



RESEARCH ARTICLE

Vol. 4. Issue.2., 2017 (April-June)

INTERNATIONAL
STANDARD
SERIAL
NUMBER
INDIA
2395-2628(Print):2349-9451(online)

One Word More

SHEIKH ASIF JAN

M.A English, University of Kashmir
Email: sasif4317@gmail.com



ABSTRACT

It is an article regarding the questions that how we are ideologically motivated in order to be manipulated by a particular system?, how we become the proponents of that very system?, what is our relation to a thing, to a producer and at last to the world and are we then able to break our formal ideals or always we adhere and adore to others?. A system uses many means to have a hold upon us--- psychologically as well as physically. Physical suppression would never yield fruit until our consciousness is subjected. Every system is a framework that is made to have both veneration and fear. Without these two concepts no system would stand. It has many references to literature and many concepts from it are used in this context to make the point better.

To identify oneself with another is dangerous and turns you out of your roots and makes you a stranger to both.

Our families, our education, our religion, our parties and media all have their respective designs to say which they glorify and at the same time deify because they are also the proponents of a system.

Key words: Ideological, repressive state apparatuses, contact zone, literature of combat, self- fashioning, idols of the mind, horizon of expectations and hybridity.

(Thinking to escape the beliefs
I met the specter of belief)

To find the overtones and undertones of coercion, hegemony is a total lie without the application of consent on the part of subjects, because physical compulsion is essential but never sufficient. In order to hold men's minds in greater subjection, clever men devise many things in society by which they inspire common folk with reverence and strike them with terror. But they would never succeed if we don't like to adhere to someone and to be led by the (pretentious) garb. As a statesman said, man is god to men. I think that this motivation does not come from race but from the refinement of mind.

Let me consider my point, the control of one by another can be classified in two ways---(1) Repressive State Apparatus and (2) Ideological State Apparatus.ⁱ In the former, coercion is used and happens to be the direct confrontation, as it contains those institutions by which one is terrified. Ideological State Apparatus is the indirect confrontation, as it contains those institutions by which one is motivated. This situation can also be described by what Mary Pratt calls "contact zone"ⁱⁱ, where the cultures clash but the dominant emerges as

the modifier. In such a context the “literature of combat”ⁱⁱⁱ does not arise because such literature is brought out first within the dominant canon and is subverted to further their canons.

In 1962, for example, in Nigeria a conference named “A Conference of African Writers of English Expression” was held, only those native writers were allowed to be a part of it that used to write in English and the native writers of vernaculars were precluded. But in the second conference only those were included who used to write in tune with the English and writers with the flag of literature of combat met the former fate.

Nigerian Marxist critic, Thiang’O, relates a story from his personal experiences that in the English-African schools a practice was applied by the Englishmen; those speaking the vernaculars were severely punished. The so-called ‘guilty’ students were traced by a formula—a kind of token was given, with the commencement of the day, to a student speaking vernaculars and was asked to hand it over, respectively, to another student speaking the same in the school arena and at the end of the day the whole chain was found.

Another fact of the schools in Africa was that English was given the utmost importance over other subjects. Those who would pass the vernaculars and fail in English were not promoted to the next class. But those students who would fail in vernaculars and hitchhike in English were provided with many benefits.

The writers who were allowed to be part of the above said conference provided the explanations that they were using the colonizer’s language in order to subvert and counteract it by their native traits. Here can be used another term “Self-Fashioning”^{iv} by Stephen Greenblatt. It signifies a willingness to transform oneself into another and describes the process of constructing one’s identity and persona as per the socially accepted standards. I think, it could not be their opinion but were made to have it—as this statement can be better defined by Althusser’s term “interpellation”.

It is this very interpellation that prevents us from understanding nature properly and compels us to act in a foolish and incorrect way. Now the question is, why do we become the subjects of interpellation? This process starts early in our childhood when we become dependent on the “Idols of the Mind”^v. The idols of the mind are divided into four types:

1. Idols of the tribe: These are the things where our ideals, our personality, our strength etc. falls short and we begin to adhere on others to fulfill our wishes, i-e idols derived from the limitations of our nature.
2. Idols of the cave: These are the illusions where our ego beats the bush in vain. These things are the outcome of our personal character.
3. Idols of the Market Place: These are the things where we see the conflict between the false appreciation we get and the actual manifestation of our ideals.
4. Idols of the Theatre: This is the main idol among the four and consists of those things where we become the proponents of a particular system, where we become the subjects, where we nudge our own ideas as haphazard and outdated, where we become the persona, where the shadows of others get instilled in our minds and bear fruit and at last where we become the surplus of those to whom we adhered.

As Stuart Hall says, the world is not given to us in the pure form. It is always mediated or represented to us. He gives some general approaches to the question of the work done by representation and those approaches are (1) The Reflective Approach, (2) The Intentional Approach and (3) The Constructionist Approach. In the first one, we are given the object as well as the meaning--- the meaning is controlled by the object. In the second, the meaning is controlled by the producer of the object. In the third, meaning is neither in the control of the producer nor in the thing represented but it identifies thoroughly social nature in the construction of meaning. But only some go through this very approach.

Let me refurbish the above statement by another example. When the Roanoke colony^{vi} was made by Sir Walter Raleigh, a book “A Brief and True Report of the New Found Land of Virginia” was published by a historiographer, where he states that the Americans were awe-stroked by the phenomenal development of the English and considered them as the men of god or themselves gods.

At that Americans had nothing but were obsessed with tobacco and it was much easy for the English to control their (Americans) minds---as it is much easy for a sculptor to carve out a statue from a crude rock than a rock badly begun by another.

Religion is also used as the main trend to manipulate the minds of the people. Columbus on his fourth visit to America declared his plan to settle his men there but the natives refused to give food to them. Knowing from his almanac that the total eclipse of the moon was imminent, Columbus warned the natives that God would show them a sign of his displeasure; after the eclipse, the terrified natives resumed the supply. But an eclipse would not always be at hand so the events of discomfiture and misfortune are identified with the wrath of God—whether it might be your decision or your personal fault.

Galileo, working on the Copernican theory, was not only tried by the clergy, whose authority was questioned but he and his daughter were forsaken by his son-in-law. On asking, he replied that Galileo proposed the theory that would make his slaves rebel. They were kept in an illusion that God sees their sorrows, misfortunes, atrocities done to them and for this they would be rewarded in heaven.

Discourses are hard to break. As Foucault says, it has both power as well as knowledge. That is why, once the discourse is made--- the manipulator and the manipulated are involved in a game, both play their games with their “horizon of expectations”^{vii}, in order to give and to be given and the consequences are “hybridity”^{viii}, which leads to the alienation of both.

So facing and answering the repressive apparatus is not enough until we will conquer the ideological apparatus---as it contains family, education, religion, political parties and media.

References

ⁱ Louis Althusser (Ideology and Ideological State Apparatuses, Notes towards an Investigation)

ⁱⁱ Mary Louise Pratt (Arts of the Contact Zone).

ⁱⁱⁱ Frantz Fanon (Wretched of the Earth).

^{iv} Stephen Greenblatt (Renaissance Self-Fashioning).

^v Francis Bacon (Novum Organum).

^{vi} First colony of America by Britain

^{vii} Hans Robert Jauss (Reception Theory).

^{viii} Homi K. Bhabha