CHAPTER 2

ORIENTALISM, DIASPORA, HYBRIDITY, RESISTANCE AND IDENTITY

2.1 Introduction

In this chapter two, the writer presents the theories that will be used to analyze the problems in chapter three. Chapter two consists of Orientalism as the background of Postcolonial, Diaspora, Hybridity, Resistance, and Identity as the theories that he will explain and elaborate and also as the background for the reader to know and understand before reading in chapter three.

2.2 Orientalism by Edward Said

Edward Said evaluation and critique of the set of beliefs known as Orientalism forms gives an important background for Postcolonial studies.

Edward Said (b.1935) is a Palestinian, who was educated in Palestine and Egypt when those countries were under British jurisdiction, and subsequently in the United States. Said was one of the first critics in America to respond to the challenge of European structuralist and post-structuralist theory. (Lodge, David. p.271)

Edward Said rejects the declaration from Western as the Superior people while the others are Inferior as he put his thought in his theory, Orientalism.

Said, Edward (1978) in Orientalism:

“Orientalism is a style of thought based upon an ontological and epistemological distinction made between ‘the Orient’ and (most of the time) ‘the Occident’.” (Ashcroft, Bill, et al. 1995:88)
Edward Said also points out that *Orientalism* occupies three overlapping domains:

“It designates firstly the 4000-year history of and cultural relations between Europe and Asia; secondly the scientific discipline producing specialists in Oriental languages and culture from the early nineteenth century; and thirdly the long-term images, stereotypes and general ideology about ‘the Orient’ as the ‘Other’, constructed by generations of Western scholars, which produce myths about the laziness, deceit, and irrationality of orientals.” (Selden, Raman and Widdowson, Peter. 1993:190)

From the above, we can say that *Orientalism* is an ideology which talks about the negative perspective from Western toward Asian as they call themselves as Superior while the others as Inferior.

### 2.3 Diaspora

Cohen, Robin (1997) defines the common elements in all forms of diaspora that people who live outside their “natal (or imagined natal) territories” and recognize that their traditional homelands are reflected deeply in the languages they speak, religions they adopt, and the cultures they produce. And diaspora is broken down into various forms in *victim diasporas, labour diasporas, imperial diasporas, trade diasporas, homeland diasporas, and cultural diasporas*.

According to Sutrisno, Mudji (2007:259):

“Diaspora adalah jejaring yang tersebar dari orang-orang yang secara kultur dan etnis saling terkait. Konsep-konsep yang terkait dengan istilah ini meliputi ide perjalanan, migrasi, ketersebaran, perpindahan (displacement), rumah dan batas. Pada umumnya, meskipun tidak selalu demikian, mempunyai konotasi makhluk asing (*alien*), orang-orang yang tercerabut dari tempat asalnya (*displaced person*), pengembara (*wanderers*), perpindahan secara paksa.”

“Diaspora is a network which is spreaded by people who are connected culturally and ethnically. The concepts which are connected with this term consist of the idea of traveling, migration, spreading,
displacement, home and limitation. Generally, most of them have connotation with an alien, a displaced person, wanderers, moving with a force."

As we can conclude from above, diaspora is the conflicts which happen to the immigrants problems as they live in the new culture which need some adaptation to settle with the new culture.

2.4 Hybridity


“hybridity occurs in post-colonial societies both as a result of conscious moments of cultural suppression, as when the colonial power invades to consolidates political and economic control, or when settler-invaders dispossess indigenous people and force them to ‘assimilate’ to new social patterns. It may also occur in the later periods when patterns of immigration from the metropolitan societies and from other imperial areas of influence (e.g. indentured labourers from India and China) continue to produce complex cultural palimpsests with the post-colonised world.”

According to Sutrisno, Mudji (2007:265):

“Hibriditas adalah pencampuran unsur-unsur budaya yang berbeda-beda untuk menciptakan gugus makna dan identitas yang baru. Konsep hybrid mengaburkan batasan-batasan budaya yang sebelumnya ada menjadi sebuah proses fusi (peleburan) atau kreolisasi.”

“Hybridity is a mixture of different culture elements to create a new a meaning and identity. Hybridity concept is blurring the culture’s lines, which already exist, into a process of fusion or creolisation”

It can be concluded that hybridity is the cultural mixing process from the different culture that will make a new culture as it is fluids into one culture which will be celebrated.
2.4.1 Cultural Diversity and Cultural Differences

According to Homi K. Bhabha (1981) in *The Commitment to Theory* states:

“Cultural diversity is an epistemological object-culture as an object of
empirical knowledge-whereas cultural differences is the process of the
enunciation of culture as ‘knowledgeable’, authoritative, adequate to
the construction of systems of cultural identification.” (Ashcroft, Bill et
al. 1995:206)

It can be said that cultural diversity talks about the differences in culture in each of states
or city in a country from geographical position while cultural differences explain the
process how each geographical area has its own culture.

2.5 Resistance

According to Bill Ashcroft in *Post-Colonial Transformation*, resistance is refusal
to absorbed, taking the array of influences exerted by the dominating power, and altering
them into tools for expressing it deeply held sense of identity and cultural being.
(2001:20)

It can be said that resistance is a refusal toward something that people are not feel so
comfort if they follow it and they will hold what they feel comfort for them.

2.5.1 Counter-Discourse

In Foucault’s formulation, discourse is an intimate a system of social knowledge
with-well-bounded rules of inclusion and exclusion: one is either in a discourse or not;
one either adheres to it or not, in which case one might subscribe to an opposing

Bill Ashcroft comments toward Foucault’s formulation about discourse as he states:
“But no discourse is seamless and totalitarian, no discourse is immune to doubt and reflexivity and the fractures which open up within it allow for forms of resistance which operate within discourse, on many of its own terms.” (2001:32-33)

Bill Ashcroft (2001:33) comments about discourse in his perception that a discourse such as imperial discourse may be so pervasive and embracing in postcolonial life that the notion of any discourse beyond it seems remote. A powerful Eurocentric discourse such as literature represents itself as ‘natural’, universal and timeless, and yet it exposes itself, by virtue of such claims, to continual resistances and contradiction. And all those particularly clear in the form of counter-discourse called ‘canonical counter-discourse’ or ‘writing back’, which operates within the discourse of literature itself. Canonical literary texts are ‘consumed’ in such a way that they become the basis for resistant, appropriated versions which subtly subvert the values and political assumptions of the originals. The significance of the texts that are re-read is that they offer powerful allegories of European culture, allegories through which life in post-colonial societies has itself been ‘written’.

2.6 Identity

“The problem of identity at a time is similar: it seems possible that more than one person (or personality) should share the same body and brain, so what makes up the unity of experience and thought that we each enjoy in normal living? The problems of personal identity were first highlighted in the modern era by Locke, who recognized that the idea that the sameness of a person might consist in the sameness of underlying mental substance, the solution proposed by Descartes, was incapable of providing any criterion for use in the ordinary empirical world, for instance in connection with the just attribution of responsibility for past action. Locke's own solution lay in the unity of consciousness, and in particular in the presence of memory of past actions; this account has been criticized as either circular, since memory presupposes identity, or insufficiently consonant with normal practice, since people forget things that they themselves did.”

(http://www.answers.com/topic/personal-identity#Philosophy_Dictionary)
The quotation above talks about the definition of identity based on personal. It is said that the body and mind of person is fix.

And also identity can be defined as stated in below:

“Identity is also forced upon individuals by a system of cultural indoctrination, when the ruling clique dictate on everybody the acceptance of the same language and laws. As a matter of fact, the national identity is essentially a manufactured identity, obtained by crushing local cultures, rather than a real common bond joining people living next to each other.”

(http://www.polyarchy.org/paradigm/english/magic.html#roots)

It can be concluded overall about identity based on above that identity can be judged by personal or in group of cultural as people have their own nationality.