

# The Comparable Nuance of Complicity and Resistance in the Development of Postcolonial Theories

**Vania Williany**

Sanata Dharma University, INDONESIA  
 e-mail: vania.williany@gmail.com

## ABSTRACT

This article will explain the issues of complicity and resistance following the significant theories on postcolonial studies. The discussion involves the postcolonial theories developed by Aime Cesaire, Edward Said, Gayatri Spivak, and Homi Bhabha. Overall, there is a comparable nuance on complicity and resistance in postcolonial theories. Complicity on power domination is seen as manipulative by Cesaire and Said. However, Spivak and Bhabha perceive that being compliant to power domination is unavoidable as knowledge has been tainted by the interest of power controller. In scrutinizing resistance, Cesaire and Said expose the clear violence of colonialism and attack colonial discourse by uncovering the unjustifiable representations. Meanwhile, Spivak and Bhabha argue that the resistance is subtly done without neglecting the tainted knowledge and cultural difference, thus, more negotiable cultural resistances are offered. To consolidate the discussion, a reading of Achebe's short story entitled "Chike's School Days" is included in this article.

Keywords: Postcolonial theories, complicity, resistance, colonizer, colonized.

## INTRODUCTION

Postcolonial criticism flourished as an established literary theory in the 1970s. Postcolonialism is interested in studying the effects of colonialism experienced by formerly colonized peoples in their cultures and societies. Accordingly, the term 'postcolonialism' has been utilized by critics referring to a variety of cultural effects of colonialism (Aschroft et al, 2007, p. 168).

However, the term 'post-colonial' is also used straightforwardly to address 'anti-colonial' and to be synonymous with 'post-independence', given the fact that there is the existence of post-colonial state. As postcolonial critics agree upon; the independence era of nation-state does not end the process of colonization. Within a post-independence nation-state, there are still the effects and resistances toward colonization in the past.

Indeed, the meaning of the term 'postcolonialism' becomes problematic. This is due to the overlapping notion of 'postcolonialism' itself. Both discursive dialogue upon the cultural effects of colonialism on colonizer and colonized and the essential spirit of 'anti-colonialism' coexist. On one hand, within its ideological meaning, 'post-colonial' criticism is beneficial to revisiting, remembering, and interrogating the colonial past as a part of decolonizing process in post-

independence nation-state. On the other hand, post-colonial theory will disclose the troubling and troubled reciprocal antagonism between colonizer and colonized to discern the ambivalent relationship between them (Gandhi, 1998). Hence, we can see that there are complicities and resistances in the development of postcolonial theory.

This paper will explain the issues of complicity and resistance following the significant theories on post-colonial studies. The discussion involves the theories of noteworthy postcolonial critics such as Aime Cesaire, Edward Said, Gayatri Spivak, and Homi Bhabha. Overall, there is a comparable nuance on complicity and resistance in postcolonial theories developed by those thinkers. Complicity on power domination is seen as manipulative and subjugating by Cesaire and Said. However, Spivak and Bhabha perceive that being compliant to power domination is unavoidable as knowledge and theory have been tainted by the interest of power controller. In terms of resistance, Cesaire and Said expose the clear violence of colonialism and attack colonial discourse by uncovering the unjustifiable representations done by colonizer to colonized. On the other hand, Spivak and Bhabha argue that the resistance should be subtly done without neglecting the tainted knowledge and cultural difference. Thus, more negotiable cultural resistances such as strategic essentialism and ambivalence as well as hybridity are offered.

## POSTCOLONIAL COMPLICITY

Discussing the issue of postcolonial complicity means we delve into the justification of colonialism. In fact, the central idea to validate colonialism is segregation based on race. Cesaire first identified this when he argued that Marxism does not answer the problem of colonial question. He states that “racism, cannot be subordinated to the class struggle” (2000, 25). Supporting this, Cesaire elucidated his analysis on European’s pseudo-humanism in treating colonized as foreign workers. Colonizer employs sociology as a scientific approach to categorize the foreign workers and their capabilities of working based on their race. Deconstructing the work of Renan, a French humanist, Cesaire reveals that racial segregation is used as a legitimate tool justifying European as a superior race and as the master. European controls the colonizer by treating them as workers and slaves. These are some examples to illustrate how European justifies racial segregation in colonialism. First, Renan wrote that Chinese people were excellent in manual dexterity thus, they were suitable to work in government administration. Meanwhile, Africans who were physically strong should work in agriculture as laborers. Europeans surely become masters and soldiers above them. Hence, Cesaire opined that the very humanism which established modern West justifies slavery, colonialism, and genocide; and racial crisis exists at its center. This shows that behind the validity of colonialism there is complicity on the pseudo-humanism confirmed by sociology as the scientific knowledge, supporting racial discrimination to subdue the Colonized.

Indeed, Cesaire’s study begins with the question of colonialism. Western settlers do come to the colonies for the sake of their easier life and substantial profit (Memmi, 2003, pp. 3-4). It is because the colonies can provide precious natural resources and human resources from different lands at the lowest cost to support the Western trades. The Western settlers can also establish and control new markets in the colonies. This way, European colonizer claims itself as ‘civilized’ subject. Colonizer does explore the world calling themselves ‘settler colonies’ performing the humanist duties of evangelization, philanthropic enterprise, helping to overcome ignorance, curing the disease, and most importantly extending the glory of God. However, all these humanist justifications of colonialism and colonialist roles above are refuted harshly by Aime Cesaire. To Cesaire, colonization is the exploration to gain economic profit merely for the colonizer. What the colonizer does is overshadowing this injustice by a mask in the form of civilization. In reality, the colonizer creates antagonistic economies for their own internal benefit (2000).

Thereafter, Said attempts to dissect how Foucault’s discourse and power influence the complicity of knowledge production within Orientalism study. Said explained that “Orientalism can be discussed and analyzed as the corporate institution for dealing with the Orient by making statements about it, authorizing views of it, describe it, by teaching it, settling it, ruling over it. In short, Orientalism is a western style for dominating, restructuring, and having authority over the Orient” (Said, 1979, p.3). In other words, Orientalism is a political doctrine which tries to represent and reinterpret the history of the Orient (East) from the Occident’s (West’s) viewpoints. First, Occident as the power controller institutionalizes the knowledge of Orient by defining who the Orient is, establishing authority upon it, as well as educating and civilizing it. Then, the Occident uses discourse to produce the Orient politically, sociologically, academically, and imaginatively during post-Enlightenment era. This discourse is so powerful that no one can write, think, or act upon the Orient without imposing Orientalism. Thus, as a discourse, Orientalism is not a free subject of thought or action.

Regarding the discussion of discourse, specifically in postcolonial study, there exists a colonial discourse as a term brought by Edward Said borrowed from Foucault’s notion of discourse. Colonial discourse(s) is an idea that demonstrates how colonialism suggests certain ways of seeing, specific modes of understanding the world and one’s place in it that assist in justifying the subservience of colonized peoples to the ‘superior’, civilized order of the western colonizer.

Moreover, Said describes that there is a binary opposition between Occident and Orient. Occident as the holder of power is more dominant than Orient, for Occident represents the Orient as their surrogate and underground self. In short, the West as the ‘Self’ is always perceived in positive terms; as the civilized one. Meanwhile, the representation of the East occurs in more negative terms, as the exotic and immoral ‘Other’. Yet, the relation of the two binary terms is dependent on each other to form a complete meaning. As Barry (2002) says, the East has become the projection of the characteristics which West doesn’t want to acknowledge, or the alter ego of the ‘Self’: the cruelty, sensuality, decadence, laziness and so on. In short, it is the West that actually identifies the East “ontologically and epistemologically in a distance” (Said, 1979, p.1).

Furthermore, Orientalism overlooks the existence of the East or people living in the East. Orientalist is introduced as the term to identify the race of ‘Oriental’, of people living in the Eastern part of the world, such as Far Eastern or Middle Eastern peoples. Those people are considered to be an anonymous race

who can be made known from their race. Again, this consensual manufactured discourse is produced by European colonizer who is maintaining its power domination. The race of people, an identity that is innate, is manipulated to name a number of people in society, whom in essence, are diverse individuals. This shows again how the colonial discourse co-opts postcolonial society.

All these bring about the positive account of power domination through discourse, as Foucault indicated. Thus, in the culture of civil society whereby Occident performs the duty as the 'master' and 'educator', the Orient submits to the Occident's hegemony--referring to Gramsci's remark-- through consent.

However, Gayatri Spivak casts doubt on Cesaire and Said's explication. Spivak indeed stated that knowledge was not innocent. What is meant by 'knowledge is not innocent' is that, Spivak believed that Western knowledge was polluted to facilitate Western's political interest, thus, none of Western knowledge was pure. In specific, Spivak showed that human consciousness was a product of construction from the shifting discourses of power which continuously educate and situate individuals to believe in particular stances and relations. Therefore, it is impossible for any individuals to construct their identities independently. In fact, individuals have their identities written for them from the power controller. The abolition of Sati by the British colonizer--the women sacrifice following their husband's death--in India can illustrate this. British Colonizer claims that the eradication of Sati is a salvation attempt to protect Indian women's lives. This knowledge spreads the idea that Indians are barbarians and British is civilized. It is justifiable for the Colonizer then, to propagate 'White men save Brown women from Brown men'. This knowledge is later manufactured to be a written identity by Colonizers to justify their rules to 'enlighten' and 'civilize' the Colonized. This shows an 'epistemic violence' whereby the truth the individuals get is constructed from knowledge that is polluted by the interest of the authority and power, and that knowledge is not neutral as Foucault and Deleuze stated. Indeed, it is epistemic violence which subtly subjugates colonial subjects compliant to the colonial rule.

The epistemic violence as mentioned above indeed marks the existence of subjectivity that also plays a role in producing consent and complicity. In fact, there is discursive analysis of subjectivity in post-colonial study. Aschroft, Griffiths, Tiffin summarize the concept of subjectivities as follows:

The concept of subjectivities problematizes the simple relationship between the individual and

language, replacing human nature with the concept of the production of the human subject through ideology, discourse or language. These are seen as determining factors in the construction of individual identity, which itself becomes an effect rather than a cause of such factors (2007, p. 202).

In regard to the subjectivity addressed in the above quotation, it can be seen that the subjects in postcolonial world, including colonizer and colonized are never in the position of neutral subjects, or of independent entities that are able to make decision based on their pure consideration, unaffected by any external factors such as social, ideological and cultural aspects. In fact, what really happens is that individuals in the postcolonial realm are situated in 'production of human subject'. The construction of consciousness of each postcolonial subject establishes upon ideology, discourse or language--those have been tainted by the discourse of colonialism. Therefore, the subjects in the postcolonial realm can never be sovereign for they are constructed by the identity written for them. Consequently, Spivak's framework in scrutinizing the polluted discourse and constructed subjects in postcolonial study illustrates how colonial discourse ideologically, politically and linguistically taints the consciousness of the postcolonial subject with colonial interests to tacitly subjugate the colonizer complying with the colonial discourse.

Next, Bhabha extends Spivak's notion on rejecting binary opposition in postcolonialism. Bhabha indeed scrutinizes how binary opposition is created to situate the relation of power in the postcolonial realm. Bhabha explains that there is a social antagonism which is perceived as binarism; yet, it is ahistorical. To be more precise, Bhabha affirms that binary oppositions of Oppressor (Occident) versus Oppressed (Orient), center versus periphery, and positive image versus negative image are all coopted with the ideology of imperialism, as 'Self' and 'Other' respectively. Bhabha also mentions that each binary similarly reflects 'mirror image'. Hence, Bhabha contends that the binary of the social antagonism as mentioned above, whose spirit is anti-essentialism, is not pure. Consequently, the 'critical theory' to map the binaries which is repeatedly grasped as the notion from depoliticized Eurocentric critic is also tacitly influenced by imperialist ideology. Critical theory then, Bhabha said, must be regarded as the 'Other'; as subversive and transgressive when it is produced through oppositional cultural practices (Bhabha, 1994, p. 20).

Moreover, looking at the colonial discourse that has been represented by the knowledge of the Orient,

Bhabha argues that the colonial discourse cannot work upon black and white relations of binary oppositions blatantly dismantled by Cesaire and theorized by Said. Thus, the colonial identity is complex, as explicated by Childs and Williams, as follows:

Identity for colonizer is no less complex... Colonial identity is a problem arising between colonizer and colonized, a 'nervous condition' of fantasy and desire, a violent, neurotic relation for (it is a) different (form of) the civilizing ambitions of colonial government, society, and missionaries (1997, p.23).

The complicity of colonizer and colonized manifested on the critical theory of postcolonialism, thus, is inevitable. This is because both colonizer and colonized reflect their mirror image on each of their representation of identity and there is 'nervous condition' that makes colonial identity complex, whereby there is complicity to colonial discourse which civilizes and tacitly forces the colonized to assimilate, being identical with the colonizer. Also, the colonizer's identity is influenced by the fact that the colonizer has learned so much about the colonized localities and nativism. Thus, the colonizer wants the colonized to get educated and Europeanized.

## POSTCOLONIAL RESISTANCE

Two decades before its 'hype' as a well-discussed theory, the seed of postcolonial resistance had been initiated by Aime Cesaire. Cesaire's 'Discourse of Colonialism' indeed dismantles the blatant nature of violent colonialism through three revelations. Firstly, Cesaire discovers that the civilization claimed by the colonizer in colonies is deception. There are two points justifying his argument. To start, Cesaire states that economic disparity cannot be solved by the colonizer as a power holder. In fact, the colonizer creates antagonistic economies for their own internal benefit (2000). Next, Cesaire states that there is superior order imposed with dishonest equations using religion. For instance, Christianity as the religion brought by the colonizer is seen as salvation, whilst local paganism is regarded as savagery. Again, the victims of this unequal order are the colonized people. Second, Cesaire decivilizes and brutalizes the colonizer. In other words, Cesaire refutes the colonizer's cruelty by showing the severity of colonialism. What Cesaire found is that European colonizer's barbarity is similar to Hitler's Nazism. For example, European Colonizer reinforces the inferiority by degenerating races through Renan's pseudo-humanism. People from India then all are seen as 'coolies' and Africans are 'niggers'. Renan

even emphasized that those inferior races were "a kind of public purposes". To be more precise, people of inferior races are justifiable to work as slaves, as administrative volunteers, for the sake of colonial's interest. Hence, Cesaire considers a civilization justifying colonialism as a sick and morally diseased civilization.

Third, Cesaire perceives colonization as thingification. By 'thingification' Cesaire means the colonizer treats the colonized as only a thing, and colonialism is right to alter the colony in all aspects. Indeed, colonialism has changed the nature of colonized society. Previously, the colonized had been communal, cooperative, democratic, ante-capitalist as well as anti-capitalist. However, after colonialism took place, the colonized society had been drained of their essence; many of them were killed and suffered from inferiority complex; also, their natural economies had been disrupted. Far from humanism, instead, Cesaire makes the analogy that if the colonizer acted as an animal competing to dominate, the colonizer would see the colonized as weaker animals he must overpower.

Being in line with Cesaire, Said in his book 'Orientalism' tries to display justification of colonial rules through Foucault's discourse and knowledge. In fact, Said undoes the discourse of Orientalism with three qualifications. The first qualification lies within Orientalism reality. To be more precise, Said stated that as a study, Orientalism does refer to a specific geographic area. However, the representation of the image of Orient in Orientalism is just the imagination of the Occident. Orient is seen as mystical, exotic and seductive. Yet again, it is merely the image assumed by the Occident that lacks correspondence to the actual Orient.

The second qualification caters to how Orientalism is man-made. By man-made, Said means that discourse on Orientalism exists to represent the Other. The 'Other' is perceived as the homogenous anonymous masses who do actions based on racial considerations (for they are Asiatics, Blacks, or Orientals). Said illustrates this by explaining how Flaubert spoke and represented the Egyptian woman he met from his own perspective and never did the woman speak for herself. The Egyptian woman or Kuchuk Hanem is represented from her being racially 'Other' as someone who "does not fatigue, does not have either self-consciousness or consciousness for others". Hence, 'Oriental' is based on the Oriental's difference with its weakness to confirm the Occident's superiority.

The third qualification pulls apart the structures of myths and truths of Orientalism. As a discourse, Orientalism is very strong. Its manipulation is rigid and sustainable. Moreover, Orientalism even infiltrates teachable wisdoms such as scholarly texts and academic texts. This can happen due to what Gramsci refer as a cultural leadership which controls society. The cultural leadership consists of institutions whereby society is made to have consent to the subtle domination. Several examples of institutions include schools, families and unions which tacitly co-opt society in grasping the Oriental knowledge. This tacit knowledge is also supported by state institutions such as military and government. Thus, colonial discourse can retain for a very long time. Besides, this colonial discourse is far from being a 'true' knowledge, since this discourse has been tainted by highly organized political circumstances which exist to internalize oppression to the Other.

Furthermore, Childs and Williams explain that the representations of the Orient as manipulated by the West will be an unfair knowledge toward the Orient. They elaborate their analysis, as follows:

it will become a scandal, however, in a situation such as that examined by Said, where one group or culture (here, Orientalists or the West in general) decide that another group is incapable of representing themselves, and undertake to speak, write, and act on their behalf—about them, for them, without consulting them (1997, p. 104).

At this stage, the notion of the Orient will be substituted by the knowledge of the Occident who decides the reality of the Orient. The Occident arranges the substitution for their "indigenous rules, [by] representing the colonized peoples by speaking and acting on their behalf" (Childs and Williams, 1997, p.105). Said's revelation on Orientalism study then is seen as an important resistance. This is because Said has managed to depict colonial control, manipulation, and incorporation of what is manifested differently about the alternative and novel world of the 'Orient'.

Different from Cesaire and Said who articulate the clear violence of colonialism while resisting colonial discourse by taking apart the unjustifiable representations, Spivak, as a 'practical deconstructionist Marxist feminist' has suggested a significant question in criticizing postcolonial studies. In her essay "Can the Subaltern Speak", she tries to topple the binary opposition between subject and object, self and other, Occident and Orient, center and marginal and the majority and minority. Instead, she strongly inquires

whether the subaltern can speak. The subaltern she addresses is the marginalized peoples in India, particularly the Indian women, who did not belong to the colonial elite. Indian subalterns can have a variety of heterogeneous status, from being minor rural aristocracy, needy landlords, rich peasants and upper-middle class peasants. Indian subalterns, specifically women, then, posit in ambiguous relation towards power assigned to them. In reality, these subalterns have never been fully compliant to the colonial rule nor taking the colonial subjectification as a part of their own resonant identity. Due to the existence of the question on gender and sexual difference in the discourse of subaltern, Spivak is certain that it is impossible for the subalterns to speak up their aspirations because they are separated by gender, class, caste, region, religion and other narratives. These separations do not let these subalterns stand up in unity. Therefore, Spivak further asks the suitable actor who will pronounce the subaltern's difference and the effective way to articulate the subaltern's difference.

In resisting the colonial discourse, in fact, Spivak disapproves the 'essentialism', or the belief that particular people or entities share some basic, fixed "nature" enabling them to get a secured category in society. In specific, Spivak subverts Marxist ideology criticizing the leftist that they overgeneralize the essence of the subalterns. For example, they regard the third world people to possess the same identity and issues. In fact, this essentialism will give three negative impacts on the subalterns. First, it opens the gate towards outside party to reform the subalterns; that may be another form of colonialism. Second, it gives a Eurocentric logo-centrism of cultural unity among heterogenous people that undermines localities. Lastly, the subalterns will be dependent on the Western intellectuals to speak for their conditions rather than being encouraged to speak for themselves. Specifically, in the last point, Spivak utilizes the suicide of Bhubaneswari as the example of how the outside factors affect the subaltern. Though Bhubaneswari committed suicide as a form of protest towards zero support of communication in her organization, her family and surroundings regarded her action as an effect of failing love. This illustrates how the subaltern's attempt to speak cannot rewrite the Western's construction of truth.

Fascinatingly, Spivak then suggested 'strategic essentialism' as a significant solution to the subaltern's voice. By 'strategic essentialism' she means a strategic use of positivist essentialism in a scrupulously visible political interest. A sensible understanding of 'strategic' here is 'pragmatic', since

Spivak sees this essentialism as having little to do with theory; it rather defines a certain political practice. Hence, 'strategic essentialism' can give awareness of the actualities experienced by the subalterns. For example, Spivak proposed the term 'feminization of poverty' focusing on the highly-gendered nature of poverty referring to more women. In other words, the women are suffering as poor adults, due to employment policy, as well as divorce and settlement regulations. Applying this, Spivak believed the resistance towards the poverty of women, as disenfranchised sex will be more tangible. Strategic essentialism may thus be seen as a political strategy whereby differences (within a group) are temporarily moderated and unity is expected for the sake of achieving political goals. Even though strategic essentialism may overthrow oppressive structures and decrease suffering, Spivak reminds that this essentialism should not be allowed to influence world views and encourage reductive views against the human dignity. Therefore, the resistance on Spivak's view is no longer blaming the antagonism of the dominant colonial rule. Fascinatingly, she makes use of the practical essentialist opposition to empower the marginalized subaltern resisting colonial discourse.

In addition, akin to Spivak, Bhabha further interrogates whether representation derived from Western theory might also be another power strategy to produce discourse over the 'other'. To find out the answer, Bhabha scrutinizes whether there is a new language of the developed critical theory (following the poststructuralist's notions) that can facilitate the shifting limitations of cultural displacement. In fact, Bhabha discovers that the new language does exist; it commutes in-between the binary opposition of the colonizer and the colonized identity. Furthermore, he asked what the function of this committed theory might be. Bhabha then utilizes Stuart Hall's theory on 'imagination' to unearth the recognition of relation between theory and political practices that ruins traditional divisions between 'authentic' sense of 'national' culture or an 'organic' intellectual. Bhabha observes that the 'true' is always marked and informed by 'ambivalence' since its emergence process is going within the negotiation of oppositional and antagonistic elements. From this, Bhabha formulates the enunciation of a language of critique, which is different from pure teleology and traditionalist narrative. This language, Bhabha said, opens up a place of translation that is there will be opportunities to interpret the language as a place of 'hybridity', which is 'neither the one nor the other'. Hybridity then, Bhabha (1994) explains:

focuses on those moments or processes that are produced in the articulation of cultural differences. These 'in-between' spaces provide the

terrain for elaborating strategies of selfhood—singular or communal—that initiate new signs of identity, and innovative sites of collaboration, and contestation, in the act of defining the idea of society itself (p. 1).

Following his finding of hybridity, Bhabha suggests a term called cultural difference. Bhabha mentioned that cultural difference is a process of defining identity, an encounter of different sign, meaning, taste, and interpretation, as well as becoming the effect of misread sign, meaning, and clash between cultures. Bhabha suggested that the enunciation of cultural difference is more significant to accommodate hybridity. He supported this by saying that cultural difference emerged to create a new culture—called 'Third Space' that is different from traditionalist narrative and teleological historicist. Thus, resistance in Bhabha's understanding is built upon the notion of negotiation between the subjects interacting in postcolonial world. The cultural difference is in fact dominating each other, but through their contestations, there is a realization of hybridity as the result of the indivisible colonial subject's ambivalence.

It can be seen that hybridity then resists the colonial discourse and dominant cultural narratives. A range of attachments and absences of the premise of dominant culture is deconstructed by the presence of the formerly-absent subjects in the mainstream discourse. Again, the dominant culture has been polluted by the differences on linguistic and racial 'Self'. Therefore, Bhabha interprets 'hybridity' as the counter narratives. To be more precise, the hybridity supporters will suggest two points. Firstly, the colonialist's ambivalence is a noticeable depiction of uncertainty. Secondly, the movement of Colonizer 'slaves' from their marginalized sphere to the home of the Colonized 'masters' creates a causal positive change in terms of constructing the 'Third World', to generate 'cracks' in the solid structures of colonialism happened to maintain its existence. Bhabha, then, envisions the hybridity as empowering and Third Space as a positive sphere which diminishes the politics of polarity and emerges hybrid individuals in the postcolonial world.

#### **EXAMPLE OF COMPLICITY AND RESISTANCE IN SHORT STORY: 'CHIKE'S SCHOOL DAYS' BY CHINUA ACHEBE**

In the fourth part of discussion, there would be an example presented to illustrate postcolonial complicity and resistance. The study focuses on analyzing Achebe's short story entitled "Chike's School Days" (1973). Here is the summary of the short story:

Sarah and Amos had five daughters; therefore, they were thrilled to welcome their last child who was a boy. He was named John Chike Obiajulu. John was his Baptist name and Obiajulu specially meant 'the only son'. Chike was educated through 'white man' education, like his five older sisters. Chike got a bell and he would ring it to call up the family members to pray together. Furthermore, Chike refused to eat Nigerian traditional food called 'yam' offered by his neighbor, saying that the food was 'heathen food', and so he followed his mother's advice not to eat such food. The neighbor was mad, but she managed to control herself not to burst out. The community was also wondering, why Sarah as an Osu (Nigerian's untouchable class) could be very proud of herself after being a Christian.

Initially, Sarah was an Osu, yet Amos was not. People considered him as crazy when he married her in the name of Christianity and changed his social status. Amos' mother, Elizabeth, a recently converted Christian, was horrified too. She begged Amos to cancel his marriage. Seeing her son's stubbornness, she even went to a diviner to stop him. When Amos did not change his mind and still married Sarah, Elizabeth was outraged and returned to her native religion.

When Chike was six or seven years old, he went to the village school where he learned religions and language. Though he disliked arithmetic, he was especially fond of English, for he loved stories, songs and the sound of English words. Despite his inability to grasp the meaning, to him, English language 'was like a window through which he saw in the distance a strange, magical new world. And he was happy.' (Achebe, 1973).

Analyzing the text using postcolonial approach of binary opposition on Orientalism, there is a conflict between tradition versus modernity. The conflict is seen when Chike rejects Nigerian traditional food, 'yam', offered by his neighbor. Chike's refusal was seen when he 'heartily shook his head and said, "We don't eat heathen food"' (Achebe, 1973). This refutation causes Chike's neighbor to get angry, yet, she still controls herself. However, the neighbor still wonders why Chike, an Osu boy, could act very arrogantly. This negative response Chike gave to the neighbor and the neighbor's stigma about Osu clearly illustrates how tradition and modernity do not go hand in hand in the story. On Chike's perspective, the Christian modernity introduced by the white colonizer infiltrates Osu tradition. Furthermore, colonizer introduces that modernity is of the higher primacy than Nigerian traditional paganism that is seen as

lower, as savagery. Christianity which symbolizes modernity escalates the social status of Osu people like Chike and his family to be superior, for they think they are practicing 'white man' values. It reflects also the success of White's tacit assimilation as Cesaire said, the very subtle colonial agenda to subdue the colonized, in this case, Nigerian wanting to be White like Chike and his family. However, this superior act is seen unacceptable in the eyes of the neighbor who still holds on to tradition. Here, the neighbor still upholds the value of tradition as the higher primacy than the modernity. Therefore, the neighbor resists the colonial discourse of modernity by staying true to hold the localities—a weaponry discourse as suggested by Cesaire as well.

Second, there are also contrasts in two situations, which are the marriage of Amos and the school days of Chike. The situation before the marriage of Amos was full of disputes. The disagreement is reflected by Amos' mother who got offended by Amos' decision to marry an Untouchable woman. The narrative pace was quite fast, exposing the disputes of Amos and his mother and there was a rapid twist on his mother returning to tradition. This shows a blatant resistance of colonialism as suggested by Cesaire and Said. Meanwhile, in narrating the school days of Chike, there was a lively situation told in a leisurely manner of the narrator. This reflects the hopeful Chike who got educated in a Westernized school. This shows a more negotiable resistance of strategic essentialism and hybridity. Chike, knowing that he is Black, native, and not yet exposed to so much knowledge, apparently is attracted so much by education offered by the white colonizer. He enjoys going to school and learning English. Chike indeed has entered hybridity stage whereby he is aware that he is not as smart as his English teacher, but he can hum some English sentences and that makes him feel accomplished to see himself as a progressive learner. He even imagines a new world he may enter through education. Those two scenes can be said as the beginning of Third Space realization of Chike shown in the story. First, Chike is aware that he learns a new foreign language called English, that he will never use in his daily life as a Nigerian boy, but this language increases his confidence to be a 'smart student' when he uses the language correctly in front of his English teacher. English language mastery, then, is the Third Space Chike should embrace to be recognized as an intelligent Nigerian student. Second, Chike learns to understand that by studying the English language, and pursuing education, he will have more opportunities to get new knowledge which excites him. He gradually grasps that knowledge from Western school is the 'Third Space', the alternative to his strict

tradition, thus, obtaining a lot of knowledge enables him to have another option in life, rather than being destined to live with local culture.

Third, applying Said's theory on representation and Bhabha's theory on ambivalence, it can be seen that the tradition is not always overlooked in the short story. In fact, there are two points where tradition can be seen as equal to modernity.

Firstly, it is in the naming system. The baby naming in Nigerian local language indeed has meaning. It is seen by the last name of Chike, 'Obiajulu', which has a significant meaning of 'the only son'. Meanwhile, his first name, 'John', an English name, does not represent a special meaning; except showing that his family mimics White language to seem superior. The juxtaposition of the naming system infers that Nigerian tradition can have more meaningful conventions compared to English culture that somehow is vain. Representations of colonized culture by colonial discourse is then ambivalent, because in mirroring the colonizer image to colonized image, the colonized culture has more meaning than the culture introduced by the colonizer.

Secondly, there is the discussion about the discourse of 'white' and 'superiority'. Being raised up in 'the ways of the white man' and going to the white school make Chike feel superior. He even rejects the traditional food prepared by his neighbor in a rude way. On the contrary, responding to Chike's unfriendliness, his neighbor, though annoyed, does not talk back and just sighs. This is an ironic situation. Indeed, Chike who has been educated in the 'white way' does not act in a polite sense. He tries to assimilate and mimic the white colonizer. It is his neighbor, who does not get educated in the 'white' manner, that shows a civilized response by controlling herself and not arguing back. As a matter of fact, the neighbor who is seen as 'black' or 'African' with 'age-old custom' can show a more civilized deed. This illustrates that being 'White' and modern is not always the best. 'White' is just an apparent identity, and to identify someone as 'white' without rendering his merits does not give any gain. This ambivalent situation can show that there is a complicit or coopted situation shown by Chike's mimicry and there is a strategic essentialist resistance shown by the neighbor.

## CONCLUSION

To sum up, there is a similar nuance on complicity and resistance in postcolonial theory. Césaire and Said view that postcolonial complicity on power domination is seen as deceiving and overpowering. Meanwhile, Spivak and Bhabha agree that being

compliant to power domination is inevitable since there has been epistemic violence and mirror image projected in power relation of Colonizer and Colonized. Towards the issue of resistance, Césaire and Said bare the antagonism of colonialism and the unjustifiable discourse of representations. Césaire carefully scrutinizes how colonialism is indeed causing fatal economic disparity through an exploitation on colony's nature and colonized manpower. Besides, colonial discourse imposed by colonizer creates rigid binary opposition based on power domination and manufactures tainted the colonial knowledge. Nonetheless, Spivak and Bhabha favor that resistance against colonial rule might be manifested by tacit practices. Still, Spivak specifically warns about the severity of 'essentialism' and Bhabha reminds the complexity of colonial identity in postcolonial world. Therefore, they propose cultural resistances such as strategic essentialism, ambivalence, and hybridity as the alternatives of discursive resolution resisting colonial discourse. Lastly, a reading of Achebe's short story entitled "Chike's School Days" included in this article has shown complicity and resistance of postcolonial situation conveyed by a literary work.

## REFERENCES

- Ashcroft, B., Griffiths, G., & Tiffin, H. (2007). *Post-colonial studies: The key concepts*. London: Routledge.
- Bhabha, H.K. (1994). *The location of culture*. London: Routledge.
- Césaire, A., & Kelley, R. D. G. (2000). *Discourse on colonialism*. New York: Monthly Review Press.
- Eide, Elisabeth. (2016). *Strategic essentialism*. In *The Wiley-Blackwell's encyclopedia of gender and sexuality studies*. Retrieved from (Academia.edu [https://www.academia.edu/26133369/Strategic\\_Essentialism](https://www.academia.edu/26133369/Strategic_Essentialism)) (Accessed on 29 March 2019)
- Gandhi, L. (1998). *Postcolonial theory: A critical introduction*. New York: Columbia University Press. Retrieved from <https://blogs.baruch.cuny.edu/eng2850kmaspring2017/files/2017/01/Achebe-Chikes-School-Days.pdf>. (Accessed 9 April 2019)
- Keramafar, H. (2018). The homeland of stereotypes. *K@ta Journal*, 53-59.
- Lomba, A. (2005). *Colonialism/postcolonialism*. London: Routledge.
- Lowe, L. (1991). Orient as woman, orientalism as sentimentalism: Flaubert. In *Critical terrains: French and British orientalisms* (pp. 75-101). Ithaca; London: Cornell University Press. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.7591/j.ctt207g5rk.6> (Accessed on 29 March 2019)



Memmi, A. (2003). *The colonizer and the colonized*. London: Earthscan.

Rizi, H. S. (2018). King Lear: A negatively capable outsider. *K@ta Journal*, 76-82.

Said, E. W. (1979). *Orientalism*. New York: Pantheon Books.

Spivak, G. C. (1988). *Can the subaltern speak?* Basingstoke: Macmillan.