

Tribhuvan University

Symptomatic reading of Stevenson's *Treasure Island* and Coetzee's *Waiting for the Barbarians*

**A thesis submitted to the Central Department of English
in partial fulfillment of the requirement for the degree of
Master of Arts in English**

By

Gokul Dhakal

Central Department of English

Kirtipur, Kathmandu

September 2007

Tribhuvan University

Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences

Letter of Approval

This thesis entitled **Symptomatic reading of Stevenson's *Treasure Island* and Coetzee's *Waiting for the Barbarians*** submitted to the Central Department of English by Mr. Gokul Dhakal has been approved by the undersigned members of the Research Committee:

Members of the Research Committee

Internal Examiner

External Examiner

Head

Central Department of English

Date: _____

Acknowledgement

This present study would not have been worked out without the scholarly guidance, invaluable suggestions and encouragement of the former Head of Central Department of English, Prof. Chandra Prakash Sharma. He constantly supported and guided me by going minutely through the script of my thesis. I feel pleasure to express my sincerest gratitude to him.

I am also highly indebted to Dr. Krishna Chandra Sharma, the Head of Central Dept. of English for his cooperation and motivation.

Likewise, I would also like to acknowledge my gratitude to Dr. Sanjeev Upreti and Dr. Arun Gupto who helped me by providing scholarly instructions. I am equally grateful to all the teachers of Central Department of English who have helped me in many ways.

I am equally thankful to my parents, brothers and sisters. I would not like to miss my best friends Ravi, Amit, Uday, Ramesh, Laxmi and all my near and dear ones who constantly encouraged and helped me in one way or another during my research period.

Lastly, I would like to dedicate my dissertation to my mom and all our martyrs as well as disabled people who suffered and gave their life for Nepal.

September, 2007

Gokul Dhakal

Abstract

The *Treasure Island* by R. L. Stevenson symbolically mirrors the intention of the Europeans, ie. mis-presenting the non-west land and lifting the valuable resources and treasures. Stevenson constructs the discourse, in order to maintain the sense of superiority and authority over Other. Stevenson, being a colonialist exhibits his imperial perspective and creates the non-western land and its peoples as cannibalistic, exotic, dark and chaotic, and tries to construct the image of the westerner as rational, superior and civilized group. On the contrary, in *Waiting for the Barbarians*, J. M. Coetzee clearly observes this Eurocentric formation of Other and gives the message to the colonizers to view into barbarity latent in themselves. The construction of Self depends on the creation of Other. In other words, Coetzee counters the constructed binary opposition of the colonizers which is based on the futile assumptions and gives true voice to the natives, behind their constructed false image.

CONTENTS

Page no.

I. Introduction

Symptomatic reading of Stevenson's *Treasure Island* and
Coetzee's *Waiting for the Barbarians*

II. Theoretical Modality

Anthropology: A with-in behavioural study

Philology: Close study of words and texts

Colonial Discourse: In relation to Post-colonial Theory

III. Textual Analyses

Symptomatic reading of Stevenson's *Treasure Island*

and Coetzee's *Waiting for the Barbarians*: A comparative study

IV. Conclusion

Works Cited

I. Introduction

Symptomatic Reading of Stevenson's *Treasure Island* and Coetzee's *Waiting for the Barbarians*

The symptomatic reading analyses how the western characters in *Treasure Island* misrepresent non-westerner as cannibal and how the colonizers in *Waiting for the Barbarians*, articulate their own barbarism. In *Waiting for the Barbarians*, the colonizers represent themselves as civilized, superior and rational and the native people as uncivilized, inferior and irrational by misinterpreting the native people and their culture. In the process of legitimizing the native people as barbarians, they evoke their own barbaric nature and activities. Colonel Joll's (The Colonizer) duty is to recognize the barbarians, but his own symptoms and behaviours can be understood as barbarous. Likewise the western characters of *Treasure Island* have the concept that the non-western land is the place for cannibals: "I began to recall what I had heard of cannibals. I was within ace of calling for help"(78). Both novels observe that one has to create the so-called barbarisms or cannibalisms for defining their own civilization. Hence, this binary opposition should be observed through symptomatic reading. Peter Hulme explains symptomatic reading and construction of European knowledge in relation to the others as:

[. . .] one can employ a "Symptomatic" reading to make a colonialist document disclose more than its writer himself knows about rules and regulations that make possible European "Knowledge" of itself and it's others. Specially, Hulme considers Colombus' journal of his voyage to the New World . . . Colombus historically "mishears" an Arawak word for "carib" as "caniba" or "cannibal"- . . . (112)

Like Columbus, Stevenson creates cannibal in non-west land, but Coetzee counters the Euro-centric Self by showing the symptoms and activities of barbarism in colonizers. As Slemon has suggested, Hulme argues that for constructing the Euro-centric Self, a colonizer has to depend on the symptom of the Other. The western Self-construction is dependant, at least at a minimal level, on the actual historical acts and practices of its others. As without creating the identity of the non-western as Other they cannot get their own identity of Self. If one's definition depends on the Other, the so-called binary opposition is futile. The more the characters of these novels try to illustrate the others' barbarism or cannibalism, the more they evoke their own barbaric nature and symptoms. Eric cheyfitz describes how this binary opposition is created:

After the association Columbus elaborated in his journal, cannibal will come to mean on thing in western language: a human who eats another human's flesh. For Europeans this term will be a part of a diverse arsenal of rhetorical weapons used to distinguish what they conceive of as their "civilized" selves from certain "savage" others, principally Native Americans and Africans. (42)

The word cannibal and barbarians themselves are western construct that show the necessity of them to construct the barbarians and cannibalism for imposing their own civilization. Reading colonialist discourse as a collection of symbolic practices, including textual codes and convention and implied meanings Elleke Boehmer views:

An important tenet of colonialist discourse theory, therefore, would hold that empire was governed as much by symbolism as by real distinctions in the world, which is to say, because colonial authority expressed its

dominance in part through medium of representation, a colonialist work of imagination functioned as an instrument of power. (51)

Therefore, the interpretations were an expression of its mastery, but they also reflected other responses: wonder, bewilderment fear. Symptomatic reading deeply analyses how colonial discourse misrepresents the colonized people through their symptoms in relation to the European colonizers and Non-European colonized. It focuses on how language is used in disputing, what kind of “work” it does, how identities and categories get constructed through legal language and how routines, repertoires, and types of discourse determine outcome.

Stevenson’s *Treasure Island* (1883), was written during Victorian period when almost every person was obsessed with material gain. *Treasure Island* is itself the foreign land for British. What Stevenson was left with was a literary reputation based solely on his romances, a reputation that solidly ignored his South Seas fiction, his essays, his travelogues about America and the Pacific, and the letters that revealed his enthusiasm for his craft and for the islanders of the South Pacific. Because of this failure to acknowledge his extensiveness as a writer, he is often remembered primarily as an author for children; his reputation as the author of *Treasure Island* has prevented many adults reading any of his other works. Though this is a romantic novel we could see colonial greed in the characters. *Treasure Island* presents the Europeans excessive desire for power and wealth by narrating the story of two types of people, sea pirates and so-called European gentleman.

Jim, a young boy is being helped by fellows like Silver, Captain Flint, Dr. Livesey, Squire, John Trelawney, Smolett and others. But in the other pirates group we

can find like Billy Bones, Blackdog, Pew, Israel, Hands, etc. Both the groups were driven by the greed towards Caribbean island named Skeleton Island where the treasure was supposed to be hidden.

Stevenson tries to show non-western land as exotic, strange and adventurous. Here the things are in disorder and in chaos. Therefore, he legitimizes non-western land as alienated, dark, different, subordinate, deviant, inferior and the place of romance.

Jim is in other's land and calls the inhabitants as cannibal. It is a futile assumption on the part of Europeans as they are alien to the new world. Everything new seems strange and distinct. Hence, without understanding the natives through anthropological study he showed them as cannibal and did not even feel justice to mention the native characters.

In *Treasure Island* the writer legitimizes the cannibalism of non-westerners. Moreover he also claims that non-western land produces cannibal. For this purpose, he makes the speech of Ben Gunn more colloquial and less standard rather than the westerners. According to Emma Letley: "In certain cases, notable that of Ben Gunn, Stevenson makes the speech of his characters more colloquial and less standard than in the serialization. But this is not so with Long John Silver" (xii). Stevenson shows that although Ben Gunn is westerner, his behaviours are similar to cannibal due to isolated, strange and dark land where whomever Englishman stays in this land will be a poor fellow creature like him.

Thus, the characters presented in western writer's text are themselves ambiguous and strange and very hard for others to understand them. The claim of colonizers that non-westerners are ambiguous is based on futile assumptions.

Coetzee's *Waiting for the Barbarians* (1980), is the first person narrative of an anonymous Magistrate posted (presumably) in South African frontier settlement who witnesses the unspeakable acts of cruelty of visiting Colonel Joll, a man determined to find enemies of the empire in the desolate lands that surround them. The Magistrate looks the other way while Colonel Joll interrogates the prisoners, assuming that the acts of the Empire, while excessive in force, are necessary for the security of the people. When the Colonel fills the settlement compound with vagrants as prisoners, the Magistrate finds it increasingly difficult to hold his tongue. He unwittingly reveals his true feelings to the Colonel. However it is not this subtle insubordination that leads to his political demise, but his sincere relationship with a barbarian girl that causes him to become a new object of the Empire's suspicion.

After the prisoners are released, a barbarian girl is left behind, begging in the streets, temporarily blinded and crippled from the torture inflicted upon her. The Magistrate befriends her and eventually invites her to sleep in his room. The relationship, however, is not based on sexuality but one of a deeper physic, emotional need. They both partake in a strangely relaxing cleansing ritual where the Magistrate washes the girls body, perhaps as a symbolic way of washing his hands of the terrible deeds of Colonel Joll. After the girls eyesight returns and she regains some use of her feet, the Magistrate decides to return the girl to her people. Following a grueling journey that took several weeks to complete, the reception the Magistrate receives when he returns to settlement is not what he expected. Charged with treason by Colonel Joll, the Magistrate is thrown into prison.

Stories like these that make one wonder if some acts of courage and heroism are not necessarily by choice. The scenes of devilishly devised interrogations that occur to the prisoners and eventually to the Magistrate himself are described with strange mixture of detail and detachment, enough to cause the reader to cringe. What occurs later in the novel, however is what truly exposes the horror of the Empire, and brings one to the unpleasant realization that these are things far worse than physical torture. Thus, Coetzee draws a clear picture of reality for the power group showing that when the might is right, the weak are always the barbarians.

Coetzee deconstructs the western hegemony and the disparate ideological agendas. He, however, is a figure who focuses upon to re-evaluate the limitation of the empire, colonialism and so on. He successfully turns a temperament into a style -his sentences sound like of no one else: he stripes them down; scouring them with an adjective and sentiment. Coetzee possess a profound interdisciplinary intelligence. His characters are caught in-between cultural and historical states, and the ambiguities of the human condition.

Therefore, Coetzee in *Waiting for the Barbarians* tries to illustrate the barbaric nature of the westerners through their activities and symptoms. Here the colonizers represent themselves as civilized, superior and rational and the native people as uncivilized, inferior and irrational by misinterpreting the native people and their culture. In the process of legitimizing native people as the barbarians, they evoke their own barbaric nature and activities. Lance Olsen writes: “Colonel Joll, as a misreader who deals in the metaphysics of presence while he describes the old Colonial Magistrate as one who believes meaning and truth “float free” (47).

Similarly Aschroft et al. say: “For the Colonel, is in the business of creating the enemy, of delineating that opposition that must exist, in order that the Empire must define itself by its geographical and racial others.” (173)

Waiting for the Barbarians is a dark look into the heart of mankind, a moral and psychological study of aging magistrate in an African frontier settlement who over time becomes more and more sympathetic to the indigenous “barbarians” that the colonial empire’s forces brutalize.

The western writer, Stevenson defines non-westerns as cannibal whereas the non-western writer Coetzee ironizes the barbarisms of the westerners. As a result, the binary opposition of civilization versus cannibalism or barbarism can be understood only through the symptomatic reading of a text.

II. Theoretical Modality

Anthropology: A with-in behavioural study

Anthropology is a careful observation of human beings and their behaviour, culture and social relations, biology and evolution, languages, music, art and architecture and of human habitation. It considers such fascinating questions as how peoples' behaviour changes over time, how people from distant parts of the world and dissimilar cultures are different and the same, how the species has evolved over millions of years, and how individuals understand and operate successfully in distinct cultural setting.

Anthropologist Eric Wolf described anthropology as the most scientific of the humanities, and the most humanistic of the sciences. Anthropology can be best understood as an outgrowth of the Age of Enlightenment, a period when the European's attempted systematically to study human behaviour. The traditions of jurisprudence, history, philology, and sociology then evolved into something more closely resembling the modern views of these disciplines and informed the development of the social sciences, of which anthropology was a part.

This discipline grew out of colonialism, perhaps in league with it, and derived some of its key notions from it, consciously or not. The majority of anthropologists of twentieth century have looked upon anthropology as a social science rather than a discipline of the humanities. It is holistic in two senses: it is concerned with all human beings across times and places, and with all dimensions of humanity like evolutionary, biophysical, sociopolitical, economic, cultural, psychological, etc. Anthropology has often been conceived, as comprising four related fields of study: biological or physical, socio-cultural, linguistics and archaeology.

Biological or physical anthropology seeks to understand the physical human being through the study of genetics, inherited traits and variations there of, evolution, adaptation, biological behaviour, etc. Likewise, socio-cultural anthropology is the investigation, often through long term, intensive field studies, of the culture and social organization of a particular people: language, economic and political organization, law and conflict resolution, patterns of consumption and exchange, kinship and family structure, gender relations, childrearing and socialization, religion, mythology, symbolism, etc. Similarly, linguistic anthropology seeks to understand the processes of human communications, verbal and non-verbal, variation in language and culture. It identifies the many subtle elements of the world's language, and documents their structure, function and history. And, archaeology studies the contemporary distribution and form of artifacts with the intent of understanding distribution and movement of ancient populations, development of human social organization, and relationships among contemporary populations; it also contributes significantly to the work of population geneticists, historical linguistics and many historians.

There has been a growing tendency in anthropology toward integration of different subfields. For example, ethno science is a subject in which anthropologists apply approaches derived from linguistics to understand the grammatical structure and manipulation of cognitive perceptions by people in different societies of such things as color, weather, and biotic environment. Another growing subfield is ethno archeology, in which observations of material behaviour in contemporary societies are used to interpret the archeological remains of prehistoric cultures. Modern anthropology is characterized by its breadth and diversity of approaches to the study of variability in human behaviour.

The colonizers attempt to legitimize the colonized without having known the language, culture, geography, history, traditions, etc. They are merely outsiders and they name the distinct culture and society of the non-west as Other. So, regarding this fact Rebeca Redwood French in her essay “Law and Anthropology” says, “Anthropological methods are employed to observe and describe- from the perspective of the insider- the local understandings of conflict, anti-social deviance, social control, and legal identity. Traditionally, the focus was on disputes, rule-formation, decision-making, exercised authority, and sanctions within a group. More recently, other methods and subjects of focus have been used” (398).

Therefore, the colonizers being outsider could not observe and describe the proper root of colonized people’s identity. Similarly, Bronslaw Malinowski, perhaps more than any other anthropologist, established the tradition of extensive fieldwork and detailed empirical observation in combination with the competent use of the local language and sensitivity to shades of opinion from the insider point-of-view. He rejected most notions of western law. He argues that law is not a special system of decrees, but an integral part of society- the net of obligations between people, which is backed up by social and psychological constraints, which make men keep to their obligations. Through his exploration of how social institutions, including law, function to fulfill human needs within a society, he founded the functionalist school of anthropology.

Likewise, Paul Bohannan in his *Justice and Judgment among the Tiv* (1957) championed the use of concepts from the legal folk culture claiming that western legal terminology de-emphasized and eventually falsified the “native point-of view”.

Therefore, the attention to the insider perspective should be focused at the expense of cross-cultural comparison and integration with western legal terminology.

John and Jean Comaroff have redefined our notions of power by theorizing the hegemonic as what members of a society take for granted as true. This view of the status quo, the normal as dominant power, leads to investigations of how the status quo is reflected in cultural ideology, and articulated in its system of meaning. Thus, rules were not being constantly negotiated but also manipulated by the participants.

Another cultural critic Clifford Geertz also recommends in his book *The Interpretation of Cultures* that the role anthropologists is, in a sense, to decode the symbolic meanings of these certain events, practices, customs and interactions that take place within a specific culture, however insignificant they may seem to the observer, detail is of utmost importance. An anthropologist must become part of the culture, looking in from the outside will not help him to understand anything. Of course, in order to reduce the occurrence of the anthropologist's own cultural bias and to attempt more accurately understand a culture; one could easily say that it is imperative that anthropologists immerse themselves in the customs and practices of that culture.

As Geertz says, the analysis of it is not an experimental science in search of law" but rather "an interpretive one in search of meaning. It is the job of the anthropologists to first attempt to understand how an event is interpreted by the culture in which it takes place, then to make an interpretation of that interpretation, and then it is left up to the reader of anthropological writing to interpret the final interpretations. Thus, construct the finest interpretations possible and most importantly to be an active participant in the culture, rather than a passive observer.

Likewise, Leela Gandhi on the issue of cultural misinterpretation, comments: “In its reflective modality, thus post colonialism also holds out the possibility of thinking our way through, and therefore out of the historical imbalances and cultural inequalities produced by the colonial encounter” (176). Hence, symptomatic reading will help to find out how imperial language shaped our thought and facilitated meanings and shaped our theoretical self-consciousness.

Thus, this researcher will focus on how the colonial encounter with multiple, distinct cultures, often very different in organizations and language from those of Europe, has led to a continuing emphasis on cross-cultural comparison and receptiveness to certain kinds of cultural relativism.

Philology: Close study of words and texts

Philology is the scientific study of the development of a particular language. Philology seeks to understand a language and understand the origins of that language, so it is often defined as the study of ancient texts and languages, although this is rather a narrow view.

The term Philology in a wide sense in the academic traditions of several nations, describes the study of language together with its literature and the historical and cultural contexts that are indispensable for an understanding of the literary works and other culturally significant texts. Philology thus comprises the study of the grammar, history, rhetoric, interpretation of authors, and critical traditions associated with a given language.

Modern historical linguistics dates from the late eighteenth century and grew out of the earlier discipline of philology, the study of ancient texts and documents, which goes back to antiquity. In the beginning, historical linguistics was comparative

linguistics and mainly concerned with establishing language families and the reconstruction of prehistoric languages, using the comparative method and internal reconstruction.

Initially, all modern linguistics was historical in orientation. Even the study of modern dialects involved looking at their origins. But, Saussure drew a distinction between synchronic and diachronic linguistics, which is fundamental to the present day organization of the discipline. Primacy is accorded to synchronic linguistics; diachronic linguistics is defined as the study of successive synchronic stages.

The biological origin of language is in principle part of the remit of historical linguistics, but most linguistics regard it as too remote to be reliably established by the comparative method, given the remoteness from historical records. Other techniques, such as mass lexical comparison, are regarded by some as means of overcoming the limitations of the comparative method, but most linguists regard them as unreliable.

The findings of historical linguistics are often used as a basis for hypothesis about the groupings and movements of peoples, particularly in the prehistoric period. However, it is now recognized that relating language to ethnic identity is problematic, as is relating language history to archeological or genetic evidence.

Hence, historical linguistics is used to study the history of words. It is used to describe general theories about how and why language changes. And to describe and account for observed changes in particular languages. Philology is divided into four branches according to their function; they are comparative philology, radical philology, textual philology and text editing and deciphering texts.

Comparative philology studies relationship between languages. Philology's interest in ancient languages led to the study of what were in the eighteenth century exotic languages for the light they could cast on problems in understanding and deciphering the origins of older texts. Radical philology is a contemporary re-appropriation of a centuries old tradition of scholarly interaction with the materiality of texts. In its main outlines, radical philology diverges from mainstream philology in its understanding of the relationship between textual scholarship and literary interpretation. This philology sees textual research as an end in itself. Likewise, textual philology and text editing method was applied to classical studies and to medieval texts for the reconstruction of the author's original. This method produced so-called critical editions, which provided a reconstructed text accompanied by a critical apparatus, i.e. footnotes listing the various manuscript variants available, thus enabling scholars to gain insight into the entire manuscript tradition and argue about variants. In addition, deciphering ancient texts is another branch of philology, which deciphers ancient writing systems, and had spectacular success in the nineteenth century.

Regarding the language and its meanings determination Bill Ashcroft et. al. in the book *The Post Colonial Studies Reader* remarks:

[. . .] the control over language by the imperial centre- whether achieved by displacing native languages, by installing itself as a 'standard' against other variants which are constituted as 'impurities' or by planting the language of empire in a new place- remains the most potent instrument of cultural control. . . One of the most subtle demonstrations of the power of language is the means by which it provides, through the function of

naming, a technique for knowing a colonized place or people. To name the world is to 'understand' it, to know it and have control over it. (283)

They view that to name the reality is therefore to exert power over it, simply because the dominant language becomes the way in which it is known. Thus, English language is the language of power and opportunity, free of limitations that the ambitious attribute to the native languages. The language that is manipulated creates the consciousness and hence our mind is shaped and our behaviour is controlled.

Now, let's view philologically the word cannibals, its origins, development, and how this term is used as archetype by the colonizers. The word cannibal is an imperial and colonial act of translation. Cannibal, as we know, entered in English (and other European languages) in the early sixteenth century as a precisely literary translation of the Spanish cannibals. In Columbus journal on November 23, 1492, it appeared for the first time where sailing between Cuba and the island that he named Espanola, he noted:

“Those Indians [Arawaks] whom he had with him called [Espanda] “Bohio”. They said that this land was very extensive and that in it were people who had one eye in the forehead, and others whom they called “cannibals”. Of these last, they showed great fear, and when they saw that this course was being taken, they were speechless... because those people ate them and because they are very warlike. (68-69)

The origin of the word can(n)ibal remains in doubt, except that it apparently is a European deformation of a Native American term, either Arawakan or Cariban.

Cannibal may be the deformation of the word carib, as caniba or cannibal. After the association Columbus elaborated in his journal, cannibal will come to mean one thing in

western; a human who eats another humans flesh. But for Europeans this term became a part of diverse arsenal of rhetorical weapons and used to distinguish what they conceive of as their civilized Self from certain savage Others, principally Native Americans and Africans.

Therefore, the missing Arawak/ carib term became a purely political figure in European tongues, a figure that tries to erase its own rhetoricity by claiming a proper, or ethnographical, referent- the fact of cannibalism- which even if it could be proved, would not justify or explain the colonial/ imperial process of translation that displaces the original native term.

Similarly searching the origin of the word barbarians, we find that in the ancient times those who spoke Greek incorrectly were called barbarous. For, as strangers coming to Athens strove to speak Greek, they often fell into absurd expression ἀρ ἀπος. Afterwards the Greeks transported the name to brutal and cruel manners, calling all nations outside Greece, Barbarians.

But, now the term has become an archetype to describe the manners of non-European people. The qualities of non-human and animalistic nature have been added. The native languages or the so-called non-English language is usually denoted by this term and is called “savage” language. Regarding the term civilized and barbarism, Roosevelt also declares in the text of Howard k. Beale as:

[. . .] It is the duty toward the people of living in barbarism to see that they are freed from chains”, he told Minnesotans a fortnight before he became president (in 1901), “and we can free them only by destroying barbarism itself. . . Exactly as it is the duty of a civilized power

scrupulously to respect the rights of weaker civilized powers. . . . So it's duty to put down savagery and barbarism. (34)

In Roosevelt's parlance, we can translate civilized as Anglo-Saxon, or white, and "savagery" and "barbarism" as the state of every people beyond that pale. Roosevelt's subscription to that version of the myth of Anglo-Saxon superiority and that saw the American people as the apotheosis of this race of races.

Therefore, philology tries to show truth behind every sign of word. It tries to clarify the imperialist's motives behind their facial mask. It ruptures identity, where the conflictive play of dialogue takes place that constitutes the speakers for and significantly through each other. Confronted with this monopoly of the literal, the colonized are left in possession of the figurative, which, as we have seen in the translations of their language by the European, is used to dispossess them. Yet what is a sign of their dispossession, figurative language, invests them with an ironic, potential or power.

Colonial Discourse: In relation to Post-colonial Theory

The discourse of the westerners regarding the non-westerners is called colonial discourse that manifests non-westerners as inferior, uncivilized and the Other. This discourse illustrates its desire to govern, dominate and control the Other. This discourse fulfills the colonial purpose because it produces a kind of stereotype of the non-westerners that legitimize the Other to make it easier to have power and authority over the orient. Regarding the same issue, Slemon borrows the ideas of Said as:

The ur-text of colonial discourse analysis is Edward Said's *Orientalism*, which provides a Foucauldian reading of those British and French scholarly treatises on, and fantastic projections onto, "the orient" in the eighteenth and

nineteenth centuries. In *Orientalism*, Said argues that although there indeed were and are peoples who actually live in a space Europe knows as “the orient” , this space was in fact never anything other than an “idea” a creation with an corresponding reality. (111-12)

Said argues that the knowledge that is associated to the westerners legitimizes their civilization, rationality and progress and the non-westerners as primitive and barbaric. Thus, they take the barbarism of the non-westerners as the burden to civilize them, educate them and to make them rational human beings. They believed in the binary opposition of Self and Other. The Self is related to the civilization and the Other is related to the cannibalism or the barbarism. Ashis Nandy agrees with what Ziauddin Sardar views:

The imperial powers also created a self-image for those who were being husbanded by colonialism. In as such as this self-image is a dualistic opposite, it is and remains in essence a western construction. Colonialism replaced the Eurocentric convention of portraying the Other as an incomprehensible barbarian with the pathological stereotype of the strange but predictable Oriental. He was now religious but superstitious, clever but devious, chaotically violent but effeminately cowardly. At the same time, a new discourse was developed where the basic mode of breaking out of these stereotypes was to reverse them; superstitious but spiritual, uneducated but wise, womanly but pacific. (16)

The aforementioned criticism shows how western discourse about the Other displays west’s desire to govern the Others and how it shares colonial perspective.

Through the colonial discourse, the westerners exercise institutionalized power over the Other. Sardar further says about institutional definition as:

Domination is only complete when dissent can be foreseen and managed; and this cannot be done unless definitional criteria has been established to determine what is genuine, sober, dissent and these criteria have been systematically institutionalized through the university system. This is what fashionable academic and intellectual trends, such as post modernism, post-colonialism and post-structuralism, are defined to do.

(19)

Westerners think and try to universalize the west as the source of everything. They treat as if the regions of non-western world, as Said says in *Culture and Imperialism*, “have no life, history or culture to speak of, no independence or integrity with representing without the west.” (xix). The westerners cannot imagine that non-western people have their own lives, histories and cultures with integrities equally worth representing as the western one. As a result, they misrepresent the non-western people by employing the colonial power, ideology and discourse:

[. . .] “post-colonial” scholars have attempted to negotiate another way of challenging Eurocentric historicism- this is the branch of post-colonial critical theory known as “Colonial Discourse analysis”. . . . social subjects, social consciousness, to be formed not through ideologies that have their base in economic or class relations but through a form of power that have their base in economic or class relations but through a form of power that circulates in and around the social fabric, framing social subjects

through strategies of regulation and exclusion, and constructing forms of “knowledge” which make possible that which can be said and that which cannot. The problem with western historicism, for Foucault, is that it overlooks these processes of social formation. (Slemon, 111)

Slemon means to say that the colonial relation is maintained and guided by colonial discourse that associated with colonial power. Said also challenges the western discourse applying the logic of Foucault’s theories and concludes that no discourse is fixed for all time. This discourse not only wields power but also stimulates opposition that oppositional power is just like the other side of the same coin. Hence, it is natural for the westerners to have a will to power over the orient. This discourse constructs the power wherever it gets chance. Colonial discourse is produced to manipulate the power in order to maintain the sense of superiority and authority over the Other. Hence, it becomes an instrument of power that becomes a means of governing the Others. The westerners try to hold the discourse to achieve the power. Discourse, in this sense, becomes an object of Self to govern the Other. Regarding this view Aschroft *et al.* explains:

[. . .] Rules of inclusion and exclusion operate on the assumption of the superiority of the colonizer’s culture, history; language, art, political structures, social conventions, and the assertion of the need for the colonized to be ‘raised up’ through colonial contact. In particular, colonial discourse hinges on notions of race that begin to emerge at the very advent of European imperialism. Through such distinctions it comes to represent the colonized whatever the nature of their social structures and cultural histories, as ‘primitive’ and the colonizers as ‘civilized’. (42-43)

The colonial discourse, not only creates power to rule the Other, but it also contains the possibility of resistance to it from the Other. We have seen that the production of otherness is essential for colonialism; yet, it is fraught with internal contradictions, since it produces the possibility of resistance in the other precisely at the moment when it impose its captivating power over the Other. Colonial discourse about the non-western world played a great role in serving the purpose of European expansion, but along with the coming of white men brought some sort of resistance in almost everywhere in the non-European world, as manifested in different resistance movements, formation of the political parties whose common goal was self-determination and national independence. Likewise, they also view the term 'counter-discourse as:

[. . .] the complex ways in which challenges to a dominant or established discourse (specially those of the imperial centre) might be mounted from the periphery, always recognizing the powerful 'absorptive capacity' of imperial and neo-imperial discourses. As a practice within post-colonialism, counter-discourse has been theorized less in terms of historical processes and literary movements to particular texts, and thus to imperial ideologies inculcated, stabilized and specifically maintained through texts employed in colonialist education systems. (56)

The cultural domination is not static and unalterable thing. Post-colonial criticism, which attempts to re-examine the colonial relationship, emerged in resistance to colonial perspectives employed in discourses of cultural representation and the texts dealing with colonial relations. The western values and traditions of thought and literature are guilty of repressive ethnocentrism because models of western thought and literature have dominated

world culture that marginalize non-western traditions and forms of cultural life and expression.

By subverting the colonial perspective, post-colonial critics have deconstructed the discourse that supports the colonization process by producing colonizing myths about laziness, passive and irrationality of the non-western. Postcolonial criticism counters the colonizer's discourse by producing the parallel discourses, which have questioned and even subverted the stereotypes and myth about the colonized people. Thus, the power and authority of the western colonial representations have been questioned and challenged by the discourses produced by the postcolonial thinkers. They present the colonial history from the perspective of colonized people's experience. For resisting the colonizers mission to construct the binary opposition, they revealed what the colonial authority did to them in the name of progress, science and civilization. Considering the same issue, Sardar borrows Nandy's view as:

[. . .] the domain of post modernism as does is deliberate attempt to dissolve the difference between high and low art and culture. But this location is more apparent than real. Nandy has some subtle and some serious differences with many of the post modern persuasion. Post modernism celebrates difference but blurs the boundaries that maintain difference. Nandy celebrates differences but not for its own sake: he wants different cultures to survive, in deed thrive, and remain different with their distinctive traits intact. (8)

The postcolonial thinkers germinate these counter attacks as colonial ideology. Frantz Fanon, one of the postcolonial writer and critic, seems to be more radical on this issue.

Like Fanon, many postcolonial critics attack the representation of non-westerners by the westerners. Europeans feel that they give the progress, science, modernity and civilization to the non-Europeans as the token of sympathy to the non-western. The images of Negroes, Arabs, Indians and the yellow races are the creation of the Third World. Elleke Boehmer, in *Colonial and Postcolonial Literature* writes on Fanon,

In his book *The Wretched of the Earth*, Fanon called for the entire structure of the colonial society to be changed from the bottom up violently. For him, to decolonize meant that the indigenous be forcefully substituted for the alien, in literature as in life. . .that means, the colonized had to insult and vomit up the white man's values. (183)

Fanon is the prototype of all the post colonial voices in which the speaker painstakingly strives for the recognition for the identity which can enable him or her to question, to deconstruct the tyranny of colonial authority. Influenced and encouraged by the postcolonial spirit, many postcolonial critics based their narrative on the line of ideological premises. Writing from their own perspective, they debunked western colonial misrepresentations about themselves. They feel that they have to become aware that when they are confronted with those misrepresentations. They realize that they become the victims of ideology in the name of western civilization. Jacobs views about the politics constituted by a broader history and geography in his book *Edge of Empire* as:

Although imperialism is undeniably a political and economic event, it also operates through a range of cultural processes. For example, social constructs of Self and Other provided the fundamental building blocks for the hierarchies of power which produced empires and uneven relations

among their citizenry. Under colonialism, negative constructions of colonized Other established certain structures of domination through which the colonizer triumphed. Similarly counter-colonial challenges frequently involve subordinated groups reclaiming 'pre-colonial' identities or revalorizing identities 'made' under the force of colonialism. (2)

The notions of Self and Other as defined, articulated and negotiated are crucial part of the cultural dimension of colonialism and post colonialism. The making and remaking of identity thus occurs through both official and popular, representation and discursive, material and ideological. Regarding the same view, Thomas in his book *Colonialism's Culture: Anthropology, Travel and Government*, notes that Colonialism has always been imagined and energized through signs, metaphors and narratives. The objective of colonial discourse is to construe the colonized as population of degenerate types, like barbaric and cannibals on the basis of race, language, culture, etc. in order to justify conquest and to establish systems of administration and instruction.

Culture is shaped by power holders. They approve whether the behaviour and nature is civilized or uncivilized by creating the discourse. Then, knowledge or truth is shaped by the power. They have always described the non-west since antiquity as a place of romance, dark, cannibalistic, barbaric, subordinate, etc. Regarding the same view, Sardar again borrows Nandy's perspective related to institutionalize suffering as:

Nandy's perspective on dealing with institutionalized suffering is based on three assumptions. First, he asserts, no civilization has a monopoly on goodness and humane values. All civilizations share certain basic values and cultural traits that derive from our biological self and social experience.

What is unique about given civilization is not its values but the framework within which these values are actualized and emphasis and priorities it assigns to these values . . . as far as they are human, are imperfect; and imperfect civilizations can only produce imperfect solutions from their cultural and social imperfections. (17-18)

Thus, colonialism and the experience of authoritarian imperial rule equally distorted the minds and cultures of both the colonizers and the colonized. The creating of civilized identity of their own as self and the non-westerners as Other is nothing but distortion of their colonized image as cannibalistic or barbaric.

Therefore, identity is inherently unstable, instead of being self-sufficient with regards to it; the colonizer at least partly constructs it through interactions with the colonized. Through the help of this framework, attention will be focused to prove the hypothesis of the present research in the third chapter that the constructed binary opposition of civilization and primitive is nothing more than Self-construction of the westerners, which is dependant at least at a minimal level, on the actual historical acts and practices of its Others. The western writer, Stevenson defines the non-westerner as cannibal, whereas the non-western writer Coetzee ironizes the barbarism of the westerners. As a result, this researcher problematizes the continuation of binary opposition of civilization versus cannibalism or barbarism through symptomatic reading.

III. Textual Analyses

Symptomatic reading of Stevenson's *Treasure Island* and Coetzee's *Waiting for the Barbarians*: A Comparative Study

Stevenson being a colonialist writer of the nineteenth century writes in his *Treasure Island* about the exploration of the European gentlemen in the non-west land. He provides dominant role to the English gentlemen in his novel. Throughout the course of their exploration, that land is repeatedly described with the use of the negative terms like dark, different, cannibalistic, exotic strange and the place of romance. It is supposed to lack organized control resulting in lawlessness. He represents the island with the colonial concept of otherness. Thus, Stevenson, as a high Victorian writer couldn't go beyond that circumstances and reproduced the imperial ideology of his time.

But on the other hand, Coetzee being the non-western writer of the twentieth century counters through irony the so-called civilization by illustrating that the barbaric nature are in the westerners themselves in *Waiting for the Barbarians*. The colonial agents are in the non-west land to civilize those non-westerners and protect them from the raid of the Barbarians. But, in the course of time, we found through deep understanding that they are no better than what they told about the Barbarians. To find the truth, about the planned raid against the empire is but an illusion of the state, as they never appeared in the novel. The supposed act of the so-called Barbarians can be traced in the act of Empire itself. Thus, the term civilization is nothing but a sham adopted by the westerner to justify their own barbaric actions against the colonized Other. So the colonizers called the colonized cannibals and barbarians.

Stevenson's legitimization of the non-western land has also been analyzed as the European's invention. Said in his *Orientalism* says, “[. . .] The Orient was almost a European invention, and had been since antiquity a place of romance, exotic beings, haunting memories and landscapes, remarkable experiences (1)”. Stevenson in his novel too shows the colonialist mentality of treating the non-west land in the same manner. His characters are driven by a motive to the non-west land to fulfill their insatiable greed for treasure. But in this process of adventure they misrepresented the non-west land with negative remarks. Therefore, symptomatic reading identifies when and how European's tried to create the image of non-western as something, which does not have light, or the land without civilization. Stevenson, through the narrator Jim narrates:

[. . .] I explored every acre of its surface; I climbed a thousand times to that tall hill they call the spy-glass, and from the top enjoyed the most wonderful and changing prospects. Sometimes the isle was thick with savages, with whom we fought. Sometimes full of dangerous animals that hunted us; but in all my fancies nothing occurred to me so strange and tragic as our actual adventures. (36)

The non-western land is signified here as the land of savages and wild animals living in a strange place. This land is eroticized and fancied as the place of adventure. The non-western land is though publicized as the wild and dark, the narrator takes it as something that is easier to conquer. It is constantly used as the place of romance where they can do their wild activities like hunting, killing, fighting and drinking. The colonizers endowed the power. So they rule this land and do whatever they wish.

The narrator throughout the novel legitimizes the non-west land. We can trace the following thought through the remarks of the narrator Jim, when he says, “the chill and the vapour taken together told a poor tale of the island. It was plainly a damp, feverish, unhealthy spot (104)”. This land is given negative term like “unhealthy spot”, where the colonizers felt difficult to adjust themselves physically and mentally. The narrator seems to create a poor tale of this land finding it different than his own. Again, he says, “The other, a mere blur of light upon darkness indicated the position of the anchored ship (120)”. The whole land is described as wild and dark. The only light is found where the British ship is anchored. But besides, the land is described as something lacking light and full of blackness. The narrator remarks the land also as a “wolf-trap” (168). He says it is a dangerous place, where they can be made captive. Thus the inner motive of the narrator is to possess the treasure and get out from this land as soon as possible. Therefore, we can find the material interest dominating in their mind.

One of the English representatives, Long John Silver conversing with Captain Smollett and the narrator, he says, “this here is a sweet spot, this island – a sweet spot for a lad to get ashore on. You'll bathe, and you'll climb trees, and you'll hunt goats. You will; and you'll get aloft on them hill like a goat yourself” (64). Silver, the pirate also remarks the land as something wild in nature and a sweet spot for their wild activities. The Treasure Island is named as Skeleton Island. The peaceful island is named so due to the result of colonialism. The narrator mentions, “Indeed, as we found when we also reached the spot, it was something very different. At the foot of a pretty big pine, and involved in a green creeper, which had even partly lifted some of the smaller bones, a

human skeleton lay with a few shreds of clothing, on the ground. I believe a chill struck for a moment to every heart” (173).

The beautiful and peaceful island became a battlefield and graveyard due to their fighting and killing during the journey to the treasure. The unburied human skeleton speaks of the brutality that had taken place there. The non-west land has been continuously raped till there has been left no resources left to be lifted up. The bones are scattered, and we know later that it was of a seaman. We know that he died there during his journey to the treasure. Seeing the position of the man, they estimated the direction of the island. Thus, clean and peaceful environment of the non-west had been dirtied and polluted by those invaders.

Humanity, fraternity and other such practices are beyond the thought of the European consciousness. They desire for nothing more than to gain the material wealth from the non-west land. In this process they disturbed the peaceful and quiet environment with the power of gun and wine. But, they never forget to claim themselves as superior and create the image of self by creating the opposition as other and uncivilized.

The “native point of view” has not been focused. Stevenson showing the imperialistic tendency has nowhere mentioned the local dwellers. To suit the materialistic purpose, act of representation is involved with politics. The only few lines describing the situation as, “[. . .] they had spoken lower and lower, and they had almost got to whispering by now so that the sound of their talk hardly interrupted the silence of the wood. All of sudden, out of the middle of the trees in front of us, a thin, high, trembling voice struck up the well-known air and words” (175-76).

Thus, Stevenson tries to create the grand-narrative without making any native's participation. His characters are only the European treasure seekers. The island is described as the dark and strange as "the silence of the wood" (7). Thus colonialist mentality is clearly reflecting through his writing.

The west tries to form ideologies through power that circulates and constructs form of "knowledge". Stevenson has tried to form such kind of knowledge. He shows that European gentlemen cannot only reach any part of the world and lift the treasure but also they consider themselves supreme in power. We can sense the same thing through the words of Captain Smolett while speaking to the narrator Jim, "As for powder and shot we'll do. But the rations are short, very short so short . . ." (95). Here the Europeans have sufficient weapons but very little rations. This means that they are not weak at all in the matter of power and strength. Similar expression can be seen through the words of the narrator as "The next thing I laid hold of was a brace of pistols, and as I already had a powder-horn and bullets, I felt myself well supplied with arms" (116-117). The narrator is also no less like other European gentlemen in the manner of weapons and power. The Europeans dignity of having power can be fully traced through these lines.

Though, the narrator was just a boy, was not less than other matured Europeans. He became the hero of his own text. He got hold of the map to reach the treasure, so the adult characters rely on him. For them, the map is very important as nothing is arranged or is in order, and everything is chaos in this land. Captain Smolett telling the other members "that you have a map of island; that there's crosses on the map to show where treasure is . . ." (49). Stevenson tries to show the non-western land as something mysterious as without the map they cannot find the way. The narrator as well as other

characters debate only on the issue of map. But they are unaware of the island dwellers or at least they are unaware of the land, which possesses the treasure.

The people of this non-west land are referred as “dark and shaggy” (78). When the narrator saw Ben Gunn, he without any hesitation thought, “I began to recall what I had heard of cannibals. I was within an ace of calling for help (78)”. The narrator thinking himself as civilized called the unknown man so. He tries to create power and named the so-called island inhabitant as cannibal. The word “cannibals” follows a particular ideological trajectory; cut off from its proper (cultural) meaning in Native American languages, it becomes a purely political figure in European tongues, a figure that tries to erase its own rhetoricity and displaces the original native term. Thus, this word initiated by Columbus is perpetuated by the European voyagers who follow him, prepares the way and is forever involved in the dispossession. So, when these English invaders met the native inhabitants of the non-west, they possessed ideas of place and people, which is destructively conflicting. The narrator forgot his own reality of debating, fighting, killing, drinking, conspiring etc. but tried to induce the politics over non-Europeans as cannibals.

Before the narrator knew about the origin of Ben Gunn being Christian, he termed him as “dark a face” (79). So here, it is crystal clear that, not the non-Europeans are so, but the Europeans themselves can be called as “bear or man or monkey” (78). The narrator says, “As soon as I remembered I was not defenceless, courage glowed again in my heart; and I set my face resolutely for this man of island, and walked briskly towards him” (78). The sense of might and power of colonialists can again be traced in the following lines. As the narrator thinking himself powerful with weapons he didn't fear

the bare handed man and marched forward towards him. Therefore, their act of showing power can be clearly felt and it tries to mark the weaker as animalistic or the so-called cannibalistic.

After knowing that Ben Gunn is a European and a Christian, the narrator remarks, "I now felt that the poor fellow had gone crazy in his solitude, and I suppose I must have shown the feeling in my face" (80). Now, the narrator blames the non-western land for the cause of Ben Gunn's condition. He thinks it is due to isolation in the dark land he has lost his Euro-crat. Therefore, Stevenson tries to legitimize the non-western land as something dark, isolated and strange. But if it is an Englishmen who stays in this land, will still be considered a "fellow-creature" (80). When the narrator accepts him as a companion later, the location of the Self can be imagined in Other. Thus he functions as the mirror on which the colonizers image is reflected.

Objectively, it is clear that the western writers have interpreted the land and the people of the non-west differently. Their project is to convert this new land into alienable place with non-humans or the cannibals. The narrator Jim, is the hero of his own dream, a day dreamer who claims himself to be powerful with a quest for treasure. He appears to be a noble character, being praised by Long John Silver "You're a good lad, Jim" (81). Doctor Livesley says, "Every step, it's you that saves our lives" (168). Even Captain Smollett helps him in building dream saying Jim as too much "the born favourite" (185). We find Silver's praise for Jim again as "And a brave lad you were, and smart, too" (59). But in fact throughout the course Jim is proved apparently crude evil traveller, a rapacious who represents as a conqueror. So, Stevenson's writing itself proves to attempt of supporting the imposition of colonial authority.

The journey of the Europeans is nothing more than commercial interest. Both the so-called intellectuals and pirates are united for greediness and selfishness and can't escape from the ground reality of power and politics. We can sense the same thing from the narrator Jim's comment:

[. . .] But our best hope, it was decided, was to kill of the buccaneer until they either hauled down their flag or ran away. . . From nineteen they were already reduced to fifteen, two others were wounded. And one, at least – the man shot beside the gun-severely wounded, if he were not dead. Every time we had a crack at them, we were to take it, saving our own lives, with the extremest care. And, besides that, we had two able allies – rum and the climate. (102)

The practice of conspiracy and killing their own shipmates for their selfish motives is at extreme. Fraternity and rationality has been lost in front of the lust for money, power and wine.

Stevenson through *Treasure Island* symbolically sets the system of knowledge into European consciousness. His intention is to prove the Europeans as the true adventurer having power and could accomplish anything from the non-west land. In this process, he uses the words in the form of images and symbols to give view of the new world with pathological stereotype of the strange cannibals or Other. Therefore, he shows imperial perspective and exhibits his colonial experiences and perceptions.

But on the other hand, Coetzee counters the so-called image of the westerners as the civilized and the non-westerners as the barbarians. The text *Waiting for the Barbarians* has the setting of colonial period, but it can be read in the post colonial

context. Coetzee's resistance against the self construction of the European can also be analyzed similarly in Ziauddin Sardar's essay as he remarks, "the imperial powers also created a self-image for those who were being husbanded by colonialism. In as much this self-image is a dualistic opposite, it is and remains in essence of western construction" (16). During the time of imperialism, the Europeans cherished their superiority and maintained the dichotomy between them and us. They represented the whites as the civilizers of the world but the non-whites as degenerate, barbaric and in need of European masters to civilize, protect and uplift them. But, Coetzee ironically satirizes these stereotypes through self-evident truths and facts.

Coetzee throughout the text nowhere mentions time in his setting. So, his plot can be of anytime during his period of colonialism. However, by constructing the narration entirely in an anonymous frontier settlement of an unnamed Empire, this novel deliberately avoids the limitations imposed by specificities of temporal, geographical and historical context and succeeds in attaining universalism to which all writers aspire. Thus, this book resonates with anyone who is concerned about complicity to oppression and prejudiced justified by political power.

The liberal humanist narrator, Magistrate attempts to maintain the middle position between the colonizers and colonized. He is sincere and well intentioned to explore the reality about the so-called barbarism. Magistrate talks in favor of the so-called barbarians with Colonel Joll, who came to investigate about the so-called barbarians prisoners, "These are only prisoners we have taken for a long time, I say, A coincidence: normally we would not have any barbarians at all to show you. This so-called banditry does not amount to much . . . They are mainly destitute tribes people with tiny flocks of their own

living along the river. It becomes a way of life” (4). The Magistrate clarifies that the so-called barbarians are the native tribals. They have never done any serious mishaps, so the Empire should not treat them so.

The British agents without understanding the origin and nature of the natives treat them as barbarians, because they do not have the same manner and behaviour like them. Moreover, Joll’s saying that he could identify the barbarians through their speech seems ridiculous. He says, “There is a certain tone, a certain tone enters the voice of a man who is telling the truth. Training and experience teach us to recognize that tone (5)”.

Therefore, by distorting the native truth, Joll attempts to conjure up the truth for the so-called Barbarians according to the desire of the Empire. Whatever the colonial object speaks seems false and made-up to master Joll, who thinks himself as a truth finder. But, the voices of the Subaltern, about the torture given to them speak through their tortured bodies.

While investigating, the narrator found the dead body of an old man whose hands were tied and his body was “sewed” (7). While asking to the guard he found that the British agents had killed him, but they claimed it was a suicide act. Therefore, violence and torture became only the way of the Empire to find the truth about them. The narrator was bound up by the state’s rule. So he says, “I cannot pretend to be any better than a mother comforting a child between his father’s spells of wrath” (8). He knows the fact, but he could not speak or do anything according to his wish to protect the innocent people. Thus, the Magistrate’s experience shows that the sovereign subject has constructed a narrative of their own to impose on the native people.

Throughout the text, brutality and legitimization done by the Empire in the name of finding the truth about the planned raids of the so-called barbarians also can be viewed through symptomatic reading. When the narrator keeps the so-called barbarian girl for humane cause, he said “people will say I keep two wild animals in my room, a fox and a girl” (37). The girl came to narrator’s room to sleep because she is insecure with the other white men. The treatment of her as an animal by the white people highly depicts their view towards the natives. Similarly, all the innocent prisoners were treated as savages and were confined in a single prison. They were bound to do latrine in one corner of the room and were not allowed to be clean and fresh. But, the colonizers thought that they were born filthy and noisy. The narrator says, “A rumour begins to go the rounds that they are diseased, they will bring epidemic to the town . . . The kitchen staff refuse them utensils and begin to toss them their food from the doorway as if they were indeed animals” (21). The such conditions of the so-called barbarians were made by them and later they misinterpreted them as uncivilized, barbaric, animalistic, etc.. Thus, we can easily conclude that the non-westerners were illogically proved animals by the colonizers.

The colonizers are always motivated to capture the non-western land and try to find out the so-called enemy barbarians and punish them. But, they forget that they are treating those innocent natives brutally. The message of treating the natives comes to us through the activities of Colonel Joll as the narrator describes:

The Colonel steps forward. Stooping over each prisoner in turn he rubs and handful of dust into his naked back and writes a word with a stick of charcoal. I read the word upside down. ENEMY...ENEMY...ENEMY ...

ENEMY. He steps back and folds his hands. At a distance of no more than twenty paces he and I contemplate each other.” (115)

Therefore, treating the natives as the enemies and punishing them severely without any feeling of sympathy can be felt as the barbarian act of themselves. The colonizers felt no pity for those natives and killed them without any cause, show an ideal distinction between civilized and barbaric behaviour.

Coetzee seeks an alternative way of finding the native without simply ignoring the image, or substituting a correct image for an incorrect and giving the true voice behind their false image, which gives the subject its ontological consistency and its fundamental structure. The Magistrate identifies with the Empire's victims, experiences, torture and humiliation. Being himself as a symbol of victim of the empire he ironizes the so-called civilization of the colonizers the Magistrate gives the message as:

What has made it impossible for us to live in time like fish in water, like birds in air, like children? It is the fault of Empire, Empire has created, the time of history. Empire has located its existence not in the smooth recurrent spinning time of the cycle of the seasons but in the jagged time of rise and fall, of beginning and end, of catastrophe. Empire dooms itself to live in history and plot against history. (146)

The narrator faced all the inhumane treatments like the natives and then he concludes that the colonizers have made the life of native people very difficult to live. The narrator, who was working for the Empire, also could not escape from the torture. He was tied with a rope and hanged on a tree. He says, “Someone gives me a push and I begin to float back and forth in an arc a foot above the ground like a great old moth with its wings pinched

together, roaring, shouting” (133). He was punished because he was suspected of supporting the so-called barbarians and plotting against the Empire. Thus, the colonizers left no stone unturned to establish their supremacy over the land.

To rule the non-west land they used power and established their own laws, not for themselves but for those natives and tried to create the discourse that they are in that land to provide them justice. The narrator comments:

I had no doubt, myself, then, that at each moment each one of us, man, woman, child, perhaps and even the poor old horse turning the mill-wheel, knew what was just: all creatures come into the world bringing with them the memory of justice ‘But we live in a world of laws’. I said to my poor prisoner 'a world of the second best. There is nothing we can do about that. We are fallen creatures. All we do is to uphold to laws, all of us, without allowing the memory of justice to fade’. (152)

They bind the narrator along with the natives up to follow the rule of laws constructed. The non-westerners have always been recognized as savages, different, irrational, Others, barbaric, etc. The colonizers have always legitimized the non-west and kept authority, humanism and truth under erasure. Thus, Coetzee's text helps us in self-knowing otherness and discloses contradictions within these notions.

The Empire has lost its own particular claim of civilization because it failed to preserve and promulgate the rule of its own laws. The narrator thinks, “I wanted to live outside history. I wanted to live outside the history that Empire imposes on its subjects, even its lost subjects” (169). The false history created by the Empire about those natives is partial. The desire to escape from the colonizers history entails the end of the Empire's

dominancy and beginning of the own history of the non-western's culture, custom and their own behaviour without any falsified images as created by the so-called civilized cultural group.

The Europeans always claim that they are in the non-west land to civilize and order the mysterious land. They think that the non-westerners are the subjects to be taught. The similar intention can be seen through the narrator's speech as he says, "I wish that these barbarians would rise up and teach us a lesson, so that we would learn to respect them" (55). The narrator is quite ambiguous character. He is a prototype for the white narrator in South Africa. The liberal Magistrate constructs for themselves, narratives of identification and empathy with victims of colonization and apartheid. Though he is the defender of the rule of law, in the eyes of colonel Joll he becomes enemy of the state and so he is assaulted and imprisoned. So, he is not without his own twinges of doubt. His focus is on the so-called hierarchy like civilized and barbaric, which is constructed by the people in power.

Barbarism is constituted and designated as the other by the symbolic order of the Empire. It is a narcissistic construct projected by the Empire in terms of counter transference. Barbarism is the speech of the mind or spirit, not the body; and it is the speech of the upper, not the lower classes. But the Englishmen projected it as the quality of the non-westerners and created a "jargon" of their behaviour and represented their own language and behaviour as civilized.

One of the subtlest demonstrations of the power of language is the way, which it provides, through the function of naming, a technique for knowing and understanding colonized place or people. To name the non-western world is to 'understand' it, to know

it and to have control over it. The word 'Barbarians', for instance, is determined by European historical formations, which had little or no relevance to the complex of linguistic cultural and economic factors, which tied and sometimes separated various societies on the same cultural group. To name something as reality and consensus is therefore exerting power over it. In colonial experience the language of the Empire becomes the most potent instrument of cultural control. Thus, by creating the non-westerners as barbarous or other they tried to create their own superiority by giving the self-identification as civilized.

Waiting for the Barbarians constitutes self-realization and the desire of self-realization underlines all of the discourse when the Magistrate says to Colonel Joll, “There were no border troubles before you came” (125). After the Empire established its camp, there started troubles and crimes. The justice and fraternity have gone far from the Empire. The truth and fact is out that the land was peaceful before the colonizers came there with the aim to protect the land and establish peace. But after they came, there was rise in crimes because those Englishmen did it all. After the self-realization the Magistrate remarks again, “Those pitiable prisoners you brought in-are they enemy I must fear? Is that what you say? You are the enemy, Colonel!” (125) . Thus, the Magistrate speaks from within and blames Colonel that; it was he who their enemy is. He realizes that the whole process inflicts brutalities upon the other after self-examining process at the edge of colonialism.

Throughout the text the westerner tried to create the image against so-called diabolic dark and filthy Barbarians. The Eurocentric cultures have constructed their own fragile sense of civilization and identity. The Magistrate understands this and blames the

Colonel saying, “-starting not now but a year ago when you committed your first filthy barbarities here! History will bear me out! . . . You are obscene torturer! You deserve to hang!” (125). Colonel being the colonial official of the Empire, in the name of civilization has inflicted pain and torture to the natives or the colonized. His and Mandel's treatment of the native is no less than barbaric or animalistic one.

The title lends itself to interpretations of the real barbarians who are actually those soldiers from the capital, desired to start a war and clear away the barbarians whom no one has seen. The colonizers spread rumour about the barbarians but through symptomatic reading we find that the barbarians are the Englishmen themselves. As, the people neither live in peace nor save their property and life. As the narrator remarks, “[. . .] By the next day gangs of soldiers have broken in, looted the houses, smashed the furniture, fouled the floors . . . After the meeting the soldiers led a procession through the streets. Doors were kicked in, windows broken a house set on fire. Till late at night there was drinking and carousing on the square” (143).

The barbarity of the English soldiers can be traced more as they didn't pay in the shops and the mothers used to lock their daughters away from them in the fear of being raped. The people complained to Mandel, who was in charge under the emergency powers while Joll was away with his army. Mandel made promise to stop such acts but didn't act. Moreover, we find that Joll blinded the so-called barbarian girl. As she says, “The man brought it very close to my face and made me to look at it. They held my eyelids open . . .After that I could not see properly anymore” (44). Thus, all the natives faced the barbarity and brutality of the colonizers.

The savagery we see and the torture even the Magistrate endures takes center stage and the idea of cultures coming into contact with one another actually takes a back seat, or at least at the microscopic level it loses its focus. He further gives the message to the colonizers to penetrate into the barbarity latent in their own behaviour and respect the diversities of the colonized. Colonizers attempt to prolong colonialism is futile and fallible according to Magistrate. The colonized should get independence from colonialism for the benefit of not only colonizers but also the colonized. Coetzee ironically encounters the barbarity and questions the validity of the colonial enterprise as the civilizing mission.

The so-called barbarians did not come to loot them, but the colonizers themselves looted the people at last. They loaded the women, food, cooking utensils, households' goods, etc. in the cart. The Magistrate elaborates:

The cart is piled high with sacks and kegs from a looted shop, even a small table and two chairs. They unfold a heavy red carpet, spread it over the load, lash it down. There is no protest from the people who stand watching this methodical act of betrayal, but I feel currents of helpless anger all about me. (155)

At last we can clearly picturize that the savagery activities that the colonizers always claimed belonged to the so-called barbarians can be found on themselves. The so-called civilized groups are endowed with the barbarity according to the native people. The proponents of the colonial mission to civilize find themselves disoriented and redundant, deserted in the desert.

Thus, Coetzee in *Waiting for the Barbarians* ironizes through the narrator, Magistrate that barbarism is within them and the task of searching barbarisms in the so-called barbarians is a futile job. Hence, re-viewing the colonizers from another standpoint we can suggest that all those adjectives used to describe the non-westerners can easily be used to describe the colonizers themselves. He explores his ethical concern with truth telling and develops a skeptical mode of Self as he tries to tell the truth about Europeans themselves that there is no concrete ontological barbarism, as there is no final signified.

In a nutshell, Stevenson defines the non-western as cannibalistic, dark, exotic and strange and legitimizes the non-west land showing the colonialist tendency. He tries to establish the self-identity of their own as civilized, by creating the non-westerners as Other and uncivilized in his *Treasure Island*. But Coetzee counters this Eurocentric formation through the activities and symptoms of the colonizers and claims that the so-called civilized group are endowed with barbarity and the constructed binary opposition of civilized versus barbarism or cannibalism is based on futile assumptions in *Waiting for the Barbarians*.

IV. Conclusion

The objective of this study is to problematize the construction of binary opposition of civilization versus cannibalism or barbarism. The symptomatic reading analyses how the western characters in the *Treasure Island* misinterpreted the non-westerners as cannibals and how the colonizers in *Waiting for the Barbarians* articulate their own barbarism.

Stevenson's legitimization creates cannibal in the non-west land. The non-west is misrepresented as dark, alienated, chaotic, exotic and with all other black images. He, being a colonialist exhibits his imperial perspective by viewing the new land with pathological stereotypes of strange and cannibals. In other words, creating the non-westerners as uncivilized he tries to represent the colonizers as civilized, superior and rational. In this process of Self-construction, they misinterpreted the non-western people and culture. But, Coetzee clearly observes this Euro-centric formation of Other and clearly identify the reflection of Self in other by showing the barbarity in the colonizers themselves.

For analyzing the colonialism, symptomatic reading becomes the methodology of countering the colonizers' discourse. It deeply analyzes how the colonial discourse misrepresents the colonized people through their manner and behaviour in relation to European colonizers and non-European colonized.

Stevenson shows will to power over the non-west and creates a discourse. This discourse constructs power and tries to maintain the sense of superiority and authority over time. Stevenson honestly shows politics of power and wealth in his novel. His characters with the modern arms and ammunitions, wine, ship, etc. shows colonial milieu

that helped them in establishing their own supremacy. His characters and their activities highly reflect the colonialist mentality. They quarrel, fight and kill anybody for the possession of treasure. This shows the features of high Victorian colonial era in which period, the Europeans assumed to civilize non-Europeans by imposing authority. So, Stevenson reproduced the imperial ideology and could not go beyond the imperialism of his time.

But Coetzee, ironizes the colonizers who try to create the imperial image of the so-called barbarians. He shows that the colonizers needed the colonized only for fulfilling their desire of showing their superiority. They tried to create their own identity as civilized by creating the non-westerners as inferior and barbaric. The behaviour and treatment of the colonizers to the so-called barbarian girl, prisoners and people clearly picturizes their own barbarism. Thus, through the Magistrate, Coetzee gives the message to the colonizers to view into the barbarity latent in them and respect the behavioural, cultural and ethnical diversities of the colonized.

Stevenson tries in a great extent to create grand narrative without allowing the native to participate in it. His novel is lacking in the non-western people and their voice, though the setting is mostly on and about the island of non-west. He did no justice to the natives, as even though he tries to form a cannibalistic image of the island dweller. All the characters are the Europeans who are more concerned with materialistic purpose and they never hesitate to show their gun power but are unaware of the island dwellers and even the land that possesses the treasure.

In contrast, Coetzee blends the voice of the natives along with the aging man, the narrator. He gets right to the heart of the human condition and those things that allow

good people to get corrupted. He includes the voice of the prisoners along with the blind girl's and those natives. Thus, Coetzee creates meta-narratives in his novel and even gives voice to the so-called barbarians. His narrator fully knows about the land and people where he has been living for many years. He gives true voice to the natives, which gives ontological structure to the subject. Thus, identifying himself with the Empire's torture and humiliation he tries to ironize the so-called civilization of the colonizers.

The word cannibals and barbarians became a purely political figure that tries to displace the original native term and tries to erase its own rhetoricity. These terms are perpetuated by the colonizers and are always involved in the dispossession. These terms are narcissistic construction of the Empire in terms of counter transference. Thus, these terms are the western construct that shows the necessity of the colonizers to construct the barbarians and cannibals for imposing their own civilization.

In literal sense, *Treasure Island* is about the adventurous voyages but in the deeper sense it symbolically mirrors the intention of the Europeans, ie. raping the treasure of the island. The resources of the non-west land have been continuously lifted till there remains nothing to be lifted up. Thus in this process they can do anything like fighting, killing, conspiring, etc. to accomplish their intention. The peaceful and clean environment of the non-west has been dirtied due to bloodshed and introduction of wine. But they never stepped back to claim themselves superior by creating the oppositions as inferior or Other.

Similarly, *Waiting for the Barbarians* clearly visualizes the evil intention and greediness of the so-called white civilizers. Colonel Joll and his army are found not to

protect the land of the so-called barbarians but to loot them and accomplish their selfish desire. They tortured the innocent natives and tried to create barbarism in them. The quite environment has been polluted by blood, tortures and killing. At last, the so-called civilized group lifted everything useful and left the land in wrecked condition.

Thus, this overall picture of these novels reveals how the colonizers constructed the discourse that manipulated the power in order to maintain the sense of superiority and authority over the Other. Discourse, in this sense, becomes an object to legitimize one's "Self" to govern the "Other". Hence, the creation of Self versus Other, civilization versus cannibalism or barbarism, rational versus irrational and such other binary opposition are created by the colonizers or the power holders, based on some futile assumptions can be understood best through the symptomatic reading of a text.

Works Cited

- Aschroft, Bill *et al.*. *Key Concepts in Post-Colonial Studies*. London: Routledge, 2004.
- - -. *The Post- Colonial Studies Reader*. London: Routledge, 1998.
- Boehmer, Elleke. *Colonial and Post colonial Literature*. New York: Oxford UP, 1997
- Bohanman, P.. *Justice and Judgement among the Tiv*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1957.
- Cecil Jane, trans.. *The Journal of Christopher Columbus*. London: Anthony Blond, 1968.
- Cheyfitz, Eric. *The Poetics of Imperialism: Translation and colonization from the Tempest to Tarzan*. Philadelphia: Pennyslavania, 1997.
- Coetzee, J. M., *Waiting for the Barbarians*. New York: Penguin, 1982.
- Comaroff, J. and Comaroff, J.. *Ethnography and historical Imagination*. Boulder: Westview Press, 1992.
- David Atwell. *J. M. Coetzee: South Africa and the politics of writing*. California: University Press, 1993.
- Gandhi, Leela. *Post-Colonial Theory*. New Delhi: Oxford UP, 1998.
- Geertz, Clifford. *The Interpretation of Cultures*. New York: Basic Books, 1973.
- “[http://en. Wikipedia.org/wiki/Talk: Philology](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Talk:Philology)”.
- Jacobs, Jane M. *Edge of Empire*. London: Routledge, 1996.
- Heward, k. Beale. *Theodore Roosevelt and the Rise of America to World Power*. Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 1956.
- Letley, Emma. Introduction. *Treasure Island* by R. L. Stevenson. New York: Oxford UP, 1985. (vii-xxiii)
- Malinowski, B.. *Crime and Custom in Savage Society*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1926.

- Redwood, Rebeca. "Law and Anthropology". *A Companion to Philosophy of Law and Legal Theory* by Dennis Patterson. Massachusetts: Blackwell Publishers, 1996. 398
- Riach, Alan. "Treasure Island and Time" *Childrens Literature in Education*,(1996):182
- Said, Edward. *Orientalism*. London: Vintage, 1979. 1-28
- Sardar, Ziauddin. "Introduction. The A, B, C, D, (and E) of Ashis Nandy".
. . . Nandy, Ashis: *Return from Exile: Alternative Sciences, Illegitimacy of Nationalism, the Savage Mind*. New Delhi: Oxford UP, 1998.
- Slemon, Stephen. "Post-Colonial Critical Theories". *Post colonial Discourses: An Anthology*. Ed. Gregory Castle. Blackwell: Oxford, 2001. 99-116
- Stevenson, Robert Louis. *Treasure Island*. New York: Oxford UP, 1985.
- Thomas, N.. *Colonialism's Culture: Anthropology, Travel, and Government*. Melbourne: Melbourne University Press, 1994. 2
- Wheeler, Michael. *English Fiction of the Victorian Peiroad*. 3rd ed. New York: Longman, 1989.
- Wolf, Eric R.. *Perlious Ideas: Race, Culture, People*. *Current Anthropology*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1994.