Turkish Online Journal of Qualitative Inquiry (TOJQI)
Volume 11, Issue 04, November 2020: 2518-2528
DOI: 10.53555/tojqi.v11i4.10184

Research Article

A Review of Colonialism, Imperialism, Capital and Labour: The Importance of Imagination

Dr Siddhartha Chakraborti[1*]

Bio Note- The author is an Assistant Professor in the Department of English at Aligarh Muslim University and assistant Coordinator in IGNOU, SC- 2713, Aligarh. He did his BA from Presidency College, Kolkata, and completed his MA and PhD from Jawaharlal Nehru University. He teaches Subaltern Studies and Digital Literature and has multiple publications, besides being funded by many agencies, including the UGC, DAAD, UKIERI and the GIAN. He is the secretary of the Aligarh ELT@I chapter and a life member of IACLALS, being the local coordinator for the 2018 conference.

Abstract

This paper examines imperialism, including its historical roots, economic aspects, and the role of imagination in perpetuating imperialistic ideologies. It traces the history of colony formations from ancient civilisations to today's global landscape and discusses various definitions of colonialism. The study assesses the ongoing relevance of Marxist thought in light of current geopolitical shifts and economic patterns. The study engages with the concept of imagination, as theorised by scholars like Edward Said and Vesna Goldsworthy, in understanding the cultural aspects of imperialism. The paper contends that the imperialist imagination, as manifested in literature and cultural discourse, plays a pivotal role in justifying interventions and shaping perceptions of colonised regions. The final section explores the philosophical and economic dimensions of imagination, as articulated by thinkers like Kant and Marx. It argues that imagination, inherent in human labour and creativity, resists easy commodification by Capital, offering a potential avenue for transformative resistance against the constraints of capitalist systems. The paper concludes by asserting the need for a holistic understanding of imperialism that acknowledges its historical, economic, and imaginative dimensions.

Keywords- Colonialism, labour, imperialism, imagination

Historically, we find the idea of colony formation from the beginning of civilisation, especially in the West. For example, the Egyptians set up colonies in Southern Canaan even before the first dynasty (Porat, 1992: 433-440). The Phoenicians created colonies, including Carthage and Carthago Nova in Spain. Carthage means 'new town' from the Phoenician root Kart-Hadasht (Ring, 1994, 177). The most prolific colonialists of the ancient Western world were the Greeks, who set up colonies ranging from Ionia and Thrace (Hornblower, 2003: 1515); apart from the colonies circling the Black Sea, the coast of modern Turkey, the northern coast of Africa, as well as southern Gaul, Spain, Sicily and Italy (Hammond, 1959: 109). The Greeks referred to their colonies as either *apoikia*, referring to those colonies which were city-states in their own right and enjoyed relative freedom from their mother states, or as *emporion*, which were trading outposts or colonies that were directly controlled by the mother city-state. The town of Empuries, established in Catalonia, Spain, is an example of such a Greek-dependent colony.

It is important to note that colonialism is not merely the occupation of the land of a different people or unclaimed land. It is not merely the extraction of resources or the reforming of locations for the

[1] *Assistant Professor Department of English Aligarh Muslim UniversityAligarh, Uttar Pradesh, India

benefit of the settler people. It is not indicated only by the subjugation, oppression or violence towards indigenous people or spaces. What defines colonialism is an imagination, a link between where the settlers were and where the settlers are now - which may encompass political, religious, cultural and linguistic ties, but is defined by an actual link with the mother state which supports and helps extend the hegemony of the settlers to its benefit. In this regard, reviewing a few definitions of colonialism will be in a different place.

The Oxford Dictionary notes colonialism as the policy or practice of acquiring full or partial political control over another country, occupying it with settlers and exploiting it economically. The Merriam-Webster Dictionary defines colonialism as controlled by one power over a dependent area or people or a policy advocating or based on such control. Margaret Kohn, in her essay "Ethics and World Politics" (2010), notes that colonialism is a broad concept that refers to the project of European political domination from the sixteenth to the twentieth century that ended with the National Liberation Movements of the 1960s (Kohn, 2010). One of the handier definitions comes from Jurgen Osterhammel's *Colonialism* (2005), where the term is defined as a relationship between an indigenous (or forcibly imported) majority and a minority of foreign invaders. The fundamental decisions affecting the lives of the colonised people are made and implemented by the colonial rulers in pursuit of interests that are often defined in a distant metropolis. Rejecting cultural compromises with the colonised population, the colonisers are convinced of their superiority and their ordained mandate to rule (Osterhammel, 2005: 16). The Collins Dictionary defines it as the policy and practice of a power in extending control over a weaker section of people or areas. It goes on to note that colonialism involves using colonial resources to increase the power and wealth of the mother nation. It also notes it to be synonymous with imperialism.

Lenin's ideas regarding imperialism as a result of the global capitalist need to extract resources have been expanded into today's postcolonial context through the Dependency Theory, which looks at a bipartition of the world as core and peripheral states, with resources moving from the periphery to the core, from the Colony and Metropol. F.H. Cardoso, in his book *Development Under Fire* (1979), draws up the salient features in the theory as-

1. there is a financial and technological penetration by the developed capitalist centres of the countries of the periphery and semi-periphery
2. this produces an unbalanced economic structure within the peripheral societies and between them and the centres.
3. this leads to limitations on self-sustained growth in the periphery
4. this favours the appearance of specific patterns of class relations, and
5. these require modifications in the role of the state to guarantee both the functioning of the economy and the political articulation of a society, which contains, within itself, foci of inarticulateness and structural imbalance. (Cardoso, 1979: 44)

One may see the continued influence of Leninist thought on the further development of the World Systems Theory of Immanuel Wallerstein (2004), where there is a third division of "semiperipheral" states in addition to the core and periphery, and the ideas of core and periphery are dislocated across the world, with the exploited and the exploiter being in all three zones. Unlike the Dependency Theory, where the world can be geographically divided clearly into exploiting and exploited, the World Systems recognise the dispersed, globalised nature of exploitation. I am including this only to argue that there is a need to take up the economics of hegemonies even in our world, where the fall of Soviet-style socialism has largely been equated with the failure of Marxism and Marxist thought. That the core-periphery models have an academic sanction and continue to be used to describe the world by eminent scholars and thinkers forces any reappraisal of postcolonialism to question the linking of advanced capitalist economies with the label of postcolonialism. Rosa Luxemburg, in her study *The Accumulation of Capital* (1913), says in her third section-

Imperialism is the political expression of the accumulation of Capital in its competitive struggle for what remains still open of the non-capitalist environment... the immense masses of Capital accumulated in the old countries… seek an outlet for their surplus products and strive to capitalise their surplus value, and the rapid change over to capitalism of the pre-capitalist civilisations... (Luxemburg, ch 31)

While Luxemburg is talking about the world at the beginning of the last century, we can still see the exact replication of the same system in today's world, with the addition perhaps of a new set of semi-industrialised nations which push their goods into even more backward markets. However, with the development of the boom in communications technology and the gradual shifting of actual manufacturing into the East, with the West vastly becoming a centre for regulation of finance capital and senior management of dislocated multinational Capital, the world has also moved on ahead- but the controls of the economy still follow predictable patterns. The emergence of the oil-producing gulf countries and the growing role of access to natural resources similarly, while allowing for some collective control on global oil prices, has nonetheless led to intense factionalism between Saudi Arabia and Iran over the area, with the subsequent rise of the Islamic State of Iraq and Syria, Kurdish demands for statehood and the involvement of both Russia and the NATO. Although the world has changed, many Marxist scholars' basic formulations still carry weight. She analyses that the imperialist expansion was based on creating spheres of influence worldwide controlled by the national bourgeoisie. Free trade was propagated within these zones, although the domestic markets in the advanced countries were protected through protective tariffs, a condition that continues today. The colonies were exploited by extracting resources at prices decided entirely by the mother country, referred to as the colonial commodity FIAT. This exploitation was, therefore, enforced through heavy militarisation. As Luxemburg observes-

Bourgeois liberal theory takes into account only the former aspect: the realm of 'peaceful competition', the marvels of technology and pure commodity exchange; it separates it strictly from the other aspect: the realm of Capital's blustering violence which is regarded as more or less incidental to foreign policy and quite independent of the economic sphere of Capital. (Luxemburg Ch 31)

Luxemburg, therefore, clearly outlines the direct link between colonial enterprise and violence while showing that the claims of imperialism to be a moral system, which uplifts the economic production of less advanced non-capitalist civilisation in reality further divides the world into haves and have-nots. This process is not backed by actual free trade but rather by systems of economic exploitation backed by direct military force. Rather than creating a space for equal competition, innovation and a healthy respect for mutual cultures, imperialism is doomed to further a cycle of violence which has the potential of undoing itself. As she sums up, Capital increasingly employs militarism for implementing a foreign and colonial policy to get hold of the means of production and labour power of non-capitalist countries and societies… the accumulation of Capital is raised to the highest power by robbing the one of their productive forces and by depressing the other's standard of living ... The more ruthlessly capital sets about the destruction of non-capitalist strata, at home and in the outside world, the more it lowers the standard of living for the workers as a whole… (Luxemburg, Ch 31)

Therefore, in the Marxist understanding, there is a linking of the economic dominance of the imperialist powers with the military dominance, which creates sharper divisions that must prove untenable in the long run. Indeed, the political decolonisation of most of the world by the 1960s proves that capitalism has had to rework itself into a neo-imperialist framework and move away from direct political intervention to other less intrusive forms of domination. Nonetheless, the continued direct military interventions of advanced economies in developing countries, most recently under the guise of advancing democracy in Afghanistan and Iraq, now rapidly encompassing the wider Levant, show that direct military intervention continues to aid capitalists who enter the market to "rebuild" economies. However, more subtle interventions have become possible with the development of a

globalised and connected world, where direct military intervention can be avoided to support various local regimes that can make way for preferred trading partners.

In some ways, imperialism has been a continued teleological category. As Gilmartin (2009) notes, three broad waves of colonial and imperial expansions connected three different areas. The first targeted the Americas and the Caribbean. It can be seen as the result of the crisis of resources during the late period of European feudalism "with European powers in search of new sources of revenue" (Gilmartin, 2009: p. 116). The second wave concentrated on Asia and can be associated with the development of mercantile capitalism and manufacturing in Europe with the Industrial Revolution. The third wave, described as new imperialism, focused on Africa and consolidated European capitalism by providing raw materials and new markets. These ideas are echoed by Young (2001) and Nicholas Thomas (1994). To this, we can add the category of neo-imperialism that extends even today through the indirect manipulations possible in today's globalised world. As Said notes: "In our times, direct colonialism has largely ended; imperialism lingers where it has always been, in a kind of general cultural sphere as well as specific political, ideological, economic and social practices" (Said, 2014: 9). To this cultural understanding of continued imperialism we can add Kwame Nkrumah's 1965 article on neo-colonialism, where he explains its politico-economic context: "The essence of neo-colonialism is that the state which is subject to it is, in theory, independent and has all the trappings of international sovereignty. In reality, its economic system and thus its political policy is directed from outside" (Nkrumah, 1965).

Said (2014) wrote that imperialism involves the practice, theory and attitudes of the mother state towards its distant ruled territories. His re-examination allows imperialism a literary turn, and it is from here that we can enter the domain of imagination, which is central to my paper- "The main battle in imperialism is over land, of course; but when it came to who owned the land, who had the right to settle and work on it, who kept it going, who won it back, and who now plans its future--*these issues were reflected, contested, and even for a time decided in narrative*" (emphasis added) (Said, 2014: xiii). Because of Said, "the history of imperialism and its culture can now be studied as neither monolithic nor reductively compartmentalised, separate, distinct" (Said, 2014: xx). In other words, we must look for the roots of imperialism within imaginations put forward by narratives in the cultural and writing practices of the West. Further, echoing the Marxist claims that the seeds of the downfall of imperialism lie within its own structure, Said notes: "Though imperialism implacably advanced during the nineteenth and twentieth-century, resistance to it also advanced. Methodologically, then, I try to show the two forces together. Western imperialism and Third World nationalism feed off each other, but even at their worst, they are neither monolithic nor deterministic. Besides, culture is not monolithic either, and is not the exclusive property of East or West" (Said, 2014: xxiv). Indeed, Said's cultural turn suggests that it is within the cultural resistance as extractable from alternative national imaginations that we can effectively attack imperialism, which is a narrative, a culture and essentially an imagination.

The imperial imagination further imagines the Orient to allow its political enactment. Said returns to the imaginative geographies that went into the creation of the Orient as a largely homogenised space in his *Orientalism* (1978) in chapter II, "Imaginative Geography and Its Representations: Orientalising the Oriental". He thinks of the Orient as created primarily as an imagined space- It is perfectly possible to argue that some distinctive objects are made by the mind and that these objects while appearing to exist objectively, have only a fictional reality. A group of people living on a few acres of land will set up boundaries between their land and its immediate surroundings and the territory beyond, which they call "the land of the barbarians." In other words, this universal practice of designating in one's mind a familiar space which is "ours", and an unfamiliar space beyond "ours", which is "theirs", is a way of making geographical distinctions that can be entirely arbitrary. I use the word "arbitrary" here because the imaginative geography of the "our land—barbarian land" variety does not require that the barbarians acknowledge the distinction. It is enough for "us" to set up these

boundaries in our own minds; "they" become "they" accordingly, and both their territory and their mentality are designated as different from "ours."… All kinds of suppositions, associations, and fictions appear to crowd the un-familiar space outside one's own. (Said, 1978: 44)

It is, therefore, through a re-examination of these "fictions", these "imaginations" of our "minds", that we can uncover the real face of the colonial-imperial drive and the variegated resistance to that must also be found in imaginative rethinking. Imperialism has also been seen by other scholars as based on imagination, even in today's postcolonial world. In her book *Inventing Ruritania: The Imperialism of the Imagination* (1998), Vesna Goldsworthy argues that the British mainly created an imagined Balkans, which they could then play around with politically. Faced with the economic power of the Western industries of the imagination, indigenous Balkan produce had as much chance of competing as the cotton industry in India when its markets were flooded with British manufacturers. British' narrative colonisation' of the Balkans began early in the nineteenth century with Byron as its Columbus; it continues still. (Goldsworthy, 1998: x)

The argument is that the literary re-imaginings of the West, which poured forth in copious volumes of texts espousing romantic liberalism, only served to further solidify the image of the Balkans in a particular way. In the face of such forceful literary production and dissemination, it was only possible for the Balkans, being technologically inferior, to produce a counter-image. The Balkans were, therefore, recreated as something very different, and "this 'textual colonisation'… provided the industries of the imagination with easy, unchallenged access to raw material" (Goldsworthy, 1998: x). By raw material, of course, one must also include the real raw materials of industrial resources, the real raw material of people for cannon fodder in the political games of the concert of Europe, first containing Turkey, and later Soviet expansionism, apart from the imaginative production of the land of vampires and superstition which must be exorcised by the West and brought into being. The central ploy is uncannily recognisable, with first, the Balkans being shown as threatened by some insider vampire figure that demands the intervention of the West. The Balkans can never be sovereign until the western Van Helsing intervenes, exorcises its demons and restores order. Again, one may extend the argument that the imaginative intrusion through narratives is only the precursor to the concrete political reshaping that capitalism demands. The non-capitalist spaces are not to be exorcised from their vampires, as much as they are to be made fit to be haunted by capitalism.

Maria Todorova, in her book *Imagining the Balkans* (1997), makes the more political argument that the Balkans have been imagined as distinct from what it was to justify the continued intervention of imperial powers (including the Turks) in its politics. As she puts it, "In Imagining the Balkans… a specific discourse, "balkanism," moulds attitudes and actions toward the Balkans and could be treated as the most persistent form or "mental map" in which information about the Balkans is placed, most notably in journalistic, political, and literary output" (Todorova, 1997: 192). In other words, the imaginary outputs of the West inform all discourses of the Balkans, even when they relate to matters unrelated to literary fiction. Balkan politics is not only about the region's real politics but also the region's perception as perceived due to the enormous imaginative output that makes us pre-read and re-read the Balkans as a text without any original referent. The Balkans and other imperial and neo-colonial interventions demand the creation of simulated identities and threats that demand Western intervention. There do not need to be any vampires in reality - only in the imagination to justify interventions and rebuilding as moral and necessary. There does not need to be weapons of mass destruction in reality - only in the imagination, for what is in the imagination is far more creative, potent and intrusive than any real.

Outside the Balkans, in the German context, in the introduction to *The Imperialist Imagination: German Colonialism and Its Legacy* (1998), the editors note- "Despite or because of the absence of state-sponsored colonial activity, stories of imaginary enterprises proliferated, especially tales of racial conflict and ideal race relations, set in actual or fictitious countries, in which "German"

protagonists were able to exhibit the qualities that marked the superiority of the German coloniser" (Friedrichsmeyer et al., 1998: 20). This is of some interest, as they note that Germany had never been a significant colonising power, but that the profound literary output that valorised colonialism would go on to form lasting attitudes amongst the German people. That a primarily non-colonial player would produce imaginations extolling the virtues of colonialism shows how intrinsically linked imagination is to the project of colonialism and imperialism. Even when colonialism is not present in real politics, it is likely in the aspirational psyche of the nation's bourgeoisie, which not only demands and commends "enterprises". However, it cloaks aggressive military intervention with ideas of superiority of the national type.

Theodore Koditschek's *Liberalism, Imperialism, and the Historical Imagination* (2011) note how the imaginative constructions of Indian history and culture by the West paved the way for British policies during colonial rule, and John Marriot's *The Other Empire* (2003) points out "Prior to the establishment of the Raj, connections between India and England were evident in travel writings and imaginative literature… travelogues entered into the expansive domain of poetry and drama" (Marriot, 2003: 2). Through these works, we can therefore develop a clear link between imperialism and imagination, with the creation of an imaginary in some ways preceding and informing imperialism.

Within a range of meanings and applications, the term "imagination" has been defined as "the faculty or action of forming new ideas, or images or concepts of external objects not present to the senses" by the Oxford English Dictionary. Imagination can be rooted back to the PIE *-iem, (Rolandi, 2015) through the Latin "imago", both of which refer to similarity, holding (together), copying, likeness and resemblance. The Sanskrit word "yama", meaning twin, has the same root, adding the sense of "twin" or "copy". The "imago" is also the last mature adult stage in the development of insects that undergo metamorphosis (Carpenter, 1913). It is characterised by the attainment of sexual maturity, the development of wings and the ability to fly. Kant's image of the flying dove, representing metaphysics in section III of his *The Critique of Pure Reason* (1787), perhaps places this idea of constant attaining after maturity and development, together with flight in the field of thought in the tightest context-

…this circumstance is easily overlooked, because the said intuition can itself be given a priori, and therefore is hardly to be distinguished from a mere pure conception. Deceived by such a proof of the power of reason, we can perceive no limits to the extension of our knowledge. The light dove cleaving in free flight the thin air, whose resistance it feels, might imagine that her movements would be far more free and rapid in airless space... It is, indeed, the common fate of human reason in speculation, to finish the imposing edifice of thought as rapidly as possible, and then for the first time to begin to examine whether the foundation is a solid one or no. (Kant, 1787: Introduction III)

Kant's work is an inquiry into the synthetic a priori, and his cautionary note on the nature of imagination presents the possible pitfalls of such conceptions. The inherent synthetic nature of most a priori statements, especially in the realm of sciences and metaphysics, reveals that the underlying principle of thought is not purely analytical or rational, nor is it empirical or derived from observations. The world is therefore thought of often through imaginative constructs, which are synthetic as well as a priori. As John Sallis in his *Delimitations: Phenomenology and the End of Metaphysics* (1986) asks, "Does the dove ascend on the wings of imagination?" (Sallis 1986: 2) and he notes the strained yet undeniable relation between imagination and philosophy or thought in general. There seems to be a sort of cautionary note, which has been taken up the ages, regarding imagination as a way of creating new ways of thinking. As Shakespeare describes the potency and pitfalls of imagination, "The lunatic, the lover and the poet, Are of imagination all compact…" (Shakespeare, 2004: 52). It is all too obvious how the linking of the lunatic, the lover and the poet hardly make for an instrument of much reliable use in profound thought. The same note of caution

against imagination can be traced in Rene Descartes, who, in his *Meditations on First Philosophy* (1960), differentiates between intellection and imagination, discarding the latter for the former as the correct way to proceed towards knowledge.

One can argue, following Sallis, that both are types of imagination. In itself, this supposed differentiation is much older, with Plato's elucidation of the philosophy of Socrates asserting the need for *eikastatic* imagination to uncover the ideal. This can be paired with his rejection of the phantastic imagination, which he sees as the source of false consciousness. When Socrates describes the caves' parable as given in Plato's *Republic*, Book VII (Plato, 350BC: Book VII), I would argue that the allegory is primarily an imagination of a specific situation. Further, it calls for philosophy to work in the realm of certain imaginative universals, referred to as the world of the ideal "*eikos*". The journey from the realm of phantasy to the realm of the *eikastic* in itself is through interactions with images - starting with the images of the figures on the cave wall and ending with the reflections of the outside world on the water. It is the imaginary which mediates and initiates one into real and into knowledge, and it is also the imaginary which provides all the sources of false consciousness. Sallis sums up this dual ambivalence by stating the dynamics that govern the relation between imagination and metaphysics in the Platonic texts- "Imagination both empowers and inhibits the metaphysical drive to presence, and metaphysics must, accordingly, both appropriate and take distance from imagination" (Sallis 1986: 7). Even Walter Benjamin in his essay on "Imaginations" (1996) notes that while "imagination" does not produce anything new, "prophetic vision" does. He distinguishes one from the other by commenting that while imagination looks to the past, prophetic visions can let one "perceive the forms of the future" (Benjamin, 1996: 281). Therefore, there is a central and essential place for imagination in the making of how we choose to perceive our world.

Going back to the root meaning, Karl Marx thought of imagination as the space that forever precedes and possibly exceeds human material labour. Every labour becomes the copy or twin of its imagined that pre-exists the possibility of labour itself. Marx, in his "The Labour-Process and the Process of Producing Surplus-Value" (1887), himself distinguished between human labour and all other types of labour, noting that what is central to human labour is, indeed, imagination-

A spider conducts operations that resemble those of a weaver, and a bee puts to shame many an architect in the construction of her cells. But what distinguishes the worst architect from the best of bees is this: the architect raises his structure in imagination before he erects it in reality. At the end of every labour process, we get a result that already existed in the imagination of the labourer at its commencement. (Marx, 1887)

This novel approach links labour to the matter of imagination, only providing in imagination a space that cannot be appropriated by Capital. Capital can buy only the product of imagination as labour, but the imagination itself cannot be quantified and commodified in the manner in which labour can. In being this excess that lies beyond the appropriation of Capital, imagination is always potentially revolutionary. In his *Wage Labour and Capital* (1847), Marx observes, "Capital, therefore, presupposes wage-labour; wage-labour presupposes capital. They condition each other; each brings the other into existence" (Marx, 1847). One could perhaps add, linking his observation on imagination, that labour presupposes imagination; only imagination does not necessarily presuppose "wage labour" that can be appropriated by Capital, although imagination itself is part of intellectual labour. This is important because particular imaginations may very well be the key out of the trap of labour as commodified by capitalism and, as such, out of the system of capitalism that monitors and regulates the dominant mode of being in our world.

Moreover, labour itself has an imagination – labour "not only effects a change of form in the material on which (the labourer) works, but he also realises a purpose of his own that gives the law to his modus operandi, and to which he must subordinate his will" (Marx, 1887). In other words, the act of

labour carries within it the imagination of being a labourer, a maker, a former, a shaper or a poet, which gives the labourer the impetus to perform the labour. At least, as far as Marx is concerned, human labour is supposed to be a satisfying task, which gives the labourer a sense of achievement, a feeling of having asserted himself or herself into being through the fulfilment of the labour. Through labour, imagination shapes the product of the labour and brings it into existence; it also shapes the labourer as an individual who "realises a purpose of his own". Therefore, as human beings imagine how to use their labour to make products, they also imagine themselves as labourers who have created the product, along with all the associated imaginations that link the product to the labourer. When capitalism alienates the labourer from his product, the seeds of discontent are sown in the fabric of the imagination of the proletariat.

The category of the international proletariat, too, is, therefore, an imagined community linked not through the material position of the individual proletariat in a relationship with property, i.e. they do not own the means of production. Instead, it is in the imagination of being alienated from the product of their labours, i.e., they cannot own the product they have created themselves, which causes a feeling of a common kinship. In practice, this is a much more abstract sensibility than even the category of the nation, which was jarringly proved during the First World War and subsequently in many conflicts around the world where workers fought workers in trenches in the name of motherlands and fatherlands. No matter what the proletariat owns, no matter what the proletariat earns, and no matter what other links they have with their immediate surroundings, they must conceive of their proletarian status through the abstract idea of their displaced relation to "means of production". At least the nation, even if we see it as an imagined community, provides the paraphernalia of national membership in the form of official documents, education systems, legal systems and penal systems, which are relatively more palpable. The emancipative principle, which is present in Marxism, despite its inability to formulate an actual global community, lies in its viewing the labourers as imaginative creators who rebel against the derecognition and destruction of their creative potential. The labourer, therefore, is viewed to be caught in a situation where imagination provides not only his labour but also the possible ways out of the dominance of capitalism and the freeing of his labour. The labourer is potentially also a philosopher, a thinker and a creator. We find that labour as a concept is spacious enough to incorporate philosophy, or as Marx would place it, Intellectual Labour. However, Marx is hinting towards a very different conception of the relation between imagination and labour. Instead of thinking of them as separate entities, we must look at them as conjoined twins, mirror images without any original. Indeed, Marxism tends to do away with binaries between intellectual or mental labour and physical labour, theory and practice, instead affirming the idea of praxis. Marx roots the creation of this distinction with the idea of the division of labour, which marks the beginning of societal hierarchy for him. He notes- "Division of labour only becomes truly such from the moment when a division of material and mental labour appears" (Marx, 1845). As such, it is perhaps necessary to look at imagination as a generative process irreconcilably linked to labour. In other words, we need to assert the idea of the imagination-labour praxis.

The word labour can be traced back to the PIE root *leh$_2$b-, which means to 'hang loosely' (De Vaan, 2008). Considering the massive impact of the Latin derivative *laborare*, which means to work or toil, it is strange to think that the word originates not from notions of a forced effortful task but from a sense more akin to lounging about. Etymologically, labour does not refer to a purpose, a job, an office, or a productive end, but rather, it is a description of a process for creating or making, which is relaxed and unhurried. The original sense is the image of a person in the throes of an imaginative fit. Imagining itself, therefore, is a process of labour that produces or generates. At the same time, we must remember that the product of human labour has already been created in the imagination of the labourer first. The other idea linked to imagination and labour is "making" or "generating". Aristotle and Plato, in their works, set out three types of making. The first, relegated to the physical world of nature, is referred to as *physis*, including the makings of the natural and the cosmic worlds. Next, we

have the idea of *poiesis*, which is human making involving creative thought. Lastly, we have the idea of *technae*, which refers to crafting through some process or machinery. In our modern world of natural, cultural and mechanical production, it would be essential to think of imagination in relation to poiesis or cultural production and how we ideate about *physis* or nature and *technae* or mechanisation. In the final analysis, the ideology of production must be seen as imagination or *poesis*. However, in an interesting turn, Martin Heidegger shows all three forms to be ultimately linked to poesis or imaginative creation. Heidegger brings together the three Aristotlean conceptions of making into the single frame of *poesis*-

Plato tells us what this bringing is in a sentence from the Symposium (205b): "Every occasion for whatever passes over and goes forward into presencing from that which is not presencing is poiesis, is bringing-forth [Her-vor-bringen]." It is of utmost importance that we think bringing-forth in its full scope and at the same time in the sense in which the Greeks thought it. Not only handcraft manufacture, not only artistic and poetical bringing into appearance and concrete imagery, is a bringing-forth, poiesis. Physis also, the arising of something from out of itself, is a bringing-forth, poiesis. Physis is indeed poiesis in the highest sense. For what presences by means of physis has the bursting open belonging to bringing-forth, e.g., the bursting of a blossom into bloom, in itself (en heautoi). In contrast, what is brought forth by the artisan or the artist, e.g., the silver chalice, has the bursting open belonging to bringing forth not in itself, but in another (en alloi), in the craftsman or artist...One is that techne is the name not only for the activities and skills of the craftsman, but also for the arts of the mind and the fine arts. Techne belongs to bringing-forth, to poiesis; it is something poietic. (Heidegger, 1977: 10-13)

What is to be noted beyond the bringing together and interlinking of physis and technis into the category of poesis or creative production is how Heidegger gives to human poesis an added ability - what is being brought forth, what is being unveiled is not the thing in itself only - it is the thing in itself in the context of the artist. The imagination of creative production is to be found in nature and technology, but what makes it relevant to humans is the ability to place themselves in the act of unveiling or *aletheia* as the creator, the maker or the poet, through this bringing forth, manifestation or, as Heidegger would put it, through the *aletheia* or revelation that all forms of making ultimately become truth functions, and as such necessary for human beings. The purpose of human labour, the purpose of human imagination, is to unveil the truth by unleashing the creative potential that helps us go beyond our everyday existence. In using this idea of truth, as something new, something that unveils, something that forms a break with every day, Alain Badiou says, "A truth is solely constituted by rupturing with the order which supports it, never as an effect of that order" (Badiou, 2005: xii). Therefore, at the risk of sounding romantic, it would not be in the right place to regard the possibility of the truth as the new in imagination.

This return to the imaginative, creative potential is summed up by Roberto Unger in his central thesis that "the world is made and imagined" (Keliher, 2012). Of course, Unger is differentiating between material making and imaginative making, or in a more Marxist sense, he is differentiating between the mental makings that necessarily precede any physical making. The importance of imagination in his philosophy is necessary to assert the possibility of a negative capability to challenge the formative contexts of our society so that we can move from a world where we view existing structures as false necessities without alternatives towards an empowered democracy. The idea behind this paper is to similarly challenge established ways of thinking about colonialism and imperialism and create spaces so that it may be possible to move beyond or predict directions of societal change.

References

Appiah, K. A. "Is the Post- in Postmodernism the Post- in Postcolonial?" *Contemporary Postcolonial Theory: A Reader*. Ed. Padmini Mongia. Hodder Education: London. Pp. 55–71. Print, 1996.

Badiou, Alain. *Being and Event*. Trans. Oliver Feltman. Continuum: New York. Print, 2005.
Benjamin, Walter. "Imagination" *Selected Writings*. Ed. Marcus Bullock and Michael W. Jennings. Vol I: 1913-1926. Harvard University Press: Cambridge, M.A. Pp. 280-282. Print, 1996.
Cardoso, F. H. *Development under Fire*. Instituto Latinoamericano de Estudios Transnacionales: Mexico, D.F. Print, 1979.
Carpenter, Geo. H. (1913) *The Life-Story of Insects*. Cambridge University Press: London, 1913, Web. 09 Dec 2015. https://www.gutenberg.org/files/16410/16410-h/16410-h.htm
De Vaan, Michiel. *Etymological Dictionary of Latin and the other Italic Languages* (Leiden Indo-European Etymological Dictionary Series; 7), Brill: Leiden, Boston. Print, 2008.
Dirlik, Arif. "The Postcolonial Aura: Third World Criticism in the Age of Global Capitalism." *Critical Enquiry* Vol. 20, No. 2. Pp. 328:356. Print, 1994.
Friedrichsmeyer, Sara, Sara Lennox, and Susanne Zantop. *The Imperialist Imagination: German Colonialism and Its Legacy*. University of Michigan Press: Michigan. Print, 1998.
Gilmartin, Mary. *Key Concepts in Political Geography*. SAGE Publications: London. Print, 2009.
Goldsworty, Vesna. *Inventing Ruritania: The Imperialism of the Imagination*. Yale University Press: London. Print, 1998.
Hammond, Nicholas Geoffrey Lemprière. *A History of Greece to 322 BC.* Clarendon Press: Oxford. Print, 1959.
Heidegger, Martin. "The Question Concerning Technology." *The Question Concerning Technology and Other Essays*. Trans. William Lovitt. Harper & Row: New York, London. Print, 1977.
Hornblower, Simon and Antony Spawforth. *The Oxford Classical Dictionary*. Oxford University Press: Oxford. Print, 2003.
Kant, Immanuel. *The Critique of Pure Reason*. Trans. J. M. D. Meiklejohn. The Project Gutenberg EBook, [1787] 2003, Web. 22 April 2016. http://www.gutenberg.org/files/4280/4280-h/4280-h.htm
Karl Marx. "The Labour-Process and the Process of Producing Surplus-Value." *Capital.* Vol. 1, Part III: The Production of Absolute Surplus-Value. Print, 1887.
Keliher, Macabe. "A Vision and a Program for the American Left: A Conversation with Roberto Mangabeira Unger on the Situation, the Task, and the Remaking of the Democratic Party". *Possible Futures: A Project of the Social Science Research Council*, 2012. Web. 9 May 2016. http://www.possible-futures.org/2012/07/02/vision-program-american-left-conversation-roberto-mangabeira-unger-situation-task-remaking-democratic-party/
—*Wage Labour and Capital.* Marx/Engels Internet Archive (marxists.org), 1993, 1999 First Published (in German): Neue Rheinische Zeitung. Print, 1849.
Kohn, Margaret. "Post-colonial Theory." *Ethics and World Politics*. Ed. Duncan Bell, 200-218. Oxford University Press: Oxford. Print, 2010.
Luxemburg, Rosa. "Protective Tariffs and Accumulation" and "Militarism as a Province of Accumulation". *The Accumulation of Capital*, from Section Three: The Historical Conditions of Accumulation, Chapters 31 and 32. Ed. Dr. W. Stark, translated by Agnes Schwarzschild (Doctor Iuris). Routledge and Kegan Paul Ltd: London, 1951. Web. 10 January 2016. https://www.marxists.org/archive/luxemburg/1913/accumulation-capital/ch31.htmhttps://www.marxists.org/archive/luxemburg/1913/accumulation-capital/ch32.html
Nkrumah, Kwame. "Introduction." *Neo-Colonialism, the Last Stage of Imperialism.* Thomas Nelson & Sons, Ltd.: London. Print, 1965.
Osterhammel, Jürgen. *Colonialism: A Theoretical Overview*. Trans. Shelley Frisch. USA: Markus Weiner Publishers, 2005.
Plato. *The Republic* "Book VII" Trans. Benjamin Jowett, 350BC, Web. 23 Mar 2016 http://classics.mit.edu/Plato/republic.html
Porat, Naomi. "An Egyptian Colony in Southern Palestine during the Late Predynastic to Early Dynastic." *The Nile Delta in Transition: 4th.-3rd. Millennium BC.* Proceedings of the Seminar

Held in Cairo, the Netherlands Institute of Archaeology and Arabic Studies, Van den Brink.: Tel Aviv. pp. 433–440. Print, 1992.

Ring, Trudy, Robert M. Salken, and Sharon La Boda. *International Dictionary of Historic Places: Middle East and Africa*. Vol. 4. Fitzroy Dearborn Publishers: London, 1996.

Rolandi, Alessandro. "EIKASIA: Video Entry by Alessandro Rolandi" N.d. Jiali Gallery: Beijing, 2015. Web. 17 May 2016. http://www.jialigallery.com/exhibition/eikasia-video-installation-by-alessandro-rolandi/

Said, Edward. *Culture and Imperialism*. Random House. Print, 2014.———. *Orientalism*. Penguin Books: London. Print, 1978.

Sallis, John. *Delimitations: Phenomenology and the End of Metaphysics*. Indianapolis University Press: Bloomington, Indianapolis. Print, 1986.

Shakespeare, William. *A Midsummer Night's Dream*. Act 5, Sc. 1, Lines -23, Sparklesoup Classics, Sparklsoup Inc: Irving, Texas. Print, 2004.

Shohat, E. "Notes on the 'Post Colonial'." *Social Text*. Vol. 31/32: pp. 99–113. Print, 1992.

Todorova, Maria. (1999) "Bones of Contention." College of Liberal Arts and Sciences: University of Florida, Gainesville, FL. Originally printed in the November issue of CLAS notes, 1999. Web. 6 Apr 2016. http://www.clas.ufl.edu/events/news/Articles%201996-2004/199911_todorova.html

Marriott, John. *The Other Empire: Metropolis, India and Progress in the Colonial Imagination*. Manchester University Press: Manchester and New York. Print, 2003.