



ORIGINAL RESEARCH PAPER

Civilization: the Dominant's Ideology to Otherness

Amaria Mehdaoui¹

Lecturer of English language and literature at Saida University,
Dr. Moulay Tahar, Saida, Algeria.



(Received: 4 May 2022; Accepted: 8 September 2022; Published: 28 February 2023)

Civilization, although an over-consumed notion used eagerly to differentiate societies' ability to progress/not progress through time and space, taking into consideration internal and external features, challenges the post-colonial pursuit for transforming the colonial discourse into self-empowerment and its intention towards re-creation of the long-lost original identity. In an attempt to discuss the menace the term plays in entrapping the post-colonial consciousness into a game of otherness, this article views the concept of civilization as the dominant's ideology towards the implementation of otherness as a doctrine. Otherness takes many forms; among them are the creation and the maintenance of different tools for defining the *self* in order to define the *Rest* as the *Other*. To explain this process, the researcher first sketches the history of the concept and its historical metamorphoses and then elucidates the importance behind its emergence after the Age of Enlightenment. The article subsequently reveals how civilization has been a colonial ideology all along, created and preserved through different discursive means, to shape the future of the post-colonial societies. Finally, the researcher proposes *post-colonial civilizations* to refer to those civilizations mingled not by geographical, religious, or cultural bounds but by sharing the experience of being subordinated by the one dominant civilization.

Keywords: Civilization, Dominant, Elective Affinity, Ideology, Otherness, Post-colonial.

¹ E-mail: mehdaouiamaria@gmail.com

Introduction

Otherness works in different ways. The most effective and dangerous is through discourse. Because words may emerge even before the signs that represent them do. They may even endure while the people who created them, the contexts they were created in, and the purposes they were ought to serve perish. Their effects, however, do not in many cases. This is the case of a concept like the one this article wants to inquire. Nevertheless, it is eminent to deal with the vessel before tackling the edge.

The Debate

Within the body of a text designed for a call of papers planned as a study day under the title *Representation of the Other in Postcolonial Discourse: Traditions and Palimpsests* tackling the power of reversing discourse for self-empowerment for the post-colonial societies¹, one claimed that: “Postcolonial transformation, on the other hand, examines how **colonized civilizations** have changed the fundamental character of the cultural authority that has controlled them.” (Emphasis added). The major aim of the argument was to highlight the importance of understanding the post-colonial call for adopting *transformation* rather than *resistance* stand. A claim Ashcroft suggests in his *On post-colonial Futures: Transformations of a Colonial Culture* (2001).

The researcher received one critical argument because of the proposition of the term *civilizations* intertwined with *colonized* within the paragraph above. The existence of such combination has seemed to a colleague “erroneous”. Quoting directly the source, my colleague argues, “We do not say ‘colonized civilization’ ... Concepts do certainly change over time, but such a compound noun has never been made”². To my astonishment, I recognized that as post-colonials we are still trapped in an anachronistic approbation of the term civilization as it has been imposed on our consciousness. In its utilization within the context of the study day, **colonized civilizations** is similar to Cox’s use of “subordinated civilizations” (2000, 219 & 222), Susan Strange’s “business civilization” (1995, 65), and Bruce Mazlish’s “contending civilizations” (2004, 23). It, hence, came to my mind that a debate over what she considered as “a tendency to use compound nouns unscientifically” has finally come at hand.

Different contemporary dictionaries, encyclopedias, and scholarly productions have devoted large and extensive readings and multi-functional uses the concept may hold. As for dictionaries, the Merriam Dictionary defines civilization as “a particular well-organized and developed *society*,” while Collins Dictionary identifies that “a civilization is a human *society* with its own social organization and culture”. From their part, the Lexico Dictionary argues that civilization means “**the society, culture, and way of life of a particular area**” (Emphasis added). The three different dictionaries utilize civilization as a direct synonym to *society* and when the concept

¹ The study day was proposed during the process of organizing study days for the PRFU program held at the Department of English Language and Literature at the University of Moulay Tahar, Saida for June 2022.

² It is fundamental to thank my colleague to guide my attention to draw the conclusions that this article may develop into further researches within the post-colonial domain.

appeared in the content of the study day it clearly identified it as such.

Nevertheless, the time for a refreshing and more centered reading of the concept that suits the post-colonial quest is now essential. As the argument of this article will reveal, civilization, next to being an over-consumed term throughout different spaces and times and for different reifications, is a colonial ideology. Whether in its current naked form or as it has been intrinsically suggested in different discourses, it has been an otherness tool that has been guiding the post-colonial towards it unavoidable scheme. Otherness, as Staszak identifies, is *"the result of a discursive process by which a dominant in-group ("Us", Self) constructs one or many dominated out-groups ("they", Other) by stigmatizing a difference- real or imagined- presented as a motive for potential discrimination"* (2009, 02). While difference represents what is real, for example that sex is biological fact, otherness is discursive construct, as much as gender is. Hence, the act of *othering* implies a singular versus plural identification. As the argument about civilization versus civilizations will appear in this paper, singularity and plurality have their own roles in the process of the ideology. While many think that otherness is a modern practice revealed to the arena merely the last half century through race and gender politics when racial and feminist theories have been rushing in the academia for their equality quest; otherness is a practice that has been documented from an unknown date. One brings this example that clarifies such an assumption, that of civilization.

It is a crucial, however, to clarify from the onset that one's use of the term post-colonial, with a hyphen, echoes Ashcroft et al.'s spelling and use. As they explain in their book *The Empire Writes Back* *"We use the term post-colonial... to cover all the culture affected by the imperial process from the moment of colonization to the present day. This is because there is a continuity of preoccupations throughout the historical process initiated by European imperial aggression"* (Ashcroft et al 2003, 02). The meaning the hyphenated term suggests, as different to postcolonial or post/colonial, is a reading of the experience of colonization during and after the period of occupation and the ways it dominates different forms of discourse.

Civilization Tracked

In their quest for tracking its history, many scholars have already devoted hundreds of pages and much ink has been spilled documenting the development and the numerous references the concept of civilization intricately submits. I shall not go through all of them since references to them will necessarily appear in this article. The focus in this process will be devoted to the colonial and post-colonial implications of the concept. One indisputable fact this article suggests is that civilization has always been a defining quality between what the Western world identified as progressed societies, hence civilized, and those who are unarguably unable to progress, and hence barbarian. This distinguishing characteristic, deeply connected to the post-colonial quest, has opened debates for centuries and the reference to it has always been intentionally or unintentionally embedded. One truth that imposes itself after collecting different meanings of the term is that civilization is *"a colonial ideology"*, as Mazlish suggests in his book, *"-that is, the use of the concept of civilization to justify domination and superiority over others"* (p. 22).

Boer (2005) traces the history of the term by collecting different translations and

the meanings they have been used for. The oldest was a political concept that came from “*Latin word civis, a translation of the Greek politēs, or citizen*” (p. 31), and which is still implicated in the world of politics since citizenship has become a privilege given to those who are well educated, well mannered, and most importantly possess the ability to progress and conform to the European civilized standards. Homer, although never used the term civilization but only an epithet to it, refers to bar-bar people from Caria, people living outside the city, and to his ear babbled (Mazlish 2004). From an acoustic perception, there emerged a distinction between people who possess the ability to speak publically in a civilized manner and those who do not. Hence, it emerged to separate agricultural and nomadic life style and the notion of the city as a Greek conception was an offshoot to the practice of Othering. Ironically, however, is the fact that the Greek itself was an *accivilization*, in Mazlish’s word who combined the Latin prefix ‘ac’ to civilization to refer to the fact that even hegemonic civilizations were borrowing from other civilizations¹.

Furthered into philosophy, the Aristotelian understanding of the concept paved a way for a comparison between being the civilized and the non-civilized man to exist. A civilized man, according to Aristotle, is the only species who does not only possess the intellectual capacity to make meaning, recall the past, but also the one who possesses a *moral excellence*, the ability to exercise control, or what he names *continence*. According to him, it is “*only such a man could keep one’s negative emotions in check, control natural impulses and biological instincts, restrain anger, irascibility and stay away from violence*” (qtd. in Makolkin 2014, 375). Civilization, according to Aristotle is the highest kingdom where only a perfect intellectual social animal belongs. This implies an oppositional suggestion to a non-civilized barbarian society which a term like civilization does not fit in terms of reference. This is however a utopian vision Aristotle himself encouraged but would know it was impossible to achieve. For, if we compare the behavior of a civilized man to a barbarian, violence as a matter of comparison takes part on both sides. If we trace the history of ancient and modern civilizations, let us take the Greek, the Roman, the Western civilization, all these were expanded upon acts of violence. As Ateş puts it:

But when we think of modern wars and war-capacity of nation states throughout national lands, it becomes impossible to draw a sharp line between civility and barbarism. In modern times barbarity takes new forms within a civilized society. Every advance had a double face, inclined to both civility and barbarity. So civilization in terms of lack of naked force does not absolutely mean civility or polite manner (Ateş 2008, 176).

By the 13th century, the epithet of the concept was circulating in Medieval Latin, a synonym for *human/humanity*, and which has been one of the most common political concepts utilized to justify imperial agendas. Crusades were waged on the name to save humanity from paganism, wars were waged for the sake of human rights and democracy, and War on Terrorism has become the obsession for the Western world in their mission to protect humans and humanity.

It was until the eighteenth century that a clear mention of the term civilization

¹ For further explanation check Bruce Mazlish *Civilization and its Contents* 2004, p.3-4.

came in Victor Riqueti Mirabeau in his *L'ami des Hommes* (1883), and which I will further examine in this article. Generally, the 18th century use of the term had an emphasis on laws and types of governments, most importantly as it was utilized by Adam Ferguson in his article *An Essay on the History of Civil Society* (1767). Contemporary scholars believe that civilization did not exist before the Enlightenment Era. There were only references to the concept. It is the neologism of that era that reflected the then ideological transformations of the time

Ferguson, a Gaelic-speaking Scottish Enlightenment philosopher, drew a comparison between rude and civilized societies. Providing micro and a macro understanding of the term, Ferguson criticized commercial societies for producing unethical and unconcerned human beings. As one of the pioneers of the theory of progress, next to Hume and Adam Smith, he argued that “*progress in the case of man is continued to a greater extent than in that of any other animal. Not only the individual advances from infancy to manhood but the species itself from rudeness to civilization*” (Ferguson, 1767/1995, 2). From Ferguson’s point of view, all forms of society, be it civilized or rude, are natural. In terms of morals and intellectuality, both possess capabilities yet in different manners. Evolving during different stages, from hunting, pastoralism, agriculture, to commerce; makes the four stages of civilization. Defining civilization on a material basis is not new in nature but seeing it as stage is what Ferguson added to the notion of civilization. The difference between rude and civilized societies according to him is based on agriculture and commerce. His theory, then, is based on the availability/ unavailability of property and division of labor. What differentiates the rude from the civilized is founded on social, not natural predispositions. With the absence of property and labor, the rude, although following some standards, these later are perceived only in his own manner which is different from that of the civilized. For that reason, the problem is more of conformity rather than knowledge. As Ferguson claims, “*even though they follow a leader to a field [meaning the rude] they cannot brook the pretensions to a formal command; they listen to no orders; and they come under no military engagements, but those of mutual fidelity, and equal ardour in the enterprise*” (1767; qtd in Launay 2021, emphasis added).

Coming back to Mirabeau’s utilization, historically the notion of civilization developed as a secular view of Enlightenment in which Mirabeau emphatically recognizes “*religion is without doubt humanity’s first and most useful constraint; it is the mainstream of civilization*” (qtd in Mazlish, 05). If it falls into the trap of luxury and wealth; it achieves its end. Weighing on an economic view, particularly feudal, Mirabeau presented a social and moral rather than the contemporary industrial and commercial perceptive of the term civilization. One fact that explains the delayed appearance of the term until Mirabeau spelled it in his writing in 1756 is that it needed factual needs. One of these was the European Expansions from the fifteenth century and the succeeding Sea Explorations. Encounter with the *other* represented an urge for its creation. As Mazlish argues, “*other is a fundamental psychological mechanism by which to achieve this end. Civilization is a form of accomplishing that task*”(p. 02). The fall of the Ottoman Empire in 1453, Mazlish tells us, was a turning point in the process of otherness. While the clash started as

religious, with an urge to establish Christianity as the only true religion in opposition to Islam; this later was reified to a *thing* that needed understanding and analysis. It was necessary to objectify Islam as Europe's other to consolidate it as an opposing image to a civilized Europe.

Another more scientific reason was the Enlightenment natural classification of humankind and theories of race. During the Age of Enlightenment, there had emerged two predominating philosophies about the origins of humankind. The first had been a Biblical view, called monogenist, which suggested that all humans are one species (descendants of Adam and Eve) and from this race comes variants of human beings. The second, called polygenist, believed that human beings evolved from numerous pairs of ancestors. Carl Linnaeus, one of the most influential scientists of the enlightenment era, developed a classification of humankind. In his work *System of Nature* (1735) he outlined a definition of the concept of race and divided humans into four groups, Europeanus, Asiatic, Americanus, and Africanus.

A German physician named Johann Friedrich Blumenbach is said to be the one who promoted racism by designing a hierarchical racial theory. In his thesis in Medical degree entitled *On the Natural Varieties of Mankind* (1775), he explored the classification of the human race based on cranial logical research. Comparing different human skulls, Blumenbach concluded that the human species can be divided into five races: Caucasian (White race), Mongolian (Yellow race), The Malayan (Brown race), Ethiopian (Black race); and The American (Red race). Despite this, Blumenbach was a monogenist. Yet, his classification fostered otherness on scientific grounds.

Later on, *Crania Americana* by Samuel George Morton was published in 1839 and became a reference book in the history of scientific racism. In his work, Morton used illustrations still new at that time with lithography to convince his readers. He carried on Blumenbach's classification and divided the human race into different classes. To push his theory further, that of the superiority of the white Caucasian race over other races, he suggested that racial and social distinctions existed in the previous civilizations. In his *Crania Aegyptiaca* (1844), he concluded that the ruling elite of ancient Egypt had been Caucasians while the slave race had been Negroes. He confirmed that enslavement of black folks by whites has natural roots in antiquity social order. Now through natural sciences, otherness has been confirmed scientifically.

Within social sciences, society as a concept surfaced with that of civilization. Society was the outcome of the seventeenth century when the civilized Western man discovered that he was among others and that change was a rational result. By the 19th century, civilization appeared as a translation from German, with its both positive and negative meanings, the first standing for *Kultur* (meaning the pure culture of Germany) and the second *Zivilisation* (a negative connotation of the degenerate culture of the West). WWI use of the term in this context is an emphatical exhibition of the battle that took place between the Germans and the Rest. Spengler, a German historian and philosopher who provided a classification to the rise and fall of civilizations, uses the term *culture* to the early stages of civilization and *civilization* to refer to the stages of maturity and decline. Culture in

this respect is an anthropological creation; while civilization is a historical one. Although the terms *cultus* and *cultura* are said to be Roman's creation to mean agriculture and cultivation, the reference that stamped itself on the source of flourishing rather than the behavior itself endured. We have become acknowledging the omnipresence of one great civilization due to its ability to succeed economically, despite the difference between contemporary industrial and traditional agricultural sources of success. Urbanization fostered this process, mainly with empowerment from capitalism that provided ground for domination of one civilization's perception over other civilizations. From this binary oppositional composition of civilized man vs. barbarian and dominant civilization vs. subordinated civilizations springs my argument of colonial civilization versus colonized civilizations.

A Turn toward a New Perspective

When the concept appeared in my study day call, it was used in plural form *civilizations*. There is a difference between civilization in singular and in its plural form. Braudel's (1980) distinction between the two is a recognizable one. As he claims:

The concept of civilization is used both in plural and singular forms. The former usage implies the existence of many civilizations in human history, so delimitation could be required to separate one from another. The plural form is related to the cultural characteristics of particular societies scattered through time and space. The second usage implies just one kind of ideal form of civility and related to the humanity as a whole. So-called civilizations are the attempts to reach that ideal type. In singular sense history of civilization is closely related to the global history (p. 177-178).

This perception of the unity of civilization, as one and whole, is in itself a challenge to the post-colonial subject in particular and to the post-colonial studies in general. The existence of many civilizations, hence, is undeniable and the delimitation that has separated one from the other is not really related to time and space only as Robert Cox (2000) suggests in his *Thinking about Civilizations*, and which this article will draw upon for the coming discussion from now on.

Starting with a more functional and modern approach to defining the concept of civilization, one finds that Cox's definition is appropriate and the closest to discussing one's intention behind its use. In his article Cox proposes that, "*Civilization is something we carry in our heads which guides our understanding of the world; and for different peoples this understanding is different. The common sense of one people is different from that of another and their notions of reality differ*" (p. 220). Taking into account this revolutionizing understanding of the term opens doors to wider explanations and more spacious use. Before getting into Cox's use of the term and one's utilization as far as post-colonial studies are concerned, let us first delve into the evolution and the different references to the concept of civilization.

In his article, Cox invites the reader to adopt a new vision toward a globalized and non-unified conception of the term civilization. He emphatically does not provide a direct definition of what the notion stands for but instead discusses the

boundaries that encircle its defining terms and how fragile they perish with new conditions. In this perspective, Cox proposes rather a Max Weber's "elective affinity"¹ notion in understanding how civilizations come into existence when their material and intersubjective circumstances spontaneously conform. It is throughout this process that I will conclude that post-colonial civilizations emphatically exist as much as the circumstances that relate them. Despite their differences, post-colonial civilizations occur due to what they have been conjunctively experiencing from the time of the colonial experience to the transformed future they seek to accomplish.

Traditionally, civilizations have been defined according to two miscellaneous yet encompassing dimensions: material and intersubjective. Cox argues that they are identified materially in terms of sharing common economic features that helped in their rise at the first place. If we go back in time to the rise of the Egyptian or the Chinese civilizations, we find that their growth was due to them sharing some characteristics like Bronze Age technology, controlled economic organizations, certain social order resulting from these organizations, and political systems based on authority. At the intersubjective level, civilizations are tied through aspects like religion, language, and myth. These compose the common sense throughout which civilizations perceive realities differently.

Civilizations, however, follow a triangular and determinative scheme. In Spengler's words, they pursue a pattern similar to the human's life; they rise, mature, and then decline. Moreover, either due to internal oppositions or encounter with other civilizations, change is the destiny of civilizations. Scholars and philosophers have drawn definite contours to what civilization stands for. Some define it taking into account geographical boundaries, we know of Egyptian, African, and Chinese civilizations. It is remarkable how concepts like boundary and frontier are related to civilization. As Mazlish argues, there is a difference between the two: while frontier draws line between powers but does not prevent interaction (like trade); boundary implies division but not interaction. Frontier, hence, is used as a marker of domination, a view of *Us* as civilized versus them on the other side of the frontier as barbarians. This fosters, "*antagonism toward the neighboring group or groups, chiefly through the creation, revival, and maintenance of ideologies, with their accompanying myths and symbols, that emphasized the uniqueness of the in-group and a negative picture of the out-group*" (p. 23). Such an ideology takes many forms, the largest is civilization, he concludes.

But these boundaries are forced to change due to globalization. This later changed the stability of the myth of geographical margins, the more people move, the less geography matters. Hence, people from the same geographical area may

¹ Elective affinity is concept that developed from chemistry where electronic entities by which different species can form chemical compounds. The term was borrowed later to literature when Johann Wolfgang Goethe created his novel, under the same title, to expose metaphorically how human relationships are as much as complicated as chemical substances. Later on, the term was used in social sciences by Max Weber in his writings where he discussed how different cultural features, like religion, politics, or economy, share certain analogies (affinities) and how they form relationships of reciprocal attraction where they influence each other despite their differences.

possess different perceptions of reality. Even the same individual may hold different perceptions of different civilizations within him/herself.

The dimensions that have been defining civilizations, therefore, are declining. Among these are three particular dimensions Cox suggests: time and space, tension between individual and community, and spirituality or cosmology. Civilizations, actually have been defining themselves in terms of time. As societies, we imagine ourselves possessing a common past and we opt for a common future. This projects both how civilizations are built upon myth and common destiny and maintained through religious and political institutions, for example, the Church and state in European civilization. Spatial conditions are represented in forms of relations between military, geopolitical, and administrative powers. The less the order of this equilibrium is retained; the better chance for a new equilibrium to rise concurs. Civilizations, therefore, transform due to a shift and emphasis on time and space. This is apparent in the evolution of European civilization through time. While it started with an emphasis on the establishment of the Church as the representation of God's power on earth, the Enlightenment of the eighteenth century came to change this centered orientation and enforce science instead. With the coming of postmodernism at the last half of the twentieth century, historical continuity itself became challenged and hence the stability of the notion of civilization.

The doctrine of individualism exposes a similar fate. While the European civilization nurtured this doctrine as defining quality that differentiates it from let us say the Eastern civilization, individualism is not a static and limited phenomenon. While societies, like the American, ignore community at the expense of individual hard work and success; this in itself contradicts the notion of civilization. Civilizations have been established upon acts of communal beliefs, and whatever individualism supporters believe they are doing; it is in the middle of communal acceptance. This is the case of societies who claim collectivism as well. And if this proves anything, it is the fact that civilizations change.

Cox thinks that forms of religions roaming the universe challenge the stability of defining one civilization from another. The three governing religions, monotheism, polytheism and pantheism, changed in conduct not in doctrine. While monotheism believes in the superiority of an absolute power; it keeps its name in form but not in formality. In the age of globalization, people define themselves as Christians or Muslims but do not really perform the doctrines by which they define themselves. Although polytheism is apparently not consumed as it had been in Anglo-Saxon earlier civilization, for example, yet, openness toward plurality and difference recognition are as powerful as they had been. And it seems like a call for unity of humanity and nature has been reestablished as the belief in common fate reappeared. These spiritual conflicts are clearly perceptible when gender, religious, ethnic, and racial conflicts collide with economic oppression. Civilizations if defined in terms of spiritual standards hence are mingling.

As far as external dimensions, civilizations relationships change over time. Cox focuses on the aspect of *awareness of the Other* as an aspect to define what he calls *civilizational identity*. Islam, for example, was the Middle Ages European's Other in times of rivalry and Islam's prosperity in sciences and military power; in the

contemporary time, Islam is still recognized as Europe's Other but as a threat. Awareness of the Other has become a tool that identifies the Other and this later has to choose either to conform or to transform. And thence demonstrates the widening gap and the ongoing struggle between what Cox calls *dominant and subordinate civilizations*. As he argues, "*The elites of subordinate civilizations confront the choice of imitating the dominant civilization while trying to preserve something of their own of reviving their myths of origin in order to reject the dominant civilization and too claim the intellectual space to create something else*" (p.222-223).

It is a matter of importance to this study to consider the relationship that unites identity and civilization. While identity has become an overused concept consumed in different discourses, some of them scholarly while the others rhetorical; it is an eminent aspect to differentiate the anachronistic understanding of civilization from the newly proposed one. To Cox, it is preferable to think of civilization as a large territory of identity, used often to defend a universal understanding the Western civilization as the rule. He, hence, proposes to see identity as self-conscious for the benefit of relating it to conscious belonging to a civilization instead of *common sense* or the *conception of reality* that have been usually the aspects characterizing the notion of civilization. As he claims, "*It is only through deep critical reflection that the formation of such 'common sense' through time and the perception of 'reality' that corresponds to it can be revealed*" (p. 224).

The challenging aspect is not the existence or the change of civilization but is the action of establishing lines to what define a civilization. Creating boundaries of what is and what is not civilized resulted in the acceptance that to become recognized as civilization, societies have to conform to the rules. The West's governance of intellectual and linguistic means makes the idealistic view one-unified civilization deny the periphery civilizations, like the Islamic or the African, to endure. On the ground of such reasoning, it is indispensable to reject the individualistic view of one and whole civilization that although accepts to define and discuss the existence of other civilization but only thought acts of Othering them. As Cox suggests:

The challenge in a multi-civilizational order is to find means of encouraging popular forces struggling for an entrenchment of human rights in *their* society without appearing to impose one civilization's norms upon another. An externally imposed order would remain fragile, vulnerable to the charge of imperialism. To evoke the idea of a multi-civilizational world order is to affirm that an alternative, even more than one alternative, to the one and final civilization of globalization is possible. This can be a *rallying force*—a myth if you like, and myth is a powerful social force—for those who resist the claims of a one civilization world and of the *pensée unique* (p.232 Emphasis added).

This rallying force is what makes a concept like post-colonial civilizations possible as an act of speaking for the marginalized and the subordinate civilizations that despite the singular experiences they endured throughout different forms of marginalization; their plurality is what characterizes them.

CONCLUSION

And, thence, I propose a slight reformulation to what I wanted to transmit in the body of my study day quoted above at the beginning of this article. Instead, I argue “Post-colonial transformation, on the other hand, examines how *post-colonial civilizations* have changed the fundamental character of the cultural authority that has controlled them”. The proposition recommends an emphasis on how one view of a unified civilization has dominated our perception and thus our consciousness and how as post-colonials we have to create counter-discourse to reverse, or rather to transform, those impositions. Post-colonial civilizations, hence, adopts a Max Weber conception of “elective affinities” to encompass and bring into mutual reinforcement and active convergence those people who experienced colonization in its broadest and narrowest forms despite the differences that may split them apart.

References

- Ashcroft, B. (2001). *On post-colonial futures: Transformations of a colonial culture*. A&C Black.
- Ashcroft, B., Griffiths, G., & Tiffin, H. (2003). *The empire writes back: Theory and practice in post-colonial literatures* (2nd ed.). Routledge.
- Ateş, D. (2008). Civilization and universal history in conceptualizing globalization. *Zonguldak Karaelmas University Journal of Social Sciences*, *4*(8), 171-184.
- Blumenbach, J. F. (1775). *De generis humani varietate nativa* [On the natural variety of mankind]. Apud Vandenhoeck et Ruprecht.
- Braudel, F. (1980). *On history* (S. Matthews, Trans.). University of Chicago Press. (Original work published 1969)
- Boer, R. (2005). Civilization. In T. Bennett, L. Grossberg, & M. Morris (Eds.), *New keywords: A revised vocabulary of culture and society* (pp. 31-33). Blackwell Publishing.
- Cox, R. W. (2000). Thinking about civilizations. *Review of International Studies*, *26*(5), 217-234. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0260210500002176>
- Ferguson, A. (1767). *An essay on the history of civil society*. A. Millar & T. Caddel.
- Launay, R. (2021). Savagery in 18th-century Scotland: An intellectual portrait of Adam Ferguson. In *Bérose - Encyclopédie internationale des histoires de l'anthropologie*. <https://www.berose.fr/article2168.html>
- Linnaeus, C. (1735). *Systema naturae*.
- Makolkin, A. (2014). Aristotle's idea of civilized man and pathway to civilization. *Biocosmology-neo-Aristotelism*, *4*(4), 369-379.
- Mazlish, B. (2004). *Civilization and its contents*. Stanford University Press.
- Mirabeau, V. R., marquis de. (1883). *L'ami des hommes, ou, Traité de la population*. Guillaumin.
- Morton, S. G. (1844). *Crania Aegyptiaca: Or, observations on Egyptian ethnography, derived from anatomy, history, and the monuments*. John Penington.
- Morton, S. G., & Combe, G. (1839). *Crania Americana; or, a comparative view of the skulls of various aboriginal nations of North and South America*. J. Dobson.
- Staszak, J. F. (2009). Other/otherness. In R. Kitchin & N. Thrift (Eds.), *International encyclopedia of human geography* (Vol. 8, pp. 43-47). Elsevier.
- Strange, S. (1995). The defective state. *Daedalus*, *124*(2), 55-74.
- Ferguson, A. (1995). *An essay on the history of civil society* (F. Oz-Salzberger, Ed.). Cambridge University Press. (Original work published 1767)

HOW TO CITE THIS ARTICLE

MEHDAOUI, A. (2023). Civilization: the Dominant's Ideology to Otherness. *LANGUAGE ART*, 8(1): 57-70, Shiraz, Iran.

DOI: 10.22046/LA.2023.04

URL: <https://www.languageart.ir/index.php/LA/article/view/303>





تمدن: ایدئولوژی مسلط برای تقویت «دیگری‌سازی»

عماریه مهداوی^۱

مدرس زبان و ادبیات انگلیسی در دانشگاه سعیده بنام دکتر مولای طاهر، سعیده، الجزایر.

(تاریخ دریافت: ۴ اردیبهشت ۱۴۰۱؛ تاریخ پذیرش: ۱۷ شهریور ۱۴۰۱؛ تاریخ انتشار: ۹ اسفند ۱۴۰۱)

تمدن، با آنکه مفهومی فرسوده و بیش از اندازه به کار رفته است که با شور و شوقی خاص برای تمایزگذاری میان توانایی جامعه‌ها در پیشرفت یا عدم پیشرفت در زمان و مکان — با در نظرگیری ویژگی‌های درونی و بیرونی — استفاده می‌شود، اما در برابر کوشش جامعه‌های پسااستعماری برای دگرگون‌سازی گفتمان استعماری به عاملی برای خودتوانمندسازی و بازآفرینی هویت اصلی و دیرزمان گمشده‌شان ایستادگی می‌کند. این مقاله در تلاشی برای پرداختن به خطری که این مفهوم در به دام انداختن آگاهی پسااستعماری در بازی «دیگری‌سازی» ایفا می‌کند، مفهوم تمدن را به مثابه ایدئولوژی چیره‌گر برای اجرای دیگری‌سازی در قالب یک آموزه بررسی می‌کند. دیگری‌سازی شکل‌های گوناگونی به خود می‌گیرد که از جمله آن‌ها، ایجاد و حفظ ابزارهای مختلف برای تعریف «خود» به منظور تعریف «باقی» به عنوان «دیگری» است. برای توضیح این فرآیند، پژوهشگر نخست تاریخ مفهوم و دگردیسی‌های تاریخی آن را ترسیم می‌کند و سپس اهمیت ظهور آن پس از عصر روشنگری را روشن می‌سازد. مقاله در ادامه آشکار می‌کند که تمدن چگونه همواره یک ایدئولوژی استعماری بوده که با ابزارهای گفتمانی گوناگون آفریده و حفظ شده تا آینده جامعه‌های پسااستعماری را شکل دهد. در پایان، پژوهشگر برای آن دسته از تمدن‌هایی که نه با مرزهای جغرافیایی، مذهبی یا فرهنگی، بلکه با اشتراک تجربه زیردست در برابر یک تمدن مسلط واحد بوده‌اند، اصطلاح «تمدن‌های پسااستعماری» را پیشنهاد می‌دهد.

واژه‌های کلیدی: تمدن، چیرگی (سلطه‌گری)، ایدئولوژی، دیگری‌سازی، پسااستعماری.

¹ E-mail: mehdaouiamaria@gmail.com



الحضارة: أيديولوجية المهيمن لتعزيز الآخريّة

عمارية مهداوي^١

أستاذ اللغة والأدب الإنجليزي بجامعة سعيدة الدكتور مولاي الطاهر، الجزائر.

(Received: 4 May 2022; Accepted: 8 September 2022; Published: 28 February 2023)

ملخص

الحضارة، رغم أنها فكرة مستهلكة أكثر من قيمتها وتستخدم بشغف للتمييز بين قدرة المجتمعات على التقدم/عدم التقدم عبر الزمان والمكان مع مراعاة السمات الداخلية والخارجية لها، إلا أنها تتحدى سعي شعوب ما بعد الكولونيالية لتحويل الخطاب الاستعماري إلى قوة وعزمها على إعادة خلق الهوية الأصلية المفقودة منذ زمن طويل. في محاولة لمناقشة الخطر الذي يلعبه المصطلح في محاصرة وعي شعوب ما بعد الكولونيالية تنظر هذه المقالة إلى مفهوم الحضارة كأيديولوجية مهيمنة نحو تنفيذ الآخريّة كمذهب. وتتخذ الآخريّة أشكالاً عديدة من بينها خلق وصيانة أدوات مختلفة لتعريف الذات من أجل تعريف الباقي ككونه الآخر. لشرح هذه العملية تتبع الباحثة أولاً تاريخ المفهوم وتحولاته التاريخية ثم توضح أهمية ظهوره بعد عصر التنوير. يكشف المقال فيما بعد كيف كانت الحضارة أيديولوجية استعمارية طوال الوقت تم إنشاؤها والحفاظ عليها من خلال وسائل استدلالية مختلفة لتشكيل مستقبل شعوب ما بعد الكولونيالية. أخيراً تقترح الباحثة تعبير "حضارات ما بعد الكولونيالية" للإشارة إلى تلك الحضارات التي تكونت ليس بالحدود الجغرافية أو الدينية أو الثقافية ولكن بمشاركة تجربة كونها تابعة للحضارة المهيمنة الوحيدة.

الكلمات الأساسية: الحضارة، الهيمنة، الأيديولوجية، الآخريّة، ما بعد الكولونيالية.

¹E-mail: mehdaouiamaria@gmail.com