

Decolonization in Beecher Stowe's *Uncle Tom Cabin, Life among the Lowly*

Hajiali Sepahvand

English Department, Faculty of Arts, Khorramabad Branch, Islamic Azad University, Khorramabad, Iran
Hajis106@gmail.com

Abstract: The study tries to explore decolonization, which is a process to achieve cultural independence, in Beecher Stowe's *Uncle Tom Cabin, Life among the Lowly*. As an autonomous American author, Stowe applies the techniques to declare the American independent themes; namely decolonization through literature, which is a component of a national culture. She, purposely, depicts the consciously imagination of American archetypal tendency of sacrifice and heroism to instruct the members of her society, like other nation's autonomous authors, abrogation of the legitimized Master/Slave discourse. Moreover, she undermines this hierarchical classification through the dialectic encounter between characters and introduces Uncle Tom as American Jesus who presents the unrepresentable notion of Master/Slave in the Bible. This new American interpretation, unlike traditional Biblical notion of Master/Slave, announces that it is impossible to be a true Christian and also a slave owner; therefore, the article explores an America theme in the novel, that is, decolonization.

[Hajiali Sepahvand. **Decolonization in Beecher Stowe's *Uncle Tom Cabin, Life among the Lowly***. *Life Sci J* 2013;10(1):3021-3029] (ISSN:1097-8135). <http://www.lifesciencesite.com>. 371

Keywords- abrogation, decolonization, master/slave, undermining, unrepresentable

1. Introduction

Episteme and discourse as introduction to the colonialism, post-colonialism and decolonization, which are followed by analysis of Beecher Stowe's *Uncle Tom's Cabin*, will be presented at first. Then, decolonization, its strategies and elements will be the central concern of the study.

2. Episteme and Discourse

Everybody meets the question of what is good or bad. But this question is followed by more essential and radical question of how we know what is good or bad. In other words, what is the criterion and standard by which we can recognize goodness and badness? Or what rules allow or legitimize the construction of a model, literature, social conduct or classification? This is the knowledge which determines the above mentions categories as legitimized or not. But knowledge is transformed into instruments by which authorities determine legitimization and classification of everything. The transformation of knowledge (to the criterion of how we know what is good or bad) is resulted in distinguishing the different episteme which are, in Julian Wolfreys' words, "constellation of discourses that come together in a particular historical period as the knowledge peculiar to that epoch (Wolfreys, 2006)." Myth and Metanarratives are the best examples of such episteme. Therefore, paradoxically, knowledge is power and power is knowledge. Lyotard puts it so: "knowledge and power are simply two sides of the same questions: who decides what knowledge is, and who knows what needs to be decided? (Lyotard, 1984)" Correspondingly, he argues that Knowledge in the form of an information commodity indispensable to

productive power is already, and will continue to be, a major- perhaps *the* major-stake in the worldview competition for power. The most powerful people and societies are the ones who have the greatest knowledge resources: those with the best technology, the most advanced communications and weapons systems, the most highly developed medicines and the means to collect the most detailed information about their competitors (Ibid). The global competition for power, according to Lyotard, has thus become a battle for knowledge, and the goal is efficiency.

Therefore, for Lyotard, knowledge and power are simply two sides of the same questions: who decides what knowledge is, and who knows what needs to be decided? In the computer age, the question of knowledge is now more than ever question of government (Ibid). Meanwhile, Foucault says "we cannot exercise power except through the production of truth (Foucault, 1977b)." Therefore, we can recognize the power (knowledge) in relation to language and the truth. Truth is what taken into account as true within the system of rules for a particular discourse; power is that which defines, determines, and verifies truth.

Discourse, is perhaps the central motif in Foucault's thinking. Discourse is a way of describing, defining, and classifying, and thinking about people, things and even knowledge and abstract systems of thought. In other words, discourses are the various ways: artistic, social, political ... in which people think and talk about their world.

Discourse in Michel Foucault's words is: "...something as an individualizable group of statements, and sometimes as a regulated practice that

accounts for a number of statements (Foucault, 1972).” Therefore, according to Michel Foucault, discourse is a group of statements or meaningful passages of language (spoken or written) which are in interaction with other group of statements as reflection of social and epistemological practices of a group in a historical epoch. This passage reflects the rhetorical practices, and social epistemological of a group. In other words, it is the power of language to constrain, reflect, and influence those practices in a group. Foucault in his empirical works, such as *Madness and Civilization* (1967), the *Birth of the Clinic* (1973), *Discipline and Punishment* (1991), and *Will to Knowing* (1971), examined the ways that experts and professionals like doctors, psychiatrists, and criminologist had increased their authority through the rise of the new discourses.

3. Discourses of Colonialism and Post-colonialism

According to the mentioned before argumentation, the twentieth and twenty first centuries experienced two great episteme: Modernity and post-modernity. Naturally, both episteme consisted of some discourses. The first one, for example, includes structuralism, modernism, colonialism....

Among the analysts and critics of colonialism, we can mention Kant who in his theory of “cosmopolitan right,” (1724-1804), discussed the issue of justice and criticized European imperialism and defended non-European peoples (Muthu, 2000).

Moreover, Albert Memmi, and Amie Cesaire similarly were the critics of colonialism. Another critic, who had a role in shaping the discourse of colonialism, was Amie Cesaire. In his work (1991), he makes a systematic defense of the societies destroyed by imperialism. He asserts:

Between the colonizers and colonized there is room only for forced labor, intimidation, pressure, the police taxation, theft, rape, compulsory crops, contempt, mistrust, self-complacency, swinishness, brainless elites, and degraded classes. No human contact, but relations of domination and submission which turn the colonizing man into a classroom monitor, an army sergeant, a prison guard, a slave driver, and the indigenous man into an instrument of production (p.26).

The second episteme, Post-modernity, presented some unrepresentable discourses including post-structuralism, racism, slavery...and post-colonialism. The latest one was proposed by Edward Said (1977), publication of Frantz Fanon (1952) and Chinua Achebe (1963a) as the influential practical critic of binary opposition or Manichean duality of white/black in which the first sign axiomatically has been privileged. In addition, Homi k. Bhabha in his work (1994) emphasized the concerns of the colonized nations and introduced the notion of “hybridity” in

which he challenges notions of identity, culture, and nation as a coherent and unified entity that exhibits a linear historical development.

In “Can the Subaltern Speak?” (1983), Spivak focused on the structures of colonialism, the postcolonial subject and the possibility of postcolonial discourse which draws on deconstructive practices, the feminist movement, and Marxism.

4. Decolonization

Whether implicit or explicit, decolonization, in general, is a revolt, against imperial domination. In other words, it is a kind of awareness against oppression and inferiority like what was done in Marxist movement against master class by slaves (working class) or by Feminist against male-centered societies. Being different in early and present involvement and engagement, like them, decolonization can be divided into two phases: first or early phase, which was started by African decolonizers, derived from the works of political theorists like Frantz Fanon (1952, 1961, 1967) and Albert Memmi (1965) who located its principal characteristic in the notion of the imperial-colonial (colonizer-colonized) dialectic itself. In this respect, the early involvement and engagement of decolonization as Ashcroft puts, is ‘a profound complicity with the imperial powers from which they sought to emerge as free agents’ (Ashcroft, 2007), that is, freedom and emancipation as free subject. Fanon, writing in the 1950s during the Algerian struggle for independence from French colonial rule, through psychoanalysis of colonial subject produced the ways in which the colonial subject’s identity is constructed by the colonist. In his famous and influential essay (Fanon, 1986), Fanon shows the effects of racism on the construction of the subject and the production of identity. In this essay which is an interior monologue, Fanon uses the constructed identity of the oppressed narrator by the racist oppressors as: ‘ “Dirty nigger!”, “Negro!”’ and eventually he puts this construction as the construction of an object among the other objects not a subject:

‘I came into the world imbued with the will to find a meaning in things, my spirit filled with the desire to attain to the source of the world, and then I found I was an object in the midst of other objects. Sealed into this crushing objecthood, I turned beseechingly to others.

I stumbled, and the movements, the attitudes, the glances of the other fixed me there, in the sense in which a chemical solution is fixed by a dye. I was indignant; I demanded an explanation. Nothing happened. I burst apart. Now the fragments have been put together again by another self (Fanon, 1986).

On the whole, early decolonization seeks to invert the structures of domination and substituting the tradition of the colonized nations in place of imperial-dominated canon. Therefore, the early decolonization is dialectic of subject/object, self/other which is resulted in a national revolt and in Parry term 'nationalist liberationist narratives'...(Parry,1987).

But in the present or advanced phase, decolonization criticism is extended by Edward Said into the area of challenging and undermining absolute and axiomatic principles upon which the world classification into superiority of the occident and inferiority of the orient is established. Such classifications in Said's view are man-made, not absolute (Said, 1977); therefore, they are used for domination by Europe. Thus, decolonization has turned away from simple inversions towards a questioning of forms and modes, to unmasking the assumptions upon which such canonical constructions are founded in a way that it moves first to make their cryptic bases visible and then destabilizes them as Ashcroft puts it :

Decolonization is the process of revealing and dismantling colonialist power in all its forms. This includes dismantling the hidden aspects of those institutional and cultural forces that had maintained the colonialist power and that remain even after political independence is achieved. Initially, in many places in the colonized world, the process of resistance was conducted in terms or institutions appropriated from the colonizing culture itself... (Ashcroft *et al.* 2007).

5. Decolonization in the Settler colonies:

In the settler colonies like the United States, Canada, New Zealand, and Australia, the land was occupied by European colonists who dispossessed and overwhelmed the Indigenous populations. Therefore, in these colonies, decolonization, which is possible through Agency, Nationalism, Appropriation and Abrogation, is different from the invaded colonies. In such colonies, according to Ashcroft *et al.*,

the first task seems to be to establish that the texts can be shown to constitute a literature separate from that of the metropolitan centre. A vast and impressive body of literary histories, thematic studies, and studies of individual literary traditions has accrued over the last one hundred and fifty years or so in the white cultures of settler colonies. The task of compiling a national literary history has usually been

an important element in the establishment of an independent cultural identity (Ashcroft *et al.*, 2004).

This decolonization which was the concern of early decolonizers can be observed in H.M. Green (1961); Carl F. Klinck (1965), a large body of text in the United State (Russell Reising, 1978), and many others. Thus, the early stage of decolonization is a kind of consciousness through which settler colonized people perceive themselves as individuals who can freely and autonomously initiate action and construct their own identity, that is, Agency, which in Ashcroft's view refers to the ability to act or perform an action. In contemporary theory, it hinges on the question of whether individuals can freely and autonomously initiate action, or whether the things they do are in some sense determined by the ways in which their identity has been constructed. Agency is particularly important in post-colonial theory because it refers to the ability of post-colonial subjects to initiate action in engaging or resisting imperial power (Ashcroft, 2007).

In the later stages some decolonizers try to develop their self-assertion through independent national literature in a controversial way like L. Kramer (1981), W.H. New (1989) and Charles Brockden Brown's (1799) work in America. But, the problem to which they meet is lack of a national and local language as their own language. In other words, the language through which they want to establish and express a separated independent national cultural identity is metropolitan language:

The colonial writer does not have words of his own....Try to speak the words of your home and you will discover – if you are a colonial – that you do not know them . . . perhaps our job was not to fake a space of our own and write it up, but rather to find words for our space-lessness . . . Instead of pushing against the grain of an external, uncharged language, perhaps we should finally come to writing *with* that grain' (Lee, 1974).

Therefore, the real concern is the control over the means of communication, that is, power of writing in the colonial situation as has been discussed in *The Conquest of America* by Tzvetan Todorov (1974). But how is it possible while the only dominant language as the medium of power is the language of the centre? In other words, post-colonial writing only can defines itself by seizing the language of the centre: 'The crucial function of language as a medium of power demands that post-colonial writing defines itself by seizing the language of the centre and re-placing it in a

discourse fully adapted to the colonized place' (Ashcroft *et al.*, 2004). It is because language is the medium through which a hierarchical structure of power is perpetuated, and conceptions of truth, order, and reality become established. Post-colonial writing is going to reject such power and; therefore, post-colonial writing is the process by which the language, with its power, and the writing, with its signification of authority, has been seized from the dominant European culture. Post-colonial writing does this through two process of

“the abrogation or denial of the privilege of ‘English’ involves a rejection of the metropolitan power over the means of communication” and ‘the appropriation and reconstitution of the language of the centre, the process of capturing and remoulding the language to new usages, marks a separation from the site of colonial privilege. Abrogation is a refusal of the categories of the imperial culture, its aesthetic, its illusory standard of normative or ‘correct’ usage, and its assumption of a traditional and fixed meaning ‘inscribed’ in the words. It is a vital moment in the de-colonizing of the language and the writing of ‘english’, but without the process of appropriation the moment of abrogation may not extend beyond a reversal of the assumptions of privilege, the ‘normal’, and correct inscription, all of which can be simply taken over and maintained by the new usage (Ashcroft *et al.*, 2004).

Therefore, post-colonial text is itself a site of struggle for linguistic control which is resulted in the appropriating discourse. This struggle extends to the disputes concerning theme, form, and genre definition, implicit systems of manner, custom, and value.

Now, the question is that may we say that language constitutes reality? Paradoxically, the answer is yes! But where is the center of reality, that is, its axiomatic center according which the other realities by other languages are constructed? The answer is that there is not any centre of reality just as there is not any pre-given unmediated reality and control over the means of communication determines the center of reality; therefore, the colonized nations through appropriation of language of metropolitan centre-- ‘to convey in a language that is not one’s own the spirit that is one’s own’ (Rao, 1938), or makes it ‘bear the burden’ of one’s own cultural experience (Achebe, 1975)-- and self-assertion abrogate its centrality and they define themselves as the centre and they may reconstruct reality according to their own pattern of conventions, expectations, and experiences, that is, establishment of the link between the received English

and place or in Emerson’s phrase, , their ‘original relation with the universe’ (Emerson, 1836).

On the whole, American decolonization by its early writers is through exhibition of a series of adventures, growing out of the condition of their own country in which, as explicitly Renata Wasserman (1984) puts it, they try to legitimize the Americanhood as well as differentiate it from the European, through stressing ‘the difference in nature and equivalence in value’ (Wasserman, 1984) between the New World and the Old. For doing so, they have taken the English language, transformed it into english to ‘bear the burden’ of their ‘own cultural experience’ as well as application, for example, of some fascinated American subjects which match those of the post-colonial theory of decolonization-namely exploring the dialectic clash between cultures in the texts-including the dialectic clash between civilization (White) and nature (Black or Indian), drawing American myth (Edenic Dream Land), Initiation of Americanhood, so that they could compete, undermine and abrogate the axiomatically superiority of Europe or white and declare their own culture as the melting pot (Dream Land) in which, unlike European tradition, both the white and black must be regarded as human equally. Americans’ decolonization, therefore, is their straggle to express themselves in their literatures, destabilizing colonial assumptions by identifying their cultures, proving there is no superiority for other cultures, and making a space for their voice to be heard throughout the world, that is, Ashcroft the theme of the celebration of the struggle towards independence in community (Ashcroft *et al.*, 2004) or what “which makes them distinctively postcolonial (Ibid).” As the concern of this research, therefore, the following up materials will be traced through analyzing the novel in this part.

6. Decolonization in H. Beecher Stowe’s *Uncle Tom’s Cabin, Life among the Lowly*:

To analyze the novel as decolonization, it is necessary to trace American Dream, Americanhood as well as American Adam in Uncle Tom’s innocent and purity whom Stowe exaggeratedly portraits to challenge, undermine, and abrogate the axiomatically justified and legitimized Slavery by society, state and Christian as the prevailing illusion of European which spread into America by the white. In other words, the research is going to show Stowe’s challenging the plot of American dream as a partial dream land to modify it and propose the alternative and design of the real perfect American Dream Land which is lack of such oppression and cruel slavery. For doing so, she puts the words in the mouth of Mrs. St. Clare “all I want is that different things be kept in different boxes. The whole frame-work of society, both in Europe and America, is made up of various things which will not stand the scrutiny of any very ideal standard of

morality (p.240-1).”Therefore, Uncle Tom is American Archetypal tendency of sacrificial heroism—namely American Jesus—and the novel as a didactic document is that part of the Bible which, unlike European Bible, contains new message of Slavery eradication, that is, American Biblical Identity or decolonization.

How Uncle Tom is the self-reliance American character or Adam? Despite of the cruel White masters as Simon Legree, he is honest to every body as well as even Legree; thus, Stowe’s decolonization is through undermining the very axiomatically superiority of the white (Europe) and inferiority of the black because Tom is, actually, the uncorrupted, innocent and non-hypocritical Adam before and after Fall who like Christ accepts and loves both friends and enemies. In other words, Stowe’s Uncle Tom is American character who contains boundless goodness, innocence, moral purity, and social innocence which posit him as overt version of Adam before the Fall, love for *all* (white and black) people, determination to better himself, non-hypocrisy - “no civilized hypocrisies and bland deceits” (Melville, 1963) - faith and loyalty to God, Christ and his cruel master, that is, a boundless universal character who is beyond the regional criteria.

In his unyielding struggle and tendency towards goodness, Tom, as we see in different parts of the novel, is laboriously practicing his penmanship, just as he read and re-read, with difficulty, his Bible, because he wants to become not only a better man, but a better Christian man. Among the other slaves on the Shelby plantation, Tom serves as a kind of spiritual father who “has, naturally, an organization in which the *morality* was strongly predominant (pp.42-3).” They gather to his cabin for prayer. According to Stowe, “but it was in prayer that he especially excelled. Nothing could exceed the touching simplicity, the childlike earnestness of his prayers (P.43).” It is this child-like earnestness that causes Tom to be uncompromisingly loyal to his “Mas’r”. Tom recognizes the terrible injustices that are inflicted on him and his fellow blacks, but his firm belief in the Bible will not allow him to rebel. His models are the saints and Christ, who also suffered and died for their beliefs. Tom is reading in the Bible that “I’m in the Lord’s hands (P. 125).” We are told that if Tom were not a Christian, he could be dishonest. Tom is flogged to death, but before he dies, he tells young George Shelby that he is “going into glory and that despite everything, “I loves ‘em all! I loves every creature, every whar!—it’s nothing *but* love! O Mas’r George! What a thing ‘tis to be a Christian!(P.545).” As a result, Tom is the American Adam who transcends the limitation of racism and color as well as proposing the modification of the society in which the dominant white masters are lack of any true conscience.

Expectedly, in a scene (p.194) in which Eva slips overboard into the river that is Tom who dives in and saves her life. In gratitude, Eva’s father, Augustine St. Clare, a kindly, dreamy man, buys Uncle Tom (p.198). Tom and Little Eva become great friends and she decorates him with wreaths of roses around his neck; thus, Stowe violates the gap between the white and black or depicts Tom who knows no borders, namely beyond the prevail limitations. Moreover, when Legree rages at him, “Do you know I’ve made up my mind to KILL you?” Tom does not fear Legree; instead, he senses only that “the hour of release” is at hand (p. 537). Consequently, he, like American Adam, is... “the hero of the new [spiritual] adventure,...standing alone, ready to confront whatever awaited him with the aid of his own unique and inherent resources (Lewis, 1908).”

Tom, like Christ, quotes from the Bible: “Pray for them that spitefully use you,” (p.75) and practically says “I forgive ye, with all my heart!” when Quimbo said “O, Tom!”, “we’s been awful wicked to ye!” (P.540). Thus, Stowe is clearly emphasizing his goodness and his belief in the tenets of Jesus, namely forgiving and compassionating every body. He is a Christian and to him, “the Lord’s grace is stronger” than vengeance (p. 75); therefore, he is imitating his God. He says Haley, the white cruel master, will have to answer to God for his wickedness. Tom says that he would rather be sold “ten thousand times over” than “have all that ar poor crittur’s got to answer for.” He understands that “Mas’r couldn’t help hisself.” This is Christian intuition and exceptional understanding on the part of a man who has just been “sold” for money to another man, a stranger, who will, in turn, sell Tom to whomever he wishes (p. 75). Ironically, his vision of Christianity is that of Christ’s, while his white masters’ vision of Christianity is satanic because of their belief in the concept of slavery as a right and natural one. On the whole, this deliberately spiritual superiority of Tom or the black and inferiority and cruelty of the white is the very abrogation of the current system of Master/Slave or declaration of Americanization and mythical dream land which rejects the injustice and its inhabitants contain, like Tom as the symbol of American Adam, boundless goodness, love for *all* people, determination to better themselves, non-hypocrisy, faith and loyalty to God, Christ and their cruel master, that is, a boundless universal character who is beyond the regional criteria.

Uncle Tom, in Stowe’s novel, is her Archetypal tendency of sacrificial heroism in which she imaginatively and, in Jung’s term, (Jung, 1968) “consciously” applies her tendency and draws the American myth of how to sacrifice the lamb to save the community or, in Rosenberg’s term, “instruct members of the community in the attitudes and

behavior necessary to function successfully in that particular culture (Rosenberg 1986)"; therefore, her novel is a book that was clearly written to be a didactic document to show her readers that Christianity and slavery were antithetical and because of her dramatically effective depiction of Tom's unjust murder and his unyielding goodness, her novel became a sort of American Bible for the Abolitionists. Uncle Tom's death served as the graphic epitome of her indictment against slavery. This American Bible says that it is impossible to be a true Christian and also a slave owner.

Dialectic encounter between axiomatically good, normal and "civilized Southern Masters of plantations and evil and abnormal barbarous Black Northern" or African Slaves is the central theme of the novel which is the Manichean delirium of Master/Slave and White/Black by Fanon as well as Said's "Us and Them". Therefore, it is to say that Americans are, paradoxically, both spiritual and physical colonizers of the black; consequently, we can analyze the novel as Stowe's Decolonization against the white American colonizers who were colonized before by the white European as well as modification and reformation of American Dream, Americanhood, and American Jesus as the follower of Brown, Cooper, Melville..., that is, disillusionment of the white American illusion or absolute decolonization.

Stowe's undermining and abrogating axiomatically superiority of the white masters (civilization) and inferiority of the slaves (wilderness) is in the dialectic encounter between Tom (American Jesus) and Mr. Legree (Satan-evil) which is not only the misery, nobility and greatness of Tom (wilderness) and ugliness of the white as Legree (civilization) but also Stowe's perception of the need for a Christ like figure who loves both his friends and enemies. Notwithstanding his exaggerated torture and tragic death; symbolically, he saves the slaves because the novel is resulted in the civil war against slavery; therefore, this is the satisfaction of the archetypal tendency of sacrifice and heroism (scapegoat) which is done by Stowe to save the slaves as Christ did for human being. In other words, Tom is the American Christ (Jesus) who has a new message and interpretation of the Bible about Master/Slave which is different from the current Bible- that is, Lyotard's "unpresentable" (Lyotard, 1984) in the Bible which "can be presented" or undermining the legitimized Christian Master/Slave. It is portrayed in the scene in which Stowe parallels Christ and Uncle Tom and says besides Tom, there has already been "One whose suffering changed an instrument of torture, degradation, and shame, into a symbol of glory, honor, and immortal life (p.538)." Thus, rejection of slavery which is "unpresentable," in the traditional European

Bible, "can be presented" by Tom (American Christ) through his sacrificial death because of not flogging a slave woman in Legree's order.

While watching a society which is illusively ruled by the justified Christian master/slave system, Stowe symbolically and exaggeratedly sacrifices Tom to awaken the society, express her own firm belief and save the oppressed black slaves. Stowe has portrayed this sacrificial heroism in Uncle Tom in a way that he reflects some features of self-reliance American Adam whose high capacity solves (melting pot) every kinds of behavior in it, that is, a prototype character who is different from the narrow-minded white (Europe) people.

After St. Clare died his wife Marie, a Christian, emerges as a thoroughly bitter, wicked woman and the servants immediately sense her "unfeeling, tyrannical character (p. 418)." She believes that "these creatures [slaves] get used to it [punishment]; it's the only way they can be kept in order (p.420)." We are informed by the novel that she impulsively decides to sell the slaves at auction, disregarding her late husband who promised to give Tom his "emancipation" (p. 398). As Miss Ophelia reminds her that "Augustine promised Tom his liberty, she says no "Tom is one of the most valuable servants on the place (p. 423)" and she sells Tom to Simon Legree. Thus, Tom encounters Simon Legree, one of the most infamous villains and their encounter is resulted in undermining the axiomatically superiority of the civilized white slave and glory of Tom, that is, Legree's cruelty to Tom, and Tom's strong faith and sacrificial heroism. Stowe points out that the first thing that Legree does is that he puts chains on Tom's wrists and ankles. She says that Tom and other blacks are treated like chairs and tables and they should not be treated like "a *man* [who] can feel (pp. 439-40)." Interestingly, this is what Fanon, in his famous and influential essay, shows as the effects of racism and he puts this exploitation as "I found I was an object in the midst of other objects Sealed into this crushing objecthood..." Then, Legree smashes his "great, heavy fist" on Tom's hands: "I never see the nigger, yet, I couldn't bring down with one crack (p. 442)." As we are tolled in the novel, while Legree finds the Bible in Tom's pocket, seizes him, and proudly introduces himself that he'll have no "bawling, praying, singing niggers on [his] place." He shouts that on *his* plantation, "I'm your church ...you've got to be as I say (p. 441)." He prides himself on "*knocking down niggers*" with one single blow of his mighty fist (p. 442) as well as calling Tom "best" (p. 446), "cussed" (466) and declares that "Ye won't find no soft spot in me, nowhere. So, now, mind yerselves; for I don't show no mercy (p. 443)!" After about one century, Fanon in his essay (1986) in a similar way uses the constructed identity of the oppressed narrator

by the racist oppressors as: “Dirty nigger!”, “Negro!” which is continuation of this literary war against Master/Slave system or early decolonization of mind.

There is the scene in the novel in which Tom is toiling in the cotton fields and he sees a woman who is kicked in the head; he tries to help her by filling her sack with some of his cotton, but she fearlessly protests. Legree hears about the incident, and he orders Tom to flog the woman. Tom says that he cannot, “no way possible.” Legree strikes him across the face and says that Tom must flog the woman. Axiomatically superiority of Master which is claimed by Legree has been betrayed in the novel so:

What! ye blasted black beast! tell *me* ye don’t think it *right* to do what I tell ye! What have any of you cussed cattle to do with thinking what’s right? I’ll put a stop to it! Why, what do ye think ye are? May be think ye’r a gentleman master, Tom, to be a telling your master what’s right, and what an’t! So you pretend it’s wrong to flog the gal! (p. 466).

Tom refuses again and says “I think so, Mas’r,” “the poor crittur ’s sick and feeble; ’t would be downright cruel, and it’s what I never will do, nor begin to (p. 466).” Undermining the axiomatically superiority of Master is declared by Tom’s volunteer readiness for sacrifice which is the real mastery: “Mas’r, if you mean to kill me, kill me; but, as to my raising my hand agin any one here, I never shall,—I’ll die first!” Tom spoke in a mild voice, but with a decision that could not be mistaken (p. 466).”

Stowe, overtly, overthrows this legitimized mastery when she portrays Legree as a “ferocious beast, that plays with its victim before he devours it” and links this cruelty to traditional Christian when she declares Legree’s answer that “didn’t you never hear, out of yer Bible, ‘Servants, obey yer masters’? An’t I yer master? Didn’t I pay down twelve hundred dollars, cash, for all there is inside yer old cussed black shell? An’t yer mine, now, body and soul? (p. 466).” Although Legree has flogged Tom and in the depth of physical suffering, he looks earnestly to heaven and exclaims: “No! no! no! my soul an’t yours, Mas’r! You haven’t bought it,—ye can’t buy it! It’s been bought and paid for, by one that is able to keep it;—no matter, no matter, you can’t harm me! (p. 466).” Stowe puts these words in the mouth the American Christ—he has a Bible in his pocket— who can “present, unpresentable” in the Bible which rejects absolute ownership of master on slave and proclaims the freedom of his soul, that is, symbolic declaration of independence.

Next day, Legree says if Tom “begs his pardon,” Legree will ease up on him (p. 493). Cassy, one of the slaves says that is impossible; Tom will never do so. Then Legree turns on her savagely: “He’ll beg like a

dog.” Legree “taunts the old black man, kicking him, and calling him a beast” and “Tom says that he knows Legree can do terrible things to him, but he also knows that there is *Eternity* waiting for him.” He speaks the word, and it “thrilled the black man’s soul.” Then “Tom faces Legree and says that he’s not afraid to die; the Lord Almighty is beside him (p. 494).” When Legree says “Tom that yor God doesn’t help you, hold on me, I am somebody; and can do something,” Tom says, “The Lord may help me, or not help; but I’ll hold to Him, and believe Him to the last (p. 509).”

One night, as the novel informs us, Cassy calls to Tom that she has drugged Legree, and she and Emmeline are going to escape. But Tom says that he cannot go. He feels that he “*must*” stay with the rest of these “poor souls” and “bear my cross” with them “till the end.” He urges Cassy to try and escape, however. “I’ll pray with all my might for you.” Then Cassy agrees to go. “Amen!” says Tom. “The Lord help ye! (pp. 517-18).”

After their escape, Legree finds Tom and asks him “Do you know anything?” Tom says “I know, Mas’r; but I can’t tell anything. *I can die!* (p.537)” Like Jesus, he is ready to give his soul to save the others and he does so because in spite of knowing their plot he does not betray them and he is kicked until his death. Stowe says us that, “like his Master, he knew that, if he saved others, himself he could Not save; nor could utmost extremity wring from him words, save of prayers and holy trust (p.539).” Cassy “learned the sacrifice that had been made for her and Emmeline (544).”

In the last moments, Tom, amazingly says that Legree “’s a poor mis’able critter! it’s awful to think on ’t! O, if he only could repent, the Lord would forgive him now; but I’m ’feared he never will!” “I hope he won’t!” said George; “I never want to see *him* in heaven!” “Hush, Mas’r George!—it worries me! Don’t feel so! He an’t done me no real harm,—only opened the gate of the kingdom for me; that’s all! (pp. 545-6).” Stowe does not tell us, in detail, the degree of Legree’s final cruelty to Tom. She only says that Legree “smote his victim to the ground,” and then she comments that “what man has nerve to do, man has not nerve to hear (538).” Eventually, although Stowe does not say so, we feel that Tom must be a counterpart of Christ in this scene and that the two of them are victims of gross injustice.

George, Mr. and Mrs. Shelby’s young son, who taught Uncle Tom how to read and write, is going to find Tom and finally finds him who is dying. When sees him, Tom sobs: “Now I shall die content.” Clearly, Tom knows that he is dying, and he is prepared for his death. He says “The Lord’s bought me,” using a most natural analogy of master and slave and the only choice for slaves and, he says further, “I

long to go. Heaven is better than Kintuck (p. 545).” George calls him ‘Poor, poor fellow,” and Tom chides him for doing so: “Don’t call me poor fellow. . . . I have been a poor fellow; but that’s all past and gone, now. I’m right in the door going to glory! . . . I’ve got the victory (p. 545).”

George offers to buy Tom’s body, for he feels that Tom is surely dead, but Legree refuses. George ignores him and he has loaded Tom’s body in the wagon then he turns to Legree, “I will proclaim this murder. I will go to the very first magistrate and expose you (p. 547),” but Legree answers “What a fuss, for a dead nigger (p. 547).” Uncle Tom is buried quietly on a dry, sandy knoll, shaded by a few trees (p.548). The blacks who have accompanied George beg him to buy them. George cannot do it but he vows to do “what one man can [do] to drive out this curse of slavery from [his] land! (p. 548).” George Shelby frees his slaves, in the name of Uncle Tom, for he vowed on Tom’s grave never to own another slave. “Rejoice, in your freedom and be as honest and as faithful a Christian as Tom was (p. 572)”; thus, Tom, as American Christ, saved others by his death. As we know, this is the literary war and introduction for great American war against slavery by Lincoln because American Dream Land is the only place for this humanist operation to add another element to the component of this unique independent identity, that is, American Decolonization.

7. Conclusion

A number of decolonization techniques in this article were applied to Beecher Stowe’s *Uncle Tom Cabin, Life among the Lowly* to see how decolonization can be accounted for in terms of literary development.

Uncle Tom can be analyzed as Stowe’s Archetypal tendency of sacrificial heroism in which she imaginatively and, in Jung’s term, “consciously” applies her tendency and draws the American myth of how to sacrifice the lamb to save the community or, in Rosenberg’s term, “instruct members of the community in the attitudes and behavior necessary to function successfully in that particular culture” as hero myth and epics; therefore, her novel is a book that was clearly written to be a didactic document to show her readers that Christianity and slavery were antithetical and because of her dramatically effective depiction of Tom’s unjust murder and his unyielding goodness, her novel became a sort of American Bible for the Abolitionists. This American Bible says that it is impossible to be a true Christian and also a slave owner.

Dialectic encounter between axiomatically good, normal and “civilized Southern Masters of plantations and evil and abnormal barbarous Black Northern” or African Slaves is the focal point in the novel which is

the Manichean delirium of Master/Slave and White/Black by Fanon as well as Said’s “Us and Them”. Therefore, it is to say that Americans are, paradoxically, both spiritual and physical colonizers of the black; consequently, we can analyze the novel as Stowe’s Decolonization against the white American colonizers who were colonized before by the white European as well as modification and reformation of American Dream, which was proposed by Brown, Cooper, Melville..., that is, disillusionment of the white American illusion or absolute decolonization.

Another point is that deliberately spiritual superiority of Tom or the black and inferiority and cruelty of the white is the very abrogation of the current system of Master/Slave or declaration of Americanization and mythical dream land which rejects the injustice and its inhabitants contain, like Tom as the symbol of American Adam, boundless goodness, love for *all* people, determination to better themselves, non-hypocrisy, faith and loyalty to God, Christ and their cruel master, that is, a boundless universal character who is beyond the regional criteria.

Eventually Tom, as American Christ, saved others by his death. As we know, this is the literary war and introduction for great American war against slavery by Lincoln because American Dream Land is the only place for this humanist operation to add another element to the component of this unique independent identity, that is, American Decolonization.

Corresponding Author

Hajiali Sepahvand, PhD candidate, Literary Criticism: Post-colonial studies.

References

1. Achebe, Chinua. (1975). *Morning Yet on Creation Day*. New York: Doubleday.
2. Achebe, Chinua. (1963a). *No Longer at Ease*. London: Heinemann.
3. Ashcroft, W.D., Griffiths, Gareth and Tiffin, Helen (2004) *The Empire Writes Back*. London: Routledge.
4. Ashcroft et al. (2007). *Post-colonial Studies, The Key Concepts*, Routledge, Taylor & Francis e-Library, p. 3,4, 12,57, 56, .
5. Bhabha, Homi K. (1994). *The Location of Culture*. London and New York: Routledge.
6. Brockden Brown, Charles. (1973). *Edgar Huntly*. Ed. David Stineback. New Haven: College and University.
7. Cesaire, Aime. (1991). *Discourse on Colonialism*. Boston: Beacon Press,.
8. Emerson, Ralph, Waldo .(1836). ‘Nature’ in Stephen E. Whicher (ed.). *Selections from Ralph Waldo Emerson*. Boston, MS: Houghton Mifflin. 1956.

9. Fanon, Frantz. (1959). *Studies in a Dying Colonialism*. Trans. H.Chevalier. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1970.
10. Fanon, Frantz. (1961). *The Wretched of the Earth*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.
11. Fanon, Frantz. (1967). *Black Skin. White Masks*. New York: Grove Press.
12. Fanon, Frantz. (1986). *Black Skin, White Masks*, trans. Charles Lam Markmann, London:Pluto Press.
13. Fanon, Frantz. (1952). *Black Skin White Masks* (trans. Charles Lam Markmann). London: Paladin [1968].
14. Foucault, Michel. *The Political Function of the Intellectual, Radical Philosophy*. Harvester. 1977b.
15. Foucault, Michel. *Archaeology of Knowledge*, trans. A. M. Sheridan Smith. London: Tavistock (first published 1969). 1972. P.80.
16. Green, H.M. (1961). *A History of Australian Literature*, 2 vols., Sydney: Angus and Robertson
17. Jung, C. G. (1968). *Man and his Symbols*, London: Adus.
18. Klinck, Carl F. (1965). *Literary History of Canada: Canadian Literature in English*, 3vols, Toronto/London: University of Toronto Press.
19. Kramer, L. (ed.). (1981). *The Oxford History of Australian Literature*. Melbourne: Oxford University Press.
20. Lee, Dennis. (1974). 'Cadence, country, silence: writing in colonial space', *Boundary* 2,3, 1 (Fall).
21. Lewis, R. W.B. (1908). *The American Adam*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. P.5.
22. Lyotard, Jean-François. (1984). *The Postmodern Condition: A Report on Knowledge*, trans. Geoffrey Bennington and Brian Massumi, Manchester: Manchester University Press. p.81)
23. Lyotard, Jean-François .*The Postmodern Condition: A Report on Knowledge*, trans. Geoffrey Bennington and Brian Massumi, Manchester: Manchester University Press. 1984. P. 8.
24. . *Ibid*. P. 5.
25. . *Ibid*. P. 9.
26. Muthu, Sankar. *Kant's "Cosmopolitan Right": Global Justice, Foreigners, and Anti – Imperialism in the Age of Enlightenment*. Vol. 7, no. 1, New York: Ny10003- Constellations, 2000.
28. Maxwell, D.E.S. (1965). 'Landscape and Theme' in *Press* 1965.
29. Melville Herman. (1936). *Moby Dick or the White Whale*, Spenser press. P.40.
30. Memmi, Albert. (1965). *The Colonizer and the Colonized* (trans Howard Greenfield).Boston, MA: Beacon Press
31. Memmi, Albert. (1965). *The Coloniser and the Colonised*. New York: Orion Press.
32. New, W.H. (1989). *A History of Canadian Literature*. London: Macmillan.
33. Parry, Benita. (1987). 'Problems in current theories of colonial discourse', *Oxford Literary Review*, 9, nos 1 & 2.
34. Rao, Raja. (1938). *Kanthapura*. New York: New Directions.
35. Reising, Russell. (1987). *The Unusable Past: Theory and the Study of American Literature*. New York and London: Methuen (New Accents).
37. Roosenberg Donna. (1986). *World Mythology*, NTC Publishing Group, Lincolnwood, Illinois USA. p. xvi
38. Said, Edward. (1978). *Orientalism*. New York: Pantheon.
39. Spivak, Gayatri Chakravorti. (1999). *A Critique of Postcolonial Reason*. Cambridge and London: Harvard University Press.". (1983).
40. *Can The Subaltern Speak?"*. London: Methuen.
41. Stowe H. Beecher. (2009). *Uncle Tom's Cabin or, Life Among the Lowly*. The Cambridge, Manhusetts, and London, Belknap Press of Harvard University University, England,
42. Todorov, Tzvetan. (1974). *The Conquest of America: The Question of the Other*. Trans. Richard Howard. New York: Harper and Row 1982.
43. Wasserman, Renata. (1984). 'Re-inventing the New World: Cooper and Alencar', *Comparative Literature*, 36, no. 2 (Spring).
44. Wolfreyes, Julian. *Key Concept in Literary Theory*. Second edition, London and Losangeles: Edinburgh University Press. 2006. P. 36.