The process of 'forming a community' in the new land necessarily meant unforming or re-forming the communities that existed there already, and involved practices such as trade, plunder, negotiation, warfare, genocide, enslavement and rebellions.

According to Marxist thinking, Earlier colonialisms were Pre-Capitalist, modern colonialism was established alongside capitalism in Western Europe.

Modern colonialism did more than just extract wealth from countries it conquered, it basically restructured their economies, draw them in a complex relationship with themselves, so that the flow of human and natural resources continue.

European colonialism involved a variety of techniques and patterns of domination that produced economic imbalance necessary for the growth of European capitalism and Industry.

Colonialism assisted in the birth of European Capitalism. Without colonial expansion, the transition to Capitalism could not have taken place in Europe.

Lenin and Kautsky gave a new meaning to word 'Imperialism', linking it to a particular stage of the development of capitalism.

Lenin argued that the growth of capitalism and Industry in the western countries created enormous wealth. This money could not be profitably invested at home where labour was limited. The colonies on the other hand lacked capital (money) but were abundant in labour and human resources.

Lenin predicted that in due course the rest of the world would be absorbed by European Capitalists. This global system was called 'Imperialism'.

Direct colonial rule is not necessary for Imperialism. 'Neo-Imperialism' or 'Neo-colonialism' is the word sometimes used to describe these situations.

We can distinguish between colonialism and Imperialism; Colonialism was the take over of territory, exploitation of resources, labour and interference with political and cultural structures of another territory or nation.

But Imperialism is primarily an economic system of penetration and control of market, political change does not effect it.

( American Imperialism wields enormous military and economic power across globe without direct political control.)
• Imperialism can function without formal colonies but colonialism cannot.

• A country may be both Post-Colonial (in the sense of being formally independent) and Neo-Colonial (in the sense of remaining economically or culturally dependent) at the same time.

• The new global order does not depend upon direct control. It does allow the economic, cultural and political penetration of some countries by others.

• This makes the term 'postcolonial' debatable, whether once colonised countries can be seen as properly 'post colonised'.

• The process of decolonisation in parts of Latin America or Australia or South Africa, where white settlers formed their own independent nations is different from the societies where indigenous population overthrew their European masters (India).

• White settlers were historically agents of colonial rule, no matter what the difference they have with their mother country, white population were never the subjects of genocide, economic exploitation, cultural decimation and political exclusion felt by indigenous people or by other colonies.

• Internal fractures exist in countries whose post Colonial status is not usually contested, such as India.

• In a moving story 'sishu' the Bengali writer Mahasweta Devi describes how how tribal people have been literally and figuratively crippled in post-independent India. National development has no space for tribal cultures or belief, and the attitude of even the well meaning government officer, Mr. Singh, towards the tribal replicates colonialist views of Non-Western peoples – to him, they are mysterious, uncivilized, backward.

In other words, they are like children, who need to be brought in line with the rest of the country. The rebellious among them have literally been pushed into forces and have been starving there for years. Pg 12

• 'Colonialism' is not just something that happens from outside a country or a people, not just something that operates with the collusion of forces inside, but a version of it can be duplicated from within.

(Behaviour duplication in the victims/oppressed)

• Jorge de Alva suggests that postcoloniality should 'signify not so much subjectivity "after" the colonial experience as a subjectivity of oppositionality to imperialising/colonizing discourses and practices'.
Alva wants to de-link the term postcoloniality from formal decolonisation because he thinks many people living in both once-colonised and once colonising countries are still subject to the oppressions put into place by colonialism.

(Alva's suggestion to connect postcoloniality to post-structuralist theory of history)

- An accent on a multiplicity of histories serves to obfuscate the ways in which these histories are being connected anew by the international workings of multinational capital.

- All 'subordinating' discourses and practices are not the same either over time or across the globe.

- Although 'minority' people living in the West (and they may not in every place be literally a minority at all) and the people living in 'third world' countries share a history of colonial exploitation, may share cultural roots, and may also share an opposition to the legacy of colonial domination, their histories and present concerns cannot simply be merged.

- Shakespeare's Othello in South Africa is to open up a powerful new reading of the play, but also to elide two different kinds of marginality: the which arises out of displacement and another in which black people and cultures were victimised but not literally isolated from each other.

- As we will see, many writings on postcolonialism emphasise concepts like 'hybridity' and fragmentation and diversity, and yet they routinely claim to be describing 'the postcolonial condition', or 'the postcolonial subject' or 'the postcolonial woman'.

- The legacies of colonialism are varied and multiple even as they obviously share some important features.

- Postcolonial theory has been accused of precisely this: it shifts the focus from locations and institutions to individual and their subjectivities. Postcoloniality becomes a vague condition of people anywhere and everywhere, and the specificities of locale do not matter. In part the dependence of postcolonial theory upon literary and cultural criticism, and upon post-structuralism is responsible for this shift.

- Critics such as Gayatri Spivak have repeatedly cautioned against the idea that pre-colonial cultures are something that we can easily recover, warning that 'a nostalgia for lost origins can be detrimental to the exploitation of the social realities within the critique of imperialism'.

- She is interested in emphasising the worlding (i.e. both the violation and the creation) of the 'third world' by colonial powers and therefore resists the romanticising of once-colonised societies' as distant cultures, exploited but with rich intact heritage waiting to be recovered...'.

(Criticism of pre-colonial culture)

- Patriarchy then becomes a useful shorthand for conveying a structure of inequity, which is, in practice, highly variable because it always works alongside other social structures.

- Similarly the word 'postcolonial' is useful as a generalisation to the extent that 'it refers to a process of disengagement from the whole colonial syndrome, which takes many forms and is probably inescapable for all those whose world’s have been marked by that set of phenomena: "postcolonial" is (or should be) a descriptive not an evaluative term'

- Postcolonial studies have shown that both the 'metropolis' and the 'colony' were deeply altered by the colonial process. Both of them are, accordingly, also restructured by decolonisation.

- Postcoloniality, like, patriarchy, is articulated alongside other economic, social, cultural and historical factors, and therefore, in practice, it works quite differently in various parts of the world.

- But if it is uprooted from specific locations, 'postcoloniality' cannot be meaningfully investigated, and instead, the term begins to obscure the very relations of domination that it seeks to uncover.

- Most Marxist thinkers tended to regard colonialism, as indeed they did capitalism, as an exploitative yet necessary phase of human social development. History, in their view, was a teleological movement that would culminate in communism. This would not happen automatically, but as a result of a fierce struggle between opposing classes.

- Many nineteenth- and twentieth-century writers equated the advance of European colonisation with the triumph of science and reason over the forces of superstition, and indeed many colonised peoples took the same view.

- Marxism's penetrating critique of colonialism as capitalism was inspirational for many anti-colonial struggles. Aimé Césaire’s moving and powerful Discourse on Colonialism (first published in 1950) indicts colonial brutality in terms that are clearly inflected by Marxist analysis of capitalism.

- it is suggested, the difference between Europe and its others can be understood as a difference between capitalist and non-capitalist societies. Césaire shares something here with his fellow Martiniquan Frantz Fanon, who also emphasised the dehumanising aspect of colonialism, thus pushing its analysis into the realm of the psyche and the subjectivity of colonised people, as well as of their masters.
Analogous debates have marked the relationship of class and gender. Although Marxist thought had paid a great deal of attention to the oppression of women, it failed to theorise the specificity of gender oppression. For feminists, the question of culture and ideologies was vital for a variety of reasons: women’s oppression had hitherto been seen as simply a matter of culture and as taking place within the family—the exploitation of their labour power was obscured by a gender-blind economic analysis which could not integrate class with other forms of social division. But, on the other hand, there was no serious analysis of the family or culture or sexuality, and of how precisely women were marginalised. Women’s oppression was, consequently, seriously under theorised within Marxism, but also of course in the wider intellectual sphere. The crucial question—how does the oppression of women connect with the operations of capitalism (or other economic systems)—remained unanswered till feminists began to interrelate the economic and the ideological aspects of women’s oppression.

The question of race and colonialism also demanded rethinking for similar reasons. The impact of colonialism on culture is intimately tied up with its economic processes but the relationship between them cannot be understood unless cultural processes are theorised as fully and deeply as the economic ones.

Thus the analysis of colonialism demanded that the categories developed for understanding capitalism (such as class) be revised, but also that the relation between the realm of ‘culture’ or ‘ideology’ and the sphere of ‘economics’ or ‘material reality’ be re-examined.

Ideology does not, as is often assumed, refer to political ideas alone. It includes all our ‘mental frameworks’, our beliefs, concepts, and ways of expressing our relationship to the world.

In The German Ideology (written in 1846), Marx and Engels had suggested that ideology is basically a distorted or a false consciousness of the world which disguises people's real relationship to their world. This is so because the ideologies that most circulate or gain currency in any society reflect and reproduce the interests of the dominant social classes.

Marx and Engels emphasised strongly that our ideas come from the world around us, that ‘It is not consciousness that determines life, but life that determines consciousness’. All our ideas, including our self-conceptions, spring from the world in which we live. And this world, under capitalism, itself gives rise to a series of illusions. Money has the power to distort, even invert reality.

As capitalism advances, money and commodities increasingly displace, stand in for, and are mistaken for human values. Thus they become fetishised (fetishes being objects which we invest with human qualities). In this view, ideology is not a
failure to perceive reality, for reality (capitalism) itself is ideological, disguising its essential features in a realm of false appearances.

- Marx does not regard all ideas as ideological or false. He contrasts ideology to science, which has the capacity to cut through illusions. The Hungarian theoretician Georg Lukács offered an alternative view of ideology in which it is not always understood as false consciousness. Rather, the validity or falsity of an ideology depends upon the ‘class situation’ of the collective subject whose view it represents.

- Ideologies are not therefore always false consciousness, but in every case, they are still the product of economic and social life.

- Gramsci drew a distinction between various kinds of ideologies, suggesting that while ideology in general works to maintain social cohesion and expresses dominant interests, there are also particular ideologies that express the protest of those who are exploited.

- The proletariat or oppressed subject possesses a dual consciousness—that which is beholden to the rulers, and complicit with their will, and that which is capable of developing into resistance. If social realities, including social conflicts, are grasped by human beings via their ideologies, then ideologies are also the site of social struggle.

- Hegemony is power achieved through a combination of coercion and consent. Playing upon Machiavelli’s suggestion that power can be achieved through both force and fraud, Gramsci argued that the ruling classes achieve domination not by force or coercion alone, but also by creating subjects who ‘willingly’ submit to being ruled.

- Ideology is crucial in creating consent, it is the medium through which certain ideas are transmitted and more important, held to be true. Hegemony is achieved not only by direct manipulation or indoctrination, but by playing upon the common sense of people.

- Gramsci is not simply interested in expanding the meaning of ideology, but in understanding also how ideologies animate social relations ‘organize human masses, and create the terrain on which men move, acquire consciousness of their position, struggle, etc.’

- Gramsci’s notion that ideologies ‘create the terrain on which men move’ helps us to locate racism not just as an effect of capitalism but as more complexly intertwined with it.
• Colonial domination involved much repression and coercion, and thus is sometimes analysed as a process which do not involve the consent of the colonised.

• Gramscian notions of hegemony stress the incorporation and transformation of ideas and practices belonging to those who are dominated, rather than simple imposition from above.

• Ideologies may express the interests of social groups, but they work through and upon individual people or ‘subjects’.

• Althusser's influential essay 'Ideological State Apparatuses' may in fact have contributed to a bifurcation by adopting a two-part structure, the first addressing ideology and the reproduction of the social relations of production, and the second how ideology creates us as subjects.

• Althusser argued that in modern capitalist societies, the former is achieved by ‘Repressive State Apparatuses’ such as the army and the police, but the latter is enforced via ‘Ideological State Apparatuses’ such as schools, the Church, the family, media and political systems.

• The above ideological apparatuses assist in the reproduction of the dominant system by creating subjects who are ideologically conditioned to accept the values of the system.

• If subjects are entirely the creation of dominant ideologies then there is no scope for any ideas outside of these ideologies, and thus no scope for social change. Thus we can say that Althusser’s ideas about ideological apparatuses are too functionalist: they stress the function but not the complexity of either institutions or human subjects.

• The problem for Post-colonial theory is that it is unable to maintain any distinction between ideas and material realities. This is obviously a difficult and tricky issue because on the one hand there is the need to interrelate the two so that issues of culture and economics are seen as mutually constitutive and on the other hand there is also the need to maintain some distinction so that the specificity of each is not eroded.

• **Language is ideological** -

~ The Swiss linguist Ferdinand de Saussure had argued that the relation between the ‘Signifier’ (which is a sound image) and the ‘signified’ (which is the concept to which it
refers) is arbitrary, which it is to say that words achieve their meaning from an association in the mind not from any natural or necessary reference to entities in the real world.

~ Language is not a nomenclature or a way of naming things which already exists but a system of signs, whose meaning is relational.

~ The sign or words need a community with shared assumptions to confer them with meaning; conversely a social group needs signs in order to know itself as a community. On this basis, we can think of language as ideological rather than as objective.

• Any set of words could be analysed to reveal not just an individual but a historical consciousness at work. Words and images thus become fundamental for an analysis of historical processes such as colonialism.

• The place of language, culture and the individual in political and economic processes could no longer be seen as simply derivative or secondary, even though the exact ways in which they came together are still a matter of sharp controversy and debate.
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