In this regard, attention is paid, too, to the notion of postcolonial reading of texts. This notion is introduced as a process by which a text is read with an understanding of what is involved, whether it is included in or excluded from the text.

2.2 Basic Critical Concepts

Some basic terminology needs to be clarified before proceeding.
2.2.1 Culture

Culture is a term that has been defined in a number of different ways. However, the word does not merely concern aesthetics or art, also known as (high culture) – though it is the concern of this study – but processes and practices created and lived by individuals in their social interaction with others. Anthropologically, culture can be used in the sense of "the way of life of a people, community, nation, or social group".\(^1\) It can also be described as the "shared values" of a group or society; particularly, it is concerned with the production of meanings.\(^2\) Roland Barthes approaches culture in terms of ideology and "myth".\(^3\) For Edward Said, culture is "all those practices, like the arts of description, communication, and representation … that often exist in aesthetic forms".\(^4\) To some extent all the above approaches are right and complement each other. However, Said's understanding of culture is more concise and comprehensive and of relevance to this study.

2.2.2 Representation

Another term of great importance to this research is representation. Representation basically means "the process by which members of a culture use language … to produce meaning".\(^5\) Another approach to this term is the Foucaultian "discourse analysis". According to Foucault, it is "regulated way of speaking" about objects, which construct, define and produce" objects of knowledge in an intelligible
way”.(6) Moreover, "representation" necessarily "involves questions of inclusion and exclusion" and therefore "power". (7) The fact is that representing the "Other" has often been made in terms of "stereotypes", by which it is meant "vivid but simple representations that reduce persons to a set of exaggerated, usually negative, characteristics". (8)

2.3 Imperialism and Culture

It can be said that imperialism and culture enjoyed a symbiotic relationship, especially during the Victorian age. William Blake (1757-1827) - an English artist and poet – points out, at the end of the eighteenth-century, that "the foundation of empire is art and science. Remove them or degrade them and the empire is no more." He adds that, "Empire follows art and not vice versa..."(9) Regardless of who follows the other, or who brings the other into being, Blake emphasizes a close association between culture and empire. In contemporary theoretical discourse, Edward Said has been among the more influential postcolonial critics to draw attention to the centrality of imperialism in Western culture, going so far as to suggest everywhere in Culture and Imperialism that imperialism has been the primary conditioning agent of Western history and culture over the last two centuries.

Therefore, it is important to note that any imperial enterprise is always preceded in time and supported by a whole rhetoric concerning
the people to be subjugated. In fact, it is this rhetoric that serves as
the first justification of colonization. It is noteworthy also that this
rhetoric in world history has repeatedly depended on certain
stereotypes about the people to be colonized. These stereotypes
consistute a considerable and essential part of imperial ideology, and
have provided the basis for imperial expansion. Thus, if one wants to
reach a better understanding of imperialism and its real values, one
must first start by studying its discursive as well as ideological
stereotypes.

In his remarkable book, *Orientalism* (1878), Said explores in depth the
nature of the Occident’s stereotypical perception of the Orient.
However, for the sake of this study, it must be clear that the term
"Orient" is used to designate the "Other", that is, not only the East but
all those who are not Western and those who have been and still are
subject to the Western hegemony. By Orientalism, Said means the
Occident’s ideological construction of the Orient. In other words,
Orientalism is the Occident’s knowledge of the Orient and not the
Orient’s knowledge of itself. As such, Orientalism comes to mean "the
discipline by which the Orient was (and is) approached systematically,
as a topic of learning, discovery and practice". If one tries to trace
the manifestations of such a discipline, one finds them deeply rooted
in a large number of colonialist discourses, including literary texts
written about the Orient or the Other. So, perhaps, it will be
rewarding in this regard if we examine the relationship between
imperialism and literature, in other words, the ideological uses to which literature was put.

As indicated in chapter one, the empire, perhaps, colonized a good part of the world culturally before economically or politically, especially in the last part of the nineteenth century. So military victory constituted only the beginning of the winning, and it took cultural texts to complete what the military might had started. In this regard, Richard Faber remarks that "imperialism depended upon the pen, at least as much as upon the ledger and the sword".\(^{(11)}\) Thus, literary texts which were produced during this period, and which can be described as colonial texts, reflected the colonial ethos, and contributed to the complexity of attitudes that made imperialism seem part of the order of things. In other words, it was clear that to assume control over a territory or a nation was not only to "exert political or economic power; it was also to have imaginative command".\(^{(12)}\) It is in the self-representations of the colonizer and the representations of the Other that the ideological uses of literature can be seen most clearly. (This will be discussed in detail later).

However, for the time being, let us ask: Why literature? As Terry Eagleton notes, George Gordon\(^{(13)}\) said: "England is sick, and English literature must save it".\(^{(14)}\) The reason for this – it was expected – was that the pacifying influence and humanizing effect of literature could be used as a kind of opium to cement the relation between social
classes in England.\(^{15}\) If English literature was institutionalized as an instrument for the transmission of moral values to the lower classes, it becomes clear, then, that it could become an even more effective weapon in the softening of the conquered people. According to Gayatri Spivak:

> Literature might be the best complement to ideological transformation. The successful reader learns to identify implicitly with the value system figured forth by literature through learning to manipulate the figures, rather than through (or in addition to) working out the argument explicitly and literally, with a view to reasonable consent. Literature buys your assent in an almost clandestine way, and therefore it is an excellent instrument for a slow transformation of the mind, for good or for ill; as medicine or as poison.\(^{16}\)

And it is precisely with this in mind – as shown earlier in chapter one – that courses in English literature were introduced into the Indian education system and schools as far back as the 1820s and 1830s.

Clearly then, English literature, or better still, colonialist literature played the role of the "surrogate Englishman". It presents "the Englishman in his highest and most perfect state, becomes a mask for economic exploitation, so successfully camouflaging the material activities of the colonizer".\(^{17}\) This use of literature as a "mask of conquest" – to use the title of Viswanathan’s book – was only part of a large scheme. In this way the white European colonizers want to create a category of people that is black or dark in "blood and colour",
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but white in "moral and intellect", such a category is what Frantz Fanon calls "Black Skin, White Masks".

The eighteenth century largely sustained the idea of an essential and heroic Europe governing a rudimentary world. This is clearly thematized in the Western literary works that have been the forms that reflected and represented West's colonial interests and impulses toward political, economic and military expansion and domination of the global scene. Furthermore, these literary works draw on and enhance the myth of philanthropic and generous colonialism. The literature of the Age of Empire – nineteenth century – exposes the same pattern in which the European hero is tested to measure his allegiance to the "civilized" (read imperialistic) values of the West. In the Victorian era, authors as varied as Mathew Arnold, Alfred Tennyson, and Rudyard Kipling, to mention but a few, expressed sentiments of English superiority. Sentiments such as this paved the way for justification of imperialistic actions and the treatment of other people and cultures as inferior. Tennyson, for example, who was one of the great poet laureates of the day, used this same pattern as it was expected to be used. His poem *Ulysses* (1842), for instance, celebrates the Victorian conception of the ideal heroic spirit as well as the Victorian commitment to the ideology of imperial expansion. Tennyson's *Ulysses* – the protagonist – confirms these ideas:

    Tho' much is taken, much abides; and tho'
    We are not now that strength which in old days
    Mov'd earth and heaven, that which we are, we are;
One equal temper of heroic hearts,
Made weak by time and fate, but strong in will

To strive, to seek, to find, and not to yield (20) (italics added)

The quest, as an imperial theme, in this poem is a cultural re-enactment of empire building. The last line, however, reinscribes the triumphant ethos of invasion, objectification, and aggression. However, it is really in Kipling that one finds the best example of the quest as an imperialist project. Consider his poem The White Man’s Burden (1899).

Take up the White Man’s burden –
Send forth the best ye breed –
Go, bind your sons to exile
To serve your captives’ need;
To wait, in heavy harness,
On fluttered folk and wild –
Your new – caught sullen peoples,
Half devil and half child

Take up the White Man’s burden –
In patience to abide,
To veil the threat of terror
And check the show of pride;
By open speech and simple,
An hundred times made plain,
To seek another’s profit
And work another’s gain. (21) (italics added).

Here is ‘the idea’ again: the white man is superior and thus justified in holding the colony and seizing as many other territories as possible in
order to spread 'civilization'. This idea is cloaked in the rhetoric of duty, but the implications are clear. Kipling's imperial quest is also based on the learning process, since it stresses the acquisition of the codes necessary to sustain supremacy and empire.

Thus, most Victorian writers, far from casting doubts on the imperial undertaking, "confirm and celebrate its success". They usually represent the Europeans as disinterested, courageous, and honorable pioneers, who, by opening up new territory to Western penetration, are the self-acclaimed bearers of culture and civilization into the realm of backward and stagnant communities. This leads us to the overall issue of literary representation in the making of empire; and Spivak reminds us that "the role of literature in the production of cultural representation should not be ignored".

2.3.1 The Allegory of Black and White

In colonial literature, everything is focused on the conflict between the hero – often white – and his enemy – often non-white – and the trope is bound to privilege the Western hero at the expense of the other who is most often portrayed as savage or monstrous. This means, in a colonial context, the colonized is represented as the epitome of corruption and evil. In Africa for instance, the black native stands for everything negative in the human being, whilst the white settler stands for everything positive. In the introduction to his book, *Manichean Aesthetic: The Politics of Literature in Colonial Africa*, Abdul
R. JanMohamed characterized the relationship between the colonizer and the colonized as a manichean one. He argues that, "The colonial mentality is dominated by a Manichean allegory of white and black, good and evil, salvation and damnation, civilization and savagery, superiority and inferiority, intelligence and emotion, self and other, subject and object".\(^{(24)}\) Likewise, in his book *The Wretched of the Earth*, Frantz Fanon asserts that, "The colonial world is a Manichean world". He adds:

> the settler points the native as a sort of quintessence of evil... The native is declared insensible to ethic; he represents not only the absence of values, but also the negation of values. He is, let us admit, the enemy of values, and in this sense he is the absolute evil.\(^{(25)}\)

Thus, the colonialists try to fix this negative image of the colonized natives to justify their later actions by saying that the natives need to be colonized in order to be civilized.

In another work entitled *The Economy of Manichean Allegory: The Function of Racial Difference in Colonial Literature*, JanMohamed emphasizes two intertwined aspects of colonization. One is political and economic, and the other is discursive and rhetorical. He calls the former "covert aim", and the latter "overt aim" of colonialism. The covert is the exploitation of the colonies' natural resources, whereas the overt aim is the declared discourse that pretends to "civilize" the savage by introducing him to "the benefits of Western culture".\(^{(26)}\) JanMohamed puts more weight on the 'overt' aim which is exemplified
in literary texts. He draws the reader's attention to the real implications and function of such colonial texts. The fact that this overt aim, embedded as an assumption in colonial literature, is accompanied in colonial texts by a more vociferous insistence, indeed by a fixation, upon the savagery and evilness of the native should alert us to the real function of those texts: to justify imperial occupation and exploitation.\(^\text{(27)}\)

Here JanMohamed joins Bhabha when the latter states that "the objective of colonial discourse is to construe the colonized as a population of degenerate types on the basis of racial origin, in order to justify conquest and to establish systems of administration and instruction".\(^\text{(28)}\) Finally, JanMohamed interlinks the function of the two aspects of colonization. He claims that, "Just as the imperialists 'administer' the resources of the conquered country, so colonialist discourse 'comodifies' the native subject into a stereotyped object and uses him as a 'resource' for colonialist fiction".\(^\text{(29)}\) In such a way, the native turns out to be an object that is exploited economically as well as literarily and discursively. Through such a strategy of discursive and fictional 'commodification', the colonial writer helps in and facilitates the physical or the material, that is, the economic exploitation of the native.

JanMohamed's and Bhabha's arguments about the contribution of colonial literature in covering, supporting, and justifying imperial
practice brings us back to what Said has said in Orientalism about the European perception, or precisely, the Occident’s ideological construction of the Orient. What is worth noting about this ideology is that it makes the Orient or the 'Other' stand for what is not Occidental and consequently determines the Orient or the Other by its opposite position to the West. If the West stands for civilization, progress and goodness, the Orient stands for savagery, primitivism and evil, respectively. It is through these binary oppositions, then, the Orient is represented and identified in the Western consciousness. What is most noteworthy in this respect, also, is that the West’s open opposition, or let us say hostility, towards the Other is only an illustration of how the West came to confine anything different or unknown to its culture into fixed stereotypes. Often this attitude of the West towards the rest has been accompanied by a sort of fascination and fear. In order to make this Other "less fearsome” and, thus, more controllable, the West has to acquire a certain knowledge of it. Knowledge means power. Here again, Said identified the dialectic of knowledge and power: "Knowledge of subject races or Orientals is what makes their management easy and profitable; knowledge gives power, more power requires more knowledge..." In yet another work entitled "Representing the Colonized: Anthropology’s Interlocutors," Said points out that Western hegemony is "heavily dependent on cultural discourse, on the knowledge industry, on the production and dissemination of texts and
Accordingly, the Orientalist travel narrative should be related to its cultural function as a form of knowledge about Europe's other, knowledge that led eventually to colonial exploitation.

To conclude, culture as well as literary representation can be viewed in terms of both semiotics and discourse, and involve issues of power and ideology.

Since the focus of this study is the modern Western empires of the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, this study will concentrate on the novel form. This is – as the researcher believes and will demonstrate later on – due to the fact that the novel is the aesthetic form that has a particular connection to the expanding territories of imperial Europe. Therefore, it is also essential to this discussion to review the nature of the relationship between European colonialism and the novel, as well as the concept of "postcolonial reading" of literature in general, and the novel as a literary genre in particular.

2.4 Colonization and the Novel as A Literary Genre

Stories are the essence or the basic part of what travellers, adventurers, explorers and novelists say about strange and remote areas of the world; stories also became the tool that colonized people utilized to assert their identity and their own history. Naturally, in imperialism, the main battle is over land; but when it came to the ownership of land, right and duties – such issues are completed and even, sometimes, decided through narrative. In this regard, Edward
Said, in *Culture and Imperialism*, argues that "The power to narrate or to block other narratives from forming and emerging, is very important to culture and imperialism, and constitutes one of the main connections between them".\(^{[33]}\) Consequently, in any narrative, according to Claire Kramsch, there is also an ideological point of view that "reveals the system of beliefs, values, and categories, by reference to which the narrator comprehends the world he/she refers to in the text".\(^{[34]}\)

However, the question that should be asked is the extent to which imperialism was influential enough on culture and society to warrant its consideration as a significant shaping force. The novels of Rider Haggard, Rudyard Kipling, E. M. Foster, and Joseph Conrad and before them Daniel Defoe, to mention a few only, are based on and move within the discourses of colonialism and Imperialism. These novels are all shaped by the deep ideological structures of imperialism; this is articulated in a variety of ways. The image of the Western hero who goes upon a quest to explore a rudimentary world, seizes the position of the subject, and objectifies others in the process is embedded in the reaches of the Western subconscious and in these texts as well. So these literary texts reinscribe an image which shares a metaphorical relationship with Western imperialism. If one takes, as an instance, Daniel Defoe’s *Robinson Crusoe* (1719), (it is regarded – by many critics – as the first English novel and also the subject of much attention in postcolonial theoretical circles),\(^{[35]}\) one will find this
image or the idea of an essential and heroic Europe exploring and governing a rudimentary or elementary world. Robinson Crusoe, the protagonist, is depicted as the essential subject in a rudimentary world. Crusoe sees Friday as a creature destined to become his manservant on the island:

At last he lays his head flat..... close to my foot, and sets my other foot upon his head..... and made all the signs..... of subjection, servitude .... to let me know how he would serve me .... I let him know his name should be Friday, which was the day I saved his life..... I likewise taught him to say Master; and then let him know that was to be my name.\(^{(36)}\)

Crusoe's relationship with Friday clearly works as a metaphor for the imperial organization of relationship. In *Orientalism*, Said notes that "Orientalism depends for its strategy on this flexible positional superiority, which puts the Westerner in a whole series of possible relationships with the Orient without ever losing him the relative upper hand".\(^{(37)}\)

### 2.4.1 Perception of the 'Other'

Not far from this image of "positional superiority" of the white man, is the white man's delineation and perception of the Other. If we look closely at Conrad's novels, we certainly find ample evidences of how the West perceives the Other. In *Heart of Darkness* (1899), one of our novels under study, for instance, Conrad depiction of the Congo jungle and its inhabitants shows the inappropriate perception of the black
African by the white race. For Marlow the European, the African natives and the wildness acquire interchangeable qualities: natural elements as "vegetation" revolts, and "trees" reign as "kings", while humans as the black natives are reduced to a mere "mass" of "black limbs", and "bodies swaying". Their speech is no more than "a black and incomprehensible frenzy". Marlow, also, perceives the black native as primitive "prehistoric man" as the jungle he inhabits "prehistoric earth".\(^{(38)}\) This issue of representation and the way the European colonizer and the colonized native are represented in English, or best, colonialis\(^{(39)}\)t literature, and more specifically in the literary narrative, leads us to try an investigation of the relationship between imperialism and the novel form.

The European imperial narrative didactically tends toward aggrandizement of Western value system by projecting it "against the Orient as a sort of surrogate".\(^{(39)}\) The Victorian travelers to the East, for example, saw themselves as the political artist-representatives of a world-empire; their literary works are sophisticated and full of imaginary as well as historical adventures performed in the service of Empire; but their narrative portrayal of the Orient "tends to be unconcerned with the truth-value of its representation".\(^{(40)}\) The Tory politician Benjamin Disraeli\(^{(41)}\) was one of the most persuasive advocates of empire. His early novel *Tancred* (1847) is a unique work in that it combines the cultural imperialism inherent in many fictional works with the future political imperialism of a national leader. The
novel grew in a great part from Disraeli’s own personal experiences as a traveller in the Middle East, and it consequently evolved as a mixture of fictional travel narrative, Victorian novel, spiritual autobiography, and early manifesto of developing imperialism. So the Victorian travel narrative, adventure tales and the colonial novel in general, have important ideological roles to play; they always propagate a positive image of European colonial adventures as a civilizing mission, as a heroic undertaking for the benefit of the colonized more than for the colonizers. And Boehner rightly states that "In writings as various as romances, memoirs, adventure tales ... the view of the world as directed from the colonial metropolis was consolidated and confirmed".\(^{(42)}\)

2.4.2 The Historical Experience

Taking the colonial novel as representative of colonial discourse could indicate granting veracity to fiction, a problem of "historical referentiality" that David Spurr has discussed tersely with reference to Joseph Conrad's novel *Heart of Darkness*:

Conrad’s suppression of any direct reference to Africa or the Congo has the effect of universalizing his narrative, making it possible to read it as a statement of the human condition rather than as simply an account of conditions in the Belgian Congo ... The irony is that *Heart of Darkness* tells us more about what the Belgian Congo was really like than any journalistic or historical account.\(^{(43)}\)
This does not mean, however, that one may elide or commingle the boundaries between factual/historical records and fictionalized versions, nor to substitute the novel for historical documents; rather, it is a way of identifying a particular literary response to a historical phenomenon that has, in its turn, brought about a great amount of postcolonial reaction from ex-colonies of European empire. Nevertheless, as Edward Said assumes, "culture and the aesthetic forms it contains derive from historical experience", and he sees the novel as "a concretely historical narrative shaped by the real history of real nations". Far from merely being conditioned by history, cultural artifacts like the novel are, according to Said, also agents of history, conditioning the kinds of attitudes and assumptions that made imperialism possible. Referring to Conrad’s treatment of Africa in *Heart of Darkness*, Said states, “To represent Africa is to enter the battle over Africa...” For Said, there is no such thing as politically pure and ideologically neutral form of representation; rather, representations “are embedded first in the language and then in the culture, institutions and political ambience of the representer”.

Said’s views of the political potency of novelistic representation, which he articulates in *Orientalism*, lead him, in *Culture and Imperialism*, to observe that “a great deal of recent criticism has concentrated on narrative fiction, yet very little attention has been paid to its position in the history and world of empire”. Since as Said argues, imperialism has been “the central fact of British history,” the
English novel is inextricably bound up with imperialist ideology and stands in unique relationship to Britain’s imperial experience. Thus, it should come as no surprise that Said’s aim in *Culture and Imperialism* is to “connect the structures of ... narrative to the ideas, concepts, experiences from which it draws support”.\(^{(50)}\) He likewise notes that the rise of the Empire and the novel paralleled and supported each other, to such a degree that they “fortified each other” and “that it is impossible ... to read one without in some way dealing with the other”.\(^{(51)}\) Suvendrini Perera in *Reaches of Empire* (1991) suggests, like Said, that the novel and empire developed together “in a complex and symbiotic relationship”.\(^{(52)}\) More than merely being “reflected” in the novel, the empire was both “processed and naturalized by it”.\(^{(53)}\)

Likewise, Ferdous Azim, locating the origins of the English novel within the eighteenth century colonial terrain, contends that the novel was influenced by the eighteenth century philosophical discourse on human subjectivity, which defines the subject as “homogeneous and consistent”.\(^{(54)}\) Actually, this is a false idea and a fake belief of human identity because, as postcolonial and psychoanalytic theory suggests, human subjectivity is split and dependent on a dialectical relationship with the Other. Yet, in spite of the falsehood of this idea, the colonizer depends on the colonized, at least, to ensure his false assumption of being socially and morally superior. What is our concern here is that Azim’s study also emphasizes the link between imperialism and the novel as a literary genre:
The birth of the novel coincided with the European colonial project; it partook of and was part of a discursive field concerned with the construction of a universal and homogeneous subject. This subject was held together by the annihilation of other subject-positions.\textsuperscript{(55)}

However, the relationship goes beyond all this. There seems to be an innate affiliation between fiction and the Empire:

The novel is an imperial genre, not in theme merely, not only by virtue of the historical moment of its birth, but in its formal structure – in the construction of that narrative voice which holds the narrative structure together. \textsuperscript{(56)}

That means, as the narrative voice controls and guides the whole narrative in the novel or in the fictional world, so imperialism controls and guides the whole in the factual world ‘centrality’. Imperialism exploits this pattern of structure and the construction of theme in the novel form to pervade its ideas among the whole, i.e. the colonizers and the colonized. Again, Edward Said emphasizes this structural pattern and he considers the novel itself a reflection of geographical and territorial exploration:

without empire, I would go as far saying, there is no European novel as we know it, and indeed if we study the impulses giving rise to it, we shall see the far from accidental convergence between the patterns of narrative authority constitutive of the novel on the one hand, and, on the other, a complex ideological configuration underlying the tendency to imperialism.\textsuperscript{(57)}
2.4.3 Geographical and Territorial Exploration

However, there is another point of importance that makes the narrative an elemental part of colonial politics. Narrative and colonialism share the same background. People have been traveling since olden times. Different groups like scientific, travellers, missionaries, writers, and military men rushed to the New World. However, these same groups started reconstructing the new places and their inhabitants imaginatively. Going back to their homelands or setting and settling, they represented these new places to the whole universe. Thus, a bulk of writings from scientific and travel reports appeared and were sometimes used in the imaginary works of earlier centuries such as Shakespeare’s *The Tempest* (1612) and Defoe’s *Robinson Crusoe* (1719).

Thus, the novel as a literary form has much affinity with colonialism. The relationship goes back to the time of *Robinson Crusoe* in which a European settles on a distant non-European island. Thus, the metaphor of the novel as a pilgrimage or quest also reveals that novels have been always dealing with the stories of far-away lands. The setting of Jonathan Swift’s *Gulliver’s Travels*, Miguel de Cervantes’ *Don Quixote*, John Bunyan’s *The Pilgrim’s Progress* and many other novels is a place other than home. They are set in strange, exotic and distant lands. But one may ask: Why the novel? Or what is there in novels that gives them a colonial flavor?
There are a number of reasons, all of which are related to the nature of the novel. First of all, the nature of the novel almost always permits a degree of resistance and dialogue. Therefore, the genre is the most suitable one for conflicting ideas and opposing interlocutors. Secondly, the novel is a mode of representation, and as such, it has the ability to give voice to the people in the assertion of their identity. The novel, on whole, has a world of its own; at the same time, it recreates and represents the world out of which it comes. Thirdly, “heteroglossia”, a notion introduced by Mikhail Bakhtin, shows the novel’s organization of socially different discourses. In the same way, postcolonial literature has paid great attention to different voices in the novel to insist on the heterogeneous nature of the novel which represents the nation.

Moreover, the novel form as a prose narrative allows the novelist to invest the colonial terrain with historical and political significance beyond the restraints of other literary genres. Additionally, the conflation of genres in the novel (it can combine elements of romance and heroic drama, for example) makes it a suitable literary medium-capable of representing the actual political and historical circumstances that permeate the colonial setting- beyond the limitations of the formal possibilities of the heroic drama, for example. Narrative as an elevated component of culture plays a key role in shaping and maintaining certain dominant colonial attitudes. It introduces and helps towards establishing colonial themes and topics.
Colonialism itself is usually treated as a theme that is subject to different perspectives. Novels such as Conrad’s *Heart of Darkness* (1898), Doyle’s *The Lost World* (1912), and Virginia Woolf’s *The Voyage Out* (1915) represent the adventurous spirit, exploration in the unknown world, and the ultimate trade and colonial establishment.

Therefore, the novel form is a representational form that is an active part of a society’s culture. Novelists, in turn, play a key role as they narrate the nation through their popular modes. The imperial–colonial age produced many novelists who wrote widely about the experience of Empire. In every aspect of British culture, there are references to the colonial experience and allusions to Empire; the novel form represents these references more lucidly. There are allusions to the facts of empire in the works of a vast majority of writers, some of whom are Kipling, Conrad, Arthur Conan Doyle, Rider Haggard, R. L. Stevenson, George Orwell, Joyce Cary, E. M. Forster and T. S. Lawrence.

Now the significant point is the way the colonized nation is narrated. Still, the novel form represents and reflects these observations, and the examples are quite numerous, and as varied as the nineteenth and early twentieth century English novel. One such instance is the case of Charlotte Bronte’s *Jane Eyre* in which the deranged wife of Rochester, Bertha Mason, who is a West Indian, is represented as a frightening and threatening figure to the extent that she is imprisoned in an isolated room. Thus, there is a long history of the relationship
between the novel and imperialism. It is clear that the two have a lot in common. Reproduction, representation, inversion, subjugation, domination, exploration and expansion are among the elements of contact between the novel and imperialism.

However, expansion is an important colonial element (as it includes domination and subjugation) that can be seen in both, and needs more consideration. As the empire expanded in space so the colonizer's self-image also expanded. Ironically, this expansion created a narrow-minded colonial subjectivity- that the more the Europeans came to see of themselves the less they came to see of the rest of the world. This process was facilitated by the novel. We can notice this colonial element in a wide range of colonial novels. If we read, again, Defoe's *Robinson Crusoe*, as an example, and as it is supposed to be a foundational Western novel, we will see that as Crusoe's world literally enlarges, his self-image also expands, and the focus of the narrative narrows to the day-to-day activities of a single (British) subject. The colonial space in which Defoe isolates the protagonist Crusoe (the colonizer), and his contact with Friday (the colonized) - whom Crusoe transforms into an image of himself - facilitate Crusoe's solipsism and Friday's subjugation. Crusoe's narcissism - as he becomes an individual self-referential - finally leads to an imposing possession and legitimate authority.

Since the novel's tendency to engage the daily activities of an individual character - mostly Western - and his expanding fictional
world, the result would be the identification of the reading public with that character. In its concern for contemporary time and a readily identifiable physical setting, its emphasis on the familiar and common, and above all, its attention to individual character and subjective experience, the novel is linked in some very significant ways to the imperial experience.

It is not a suggestion that imperialism gave rise to the novel; rather, imperialism contributed significantly to the construction of the focal point of the narrative's attention, namely, the individual (European) subject. This does not suggest, however, that the colonized world did not have a profound impact on the colonizer's consciousness and on later novels. Rather, the absence of that world and its inhabitants from the novel suggest how self-engrossed the colonial powers became in the wake of an expanding empire. Indeed, a country, Britain for example, on its way to control over a quarter of the globe, such an enlarged sense of self was crucial for obtaining and maintaining the Empire. In this sense, the novel and imperialism have a reciprocal relationship – the rise of each parallels and reinforces the rise of the other. So the nature of the novel and its shared history with colonization are the two significant factors which make of the narrative an effective and efficient mouthpiece for colonialism; it has also proved to be suitable for postcolonial literary reactions emerging from those writing back from the colonies.
However, if the development of the British novel is the aim, then
Britain’s imperial history should be scrutinized. Since it is not the aim
of this study to trace the development of the English novel, yet this
brief background helps us to draw a conclusion that it is not very
strange if one makes his or her mind to spend a relatively long period
of time in studying the relationship between colonialism and literature
or between fact and fiction; or better still, connecting literature to
politics. It is true to say that literature exists between the real and the
imaginary. In a literary work, the different interactions are displayed
between individuals and groups. And since literary works circulate in
society through individuals and institutions alike, they are exploited
by the colonial system to build up a strong ideological authority and
dominance over the natives.

What the researcher needs to emphasize here is that such colonialist
discourses are important to reinforce and support colonialist actions
that will take the form of either political or military intervention.
Therefore, the rhetorical as well as the political coexist and unite to
serve the same idea, namely, economic exploitation. Hence the
relationship between literature and politics or between culture and
imperialism. This is what leads Edward Said, in *Culture and
Imperialism*, to study the relationship between imperialism and
culture and to advocate an ideological approach to culture and
literature, suggesting that we should change the way we think about
and read Western culture and literature, more specifically, how to read the English novel:

The novel, as a cultural artifact of bourgeois society, and imperialism are unthinkable without each other. Of all the major literary forms, the novel is the most recent, its emergence the most datable, its occurrence the most Western, its narrative pattern of social authority the most structured; imperialism and the novel fortified each other to such a degree that it is impossible to read one without ... dealing with the other.\(^{(59)}\)

Part of Said’s contribution to illustrate his method is his reading of Jane Austen's *Mansfield Park*, Joseph Conrad's *Heart of Darkness*, Rudyard Kipling's *Kim*, E. M. Forster's *Passage to India*, and many others.

Thus through colonial discourse analysis, imperialism is connected to culture. Literature, as one of the aspects of the cultural machine, is used to stop all memories of imperial violence, mystify the mind of the native, produce ambiguities, and, as a result, establish a calm feeling towards the dominating power. Narrative, in particular, is efficient in creating such feeling. Therefore, Said suggests that cultural artifacts like the novel must be read and analyzed within the imperial context: to read and draw out what is “ideologically represented”.\(^{(60)}\) Said calls his method “contrapuntal reading”.\(^{(61)}\) This way is a type of postcolonial strategy of reading texts which will be the focus of the following pages.
2.5 A Postcolonial Reading of the Novel

A point bearing reference to the matter in hand is the apparent division between the "cultural studies" approach and the "close-reading" approach. Actually, cultural studies should not exclude close-reading. Nevertheless, to say that texts are privileged as social documents requires the practitioners to theorize some issues. Such grounds require close-reading to support and realize the use of the texts. Literary and imaginative texts of certain linguistic and representational complexity can represent the social situation to a large extent. It is possible for cultural studies in a way to examine how cultural texts or imaginative writing as a subcategory are interpreted differently in different social positions. Different people may read the same text for different purposes, arrive at different interpretations and derive differing meanings.

Nevertheless, for a materialist reading of texts the historicity of the text, its placement, its production, and its use are all foregrounded against the texts. And since postcolonial criticism is in some way materialist, so, as far as any postcolonial reading is concerned, the historical background of the text is essential. It is true that the real and the imaginary are different in nature. In everyday life, history and fiction, respectively, are the signifiers of these two concepts. History is an attempt to convey real phenomena by means of copying. Still a certain degree of the imaginary is inevitable. On the other hand, in fiction, or, broadly, in a representational work, the artist tries to
represent different phenomena. Here also, a certain amount of history goes into it. Therefore, fact and fiction complement each other since both are involved in representation. Historians who depend on imagination and artists who exploit the historical are both politically oriented. The subjectivity and mental inclinations of the historian and the literary artist can be measured to a large extent by re-reading their texts and scrutinizing the exclusions and inclusions. In other words, one should read texts contrapuntally to understand them for what they really are.

This political use of literary texts leads us to the concept of "discourse". The meaning of discourse varied throughout history; but what is of most relevance to this context is Michael Foucault's understanding of discourse. For Foucault, discourse is

a strongly bounded area of social knowledge, a system of statements within which the world can be known ... There are certain principles of exclusion and inclusion that operate within this system; some things can be said and some things cannot.\(^{62}\)

Edward Said used Foucault's concept of discourse to re-read and re-structure the study of colonialism. So the study of the Orient considered in the context of literature and culture fostered a specific way of reading this field and fortifying the empire. In the case of literature, which has grown roots in mainstream colonialism, a sharp colonial divide is established in which colonial discourse depends on notions of race that appeared at an earlier stage of European
imperialism. So from that time onward, rules of inclusion and exclusion functioned on the presupposition, as said earlier, that the European colonizer is superior; the European race, culture, history, language, politics and manners are better than its colonial counterparts. The "national" result would be that the colonized needed the colonizer for betterment.

According to the editors of Key Concepts in Post-colonial Studies, a significant function of colonial discourse is its filtering representational system:

Colonial discourse tends to exclude, of course, statements about the exploitation of the resources of the colonized, the political status accruing to colonizing powers, the importance to domestic politics of the development of empire, all of which may be compelling reasons for maintaining colonial ties.\(^{63}\)

Colonial discourse studies attempt to present intellectual and objective analyses of colonial "epistemologies" while having the history of colonialism in the background. So, reading colonial literature should be done within the colonial context. The consequence is to give a greater chance to the reader to interpret and question the author's rules of inclusion and exclusion.

Therefore, during the last century, the works of some critical theorists (Michael Foucault, Frantz Fanon, Edward Said, Homi Bhabha, Abdul JanMohamed, Gayatri Spivak, and others) have laid the foundation for pursuing another approach to colonial literature (literature that is
affected by colonialism), and the universalism inherent in the liberal humanist readings of traditional criticism and literature. Taking seriously the weak and their response to their marginalization, these theorists and critics have invited a re-examination of colonial texts. Their works have shown that embedded in this inclusivity of universalism is a working system of exclusivity that makes the voice of the weak and the marginalized disappear. They have exposed that what lies behind the claim of universalism might well be the dominance of First-World interpreters. This new approach to colonialist culture and literature is called the Postcolonial Reading.

Postcolonial criticism, in general, could be envisaged as a geopolitical and ideological reading strategy in relation and reaction to imperial culture, literature and ideologies. The cultural analysis of colonialism and its ideologies has played a crucial role in anti-colonial political movements around the globe. As a domain within literary studies, postcolonialism analyzes literature produced by both the colonizer and the colonized cultures from the first point of encounter to the present.

Generally speaking, postcolonial literary analysis refers to a set of reading practices that seek to understand the intersections - culturally, politically, historically and socially - between colonialist and anti-colonialist ideologies. By employing various strategies and focusing on diverse subjects, postcolonial literary analysis has contributed to reducing the traditional conception of disciplinary boundaries, insisting upon the importance of studying literature
together with history, politics, sociology and other art forms rather than in isolation from the multiple material and intellectual contexts that determine its production and reception. For its purposes, this subordination (economic, culture and political) between nations, races study considers postcolonial criticism as a set of reading practices that focus fundamentally on the relationships of domination and or cultures, which characteristically have their roots in the history of modern European colonialism and imperialism.

2.5.1 Key Concepts

Some basic key concepts need to be discussed.

Postcolonial reading: a critical approach to literary text that comprises of a subversive reading and re-reading mostly applied to works emanating from European colonizing forces (but may be applied to works by the colonized).

Contrapuntal reading: a strategy of reading texts popularized by the late Edward Said. He suggests that in reading a text one must open it out both to what went onto it and to what its author excluded. In fact, according to Said, postcolonial readers must connect the structures of a narrative in a given text to the ideas, concepts and experiences from which it draws support. Said’s contrapuntal reading strategy is a type of postcolonial reading.
2.5.1.1 Postcolonial Reading

Postcolonial reading or postcolonialism, as R. S. Sugirtharajah puts it, is "a mode of interpretation" (64) in order to subvert, expose, and liberate both the text and its interpretation. A postcolonial reading always opts for an oppositional stance, one that intentionally adopts a posture of resistance in approaching familiar stories from the other side, the losing side, the side of the unheard voice, the side of incidents not recorded in the history. Such a stand always pushes us to see things from the side of the oppressed/colonized. It also encourages us to think about what they need for their liberation. According to Sugirtharajah, postcolonial interpretation is

A process of cultural and discursive emancipation from all dominant structures ... an oppositional reading practice ... more a subversive stance towards the dominant knowledge ... a reading posture ... a critical enterprise aimed at unmasking the link between idea and power, which lies behind Western theories and learning ... a discursive resistance to imperialism, imperial ideologies, imperial attitudes. (65)

Likewise, in Key Concepts in Postcolonial Studies:, the term postcolonial reading is defined as "a way of reading and rereading texts ... to draw deliberate attention to the profound and inescapable effects of colonization on literary production; anthropological account; historical records; administrative and scientific writing", (66) and on culture and society in general. Culture itself is seen by
postcolonialism as a web of conflicting discourses; therefore, postcolonial reading rejects the universalism inherent in the liberal humanist readings of traditional criticism in favor of an acceptance of issues of cultural difference in literary texts. However, the goal of this new reading is not merely one of analysis and description, but rather it challenges the dominant narratives and provides a voice to the untold stories of the colonized in the text. It also champions a celebration of hybridity and encourages writing back from the margin or periphery to the centre.

Various Third-World scholars in the humanities and social sciences use postcolonial literary theory to examine the ways, both salient and silent, in which colonization is effected and affects the colonized society. These scholars commenced working on fresh, postcolonial world-centered strategies, methodologies and conceptual frameworks to analyze the colonial discourse with, as a way of rationalizing, the present state of their societies. One of the tenets of such strategies is to analyze the way in which a literary text, whatever its themes, is colonialist or anti-colonialist. The theory inspects the ways such a text reinforces or resists colonialism's oppressive ideologies. This is made, on one hand, via reading of specific postcolonial texts and the effects of their production in and on specific social and historical context. On the other, via revisioning of received tropes and modes such as allegory, irony, and metaphor and the re-reading of canonical texts in the light of postcolonial discursive practices.
When postcolonial texts attempt to "re-write" the canonical master texts of Europe, Stephen Solemon suggests, they do not merely articulate an "anxiety of influence" but practice intertextual reiteration as a parodic strategy. However, as Solemon argues, postcolonial critical discourse positions these reiterative (or sometimes oppositional) textual responses or postcolonial texts in "dialectical relation to their colonialist precursors", and this speaks directly to the struggle within colonialist ideology, making it appear seamless and/or radically fractured. Pierre Macherey formulates a method for the interpretation of ideology thus: "what is important in a work is what it does not say ... But rather this, what the work cannot say is important, because the elaboration of the utterance is carried out, in a sort of a journey to silence".

If we apply this method to the colonial texts in general, and the colonial novel in particular, we may be able to identify the hidden structures of power/powerlessness and the true significances of what cannot be, or is not, said. When postcolonial texts recreate these silences, they clearly attempt to draw attention to what was not said in the first place, and in the reiteration of such moments, they challenge the tenets of colonialist ideology. We will trace these patterns of textual reiteration and opposition in Chinua Achebe’s *Things Fall Apart* (1958) that recreates incidents, images and sequences from Joseph Conrad’s *Heart of Darkness* (1899) to tell
stories from the 'other' point of view. Many of such postcolonial texts re-write the colonial novels by challenging the constructs upon which they were established and offering possibilities of alternative interpretations where the marginal displaces the colonially centered within the fictional space, and illustrating, Benita Parry points out, "the role of the native as historical subject and combatant, possessor of other knowledges and producer of alternative traditions". 

Therefore, the task placed before a postcolonial reader is not an easy one. The term "postcolonialism" itself is always an open-ended one. The postcolonial reading never meant to give answers but meant to pose questions; it never ends a discussion, but begins it. It challenges the dominant modes of analysis, and critiques the cultural, political, and linguistic hegemony of the West over non-Western cultures and societies. Accordingly, postcolonial reading focuses particularly on the way in which literature by the colonizing culture distorts the experience and realities of the colonized and ascribes to them inferiority, and on the way in which literature by the colonized people's attempts to articulate their identity and reclaim their past in the face of that past's inevitable otherness.

Thus, the first task of postcolonial literary analysis is re-reading Western canonical texts in order to detect realized or potential colonial elements in them. The second task of postcolonial reading is to encourage critics to search out not only literary but also other texts, such as historical discourses, official documents, and missionary
reports, to learn how the colonized were represented and how they resisted or accepted colonial values. The third task is to perform literary analysis of literature that emerged from the former colonies as a way of writing back to the center, questioning and challenging colonialists discourses, and in the process producing a new form of representation.\(^{(71)}\) Such a project of rewriting, in its turn, guides us toward reading literature both intertextually and contextually – reading literature “contrapuntally” as Edward Said suggests.

### 2.5.1.2 Contrapuntal Reading

Contrapuntal reading is a methodology that paves a way for a situation that goes beyond the Manichean/Othering reading, which we have discussed in the previous section. In *Culture and Imperialism*, Said offers a contrapuntal method of colonial and global cultural analysis, in which texts and contexts are seen as feeding each other. Said’s concept entails that a certain kind of indeterminism is always privileged during the reading process and allows for a range of affiliations that inform the notion of “worldliness”, of the origin of the text’s open-endedness. Rather than follow the formalist and other approaches to reading, which essentialize the text, turning it into a verbal object of truth, contrapuntal reading concentrates on “the central question of its promotion of colonial ideology. The text is not studied for its own sake ... but for those intrinsic textual features which embody colonial codes”.\(^{(72)}\) By giving primacy to indeterminism,
a contrapuntal reading allows the text to yield different temporalities and different subjectivities.

Generally speaking, contrapuntal analysis is used in interpreting colonial texts, considering intertwined histories and perspectives. Specifically, by interpreting a colonial novel contrapuntally, we take into account the perspectives of both the colonizer and the colonized. To interpret different perspectives simultaneously is a helpful approach to make important connections in a novel. For, if one does not read with the right background, one may miss the connections or the weight behind the presence of Antigua in Austen’s *Mansfield Park*, Australia in Dickens’s *Great Expectations*, India in Kipling’s *Kim*, or Africa in Conrad’s *Heart of Darkness*, for example. To read contrapuntally means to be aware of how the text interacts with itself or with the mainstream as well as with the historical or biographical contexts that the dominant discourse tries to domesticate, speaks, and acts against. It is, in Said’s words, reading “not univocally but contrapuntally, with a simultaneous awareness both of the metropolitan history that is narrated and of those other histories against which (and together with which) the dominating discourse acts”.\(^{(73)}\)

When we apply a postcolonial or a contrapuntal reading to the colonial novel, then we should examine it for what it says about the dominant political and economic structures, and what it says or/and what it does not say of the Other, and how these serve the interests of the
dominant power. Since what is not said (in a text) may be as important as what is said, it is important to read with an understanding of what does it mean, in the culture of imperialism, when Conrad’s Marlow shows that “he always felt a passion to fell in the great blank spaces on the map”\(^{(74)}\) or when a novelist as Austen shows that “a colonial sugar plantation is seen as important to the process of maintaining a particular style of life in England”\(^{(76)}\) for instance. Thus, as politician successfully stereotyped and “othered” the colonized, they “othered” their people as well. And so did the creative authors of the time – including Jane Austen, Charles Dickens, Joseph Conrad, William Thackeray, and Rudyard Kipling, to mention but a few. Traces of imperialism found in the texts of this time provide an accurate gauge with which to judge the connection between culture and empire.

Accordingly, postcolonialism necessitates a vision in which imperialism and literature are viewed simultaneously. This is what the researcher thinks he has done and will do through the remaining chapters to answer the main question of this thesis of how colony and empire had been represented in English literature, addressing both the perspective of imperialism and the resistance to it. In effect, the vocabulary of colonial racism should be studied exhaustively by a rereading and rewriting of the established canon. This process of intervention, in fact, had been started in the early decades of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, when the Third World cultural
and literary discourses entered into what could be called intercultural dialogue with Western literary tradition in general but with English Orientalist tradition specifically. Since then, it subverts the discourse of Orientalism and calls into question the Western representation of the Other's culture and history. In postcolonial contexts, literary texts in general and the novel form in particular continue the task of critiquing and subverting imperialism. This can also be considered an act of a cultural and aesthetic contestation and rewriting of the Western traditional denigration and romanticization of the Orient, the Other.

Writing from the point of view of the Other (the colonized), creates a new vision of colonialism and its effects. Such a project of rewriting guides us, again, toward reading literature both intertextually and contextually – reading literature contrapuntally. That is to say, we might now read Joseph Conrad’s *Heart of Darkness* (1899) by the light of Chinua Achebe’s *Things Fall Apart* (1958); Daniel Defoe’s *Robinson Crusoe* (1719) through the eyes of J. M. Coetzee’s *Foe* (1956); William Shakespeare’s *The Tempest* (1612) under the microscope of Aime Cesaire’s *A Tempest* (1969).

Thus, postcolonialism is “catechrestic: reading between the lines”, or “a kind of reading against the grain”. It is also clear that this term deals with the problems of race, gender, caste, class, slavery, representation and resistance as they are posed and represented textually. It deals, too, with rereading and rewriting of colonial texts as
well as the postcolonial textual responses to such influential master discourses of imperial Europe such as history, literature, philosophy, and linguistics. Looking at traditional European texts from a postcolonial position has enabled the reader and the postcolonial writer to reread and rewrite these texts from a different perspective (postcolonial) which is a powerful method of dramatizing the oppositional relationship between the colonizer and the colonized. This is also looked at as a process of a cultural contention.

Conclusion

In order to represent this cultural confrontation adequately, the researcher will discuss a literary text written from the Western/ex-colonizer perspective with a text written from the Eastern/ex-colonized perspective. In other words, this project has been designed as a study of the colonial and postcolonial novel by Joseph Conrad and Chinua Achebe – specifically, Conrad’s Heart of Darkness and Achebe’s Things Fall Apart. This choice is based on the fact that in the works of each of these authors there is complex engagement with the politics of societies each represents. In addition, these two novels, particularly, deal with the same relational issues of sociocultural events – colonialism, race, gender, savagery, civilization – but from different positions. They also share the same setting: Africa. Therefore, the connection between their writings is the history of European colonization of Africa. While Conrad was implicated in it, Achebe revised the history that he read in Conrad’s work.
In doing so, the researcher draws on the critical models developed by postcolonial critics (as have been detailed in this chapter and in chapter one) in their study of the colonial and postcolonial literature. Ultimately, this study will attempt to provide theoretical and methodological procedures for analyzing colonial discourse, or more accurately, colonial misrepresentation of the colonized and the postcolonial contestation of it.
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