CHAPTER TWO
UNDERSTANDING COLONIAL SPACE: FROM ENUNCIATION TO ASSETS

The present chapter aims to develop a theoretical framework for the study by linking up the concepts of landscape, territory, and assets further. It also tries to examine how each of these is employed as a tool of space production. Beginning with a general critical understanding of these crucial components of space, the chapter proceeds to link each of these concepts to the spatial politics of colonialism, as reflected in colonial travel and expedition writing.

Before beginning to engage with each of these individual concepts, it is necessary to recapitulate the key points developed in the previous chapter. First, it is argued so far that space is a social construct. Second, social space, and for that matter, political space is produced by appropriating natural space into designs of control, occupation, and utilization. In short, every project of space- production facilitates the commencement as well as the furtherance of power. As Lefebvre argues in *The Production of Space*, this politics of space often functions through narratives of prohibition (35). In a similar vein, Tim Creswell in his study *In Place/Out of Place: Geography, Ideology, and Transgression* (1996), argues that the production of space often involves narratives of normative as well as transgressive use of space (9). It could be suggested that, the construction of space involves not only acts of coding and visualizing space but also interventions in space.

As mentioned earlier, visualization of space could be said to correspond to what Lefebvre terms as perceived space. Similarly, realization and production of space could be said to correspond to Lefebvre's ideas of conceived and lived space. It is also suggested, in the present thesis, that the three components of space discussed here also correspond with these stages of space production. In other words, landscape corresponds to visualization or coding of space, territory corresponds to realization or politics of space and assets correspond to spaces of production. To this extent, landscape, territory, and asset are forms of, as well as, means to re-frame space. However, each of these modes of space has its own dynamics. Whereas landscape is the visual or aesthetic appropriation of space, territories are the more explicit realization of the same. Assets, on the other hand, are best viewed as the conversion of space into utilities.

It is important to note that colonial travel and expedition narratives transform pre-colonial space into landscapes, territories, and assets. They not only participate in acts of visualizing or realizing the colony as imperial as an asset, but they also force the

transformation of territories into an apparatus of wealth. The following sections discuss dimensions of the construction of space as landscape, territory, and assets with special reference to colonial travel and expedition writing.

I

Before probing deeper into the concept of landscape, it is necessary to trace the development of the concept. In *Iconography of Landscape* (1988), cultural geographers Denis Cosgrove and Stephen Daniels mention that landscape originated in fifteenth-century Italy as an artistic genre or mode of painting. It derives, to a great extent, from the linear perspective which was a newly invented technique to enframe three-dimensional material space on a two-dimensional canvas. This view is also endorsed by John Wiley in his book *Landscape* (2007). Wiley also suggests that it is possible to condense twentieth-century theorizations of landscapes to three major strains (17). First, cultural geographer Carl Sauer (1889-1975) and the 'Berkley School' of landscape studies influenced by him theorize landscapes as an external reality subject to visual perception. Second, comes British geographer W. G. Hoskins (1908-1992) who in his book *The Making of the English Landscape* (1954), views landscapes as a tool to investigate rural local histories. Third, American thinker J B Jackson (1909-1996) looks at landscape as a symbolic text implicated in projects of domination such as capitalism.

The term landscape shares a complicated history with colonialism, given that both are attempts to reframe space. It is necessary to look at the reception of the term landscape. The following definition by Wylie is a useful window to look at the concept:

> It is a tension between proximity and distance, body and mind, sensuous immersion and detached observation. Is landscape the world we are living in, or a scene we are looking *at*, from afar? Alternatively put…does the word landscape describe the mutual embeddedness and interconnectivity of self, body, knowledge, and land- landscape as the world we live in, a constantly emergent perceptual and material milieu? Or is landscape better conceived in artistic and painterly terms as a specific cultural and historical genre, a set of visual strategies and devices for distancing and observing. (2)

As Wylie suggests, a landscape is viewed both in terms of the insider's as well as the outsider's gaze, as inhabitation of, as well as, a detached observation on space. In other

words, it is possible to approach the idea of landscape through notions of embodiment, inhabitation, and dwelling and also as a space to be gazed at. What is suggested is that a landscape could be experienced both as a space to live in, as well as a sight or scene to be visually perceived. Wylie writes: "Landscape is not only something we see, but it is also a way of seeing things, *a particular way of looking at and picturing the world around us*. Landscapes are not just about what we see but about how we look. *To landscape is to gaze in a particular fashion*" (7; emphasis added). It explains the role of landscape as an ideological instrument.

The definition of landscape put forward by Wylie offers important clues into dimensions of landscape as a tool to formulate space. First, it suggests that a landscape is not to be always equated with a sight or space to be looked at. What is more important is the act of looking or gazing. This view of a landscape as a gaze takes us to the next important dimension of it, that, a landscape gaze is always shaped, influenced and determined by ideologies. Wylie argues that a landscape gaze is a culturally conditioned perception of space and is regularly implicated in "particular cultural values, attitudes, ideologies and expectations" (7). In other words, the transformation of space into landscapes not only derives from particular ideological positions but also reinforces these positions. In other words, landscape is a political tool of constructing space along particular ideologies. To the extent that such expectations reflect the dominant political position of the person carrying out the act of gazing, a landscape gaze essentially de-scribes as well as re-inscribes. To simplify, every act of transforming space into a landscape is an act of unsettling the existing space by favoring or prioritizing some aspects and overlooking others. It is important to recall, at this moment, what Lefebvre terms as political coding of space.

Given that the positions from which landscape-gazes operate are often positions of authority and power, a landscape gaze is often an instrument of power. In his study *Social Formation and Symbolic landscape* (1984), cultural Geographer Denis Cosgrove explores how as a particular artistic way of enframing space, landscape functions as an instrument to assert strategic command and control over space (85). Cosgrove views landscape primarily as a "way of seeing, a *composition and structuring* of the world so *that it may be appropriated* by a detached individual spectator to whom an illusion of *order and control is offered through the composition of space* according to the certainties of geometry" (55: emphasis added). It is interesting that like Wiley, Cosgrove also views

a landscape as a gaze and construct. However, he hints at an important dimension of the politics of space transformed into landscapes, namely, the appropriation or possession of space. In other words, the construction of a landscape is often driven by the agenda of acquisition of space. It is also important to note that visions of appropriation determine the shape and disposition of landscapes. To this extent, the political coding or visualization of space as a landscape is often a colonising exercise. Cosgrove supports this view in "Prospect, perspective and the Evolution of the Landscape Idea" (1985), arguing that the framing of space as landscape "involves control and domination over space as an absolute, objective entity; *its transformation into the property of the individual or the state*" (46: emphasis added). Wylie also argues that the landscape gaze transforms a plot of land into property (59). In light of these views, it is possible to suggest that landscapes often serve as preludes to the conversion of space into territories and productive assets. As later discussions reveal, this crucial function of landscape as a prelude to appropriation assumes greater significance in expansionist projects like colonialism that essentially thrive on the appropriation of space only as a material resource.

Given that the appropriation of space is always an ideological exercise, it is important to view landscapes as ideological constructs. Although the link between landscape and ideology is suggested above, it is necessary to discuss it in further detail. Cosgrove observes that landscape is a "visual ideology" (Prospect 47), employed as a tool to reinforce and naturalize power structures. Wylie, in a similar vein, argues that landscape is often implicated in a "politics of vision" (62). The use of landscape as an ideological tool in the service of power has been explored by a John Barrell in *The Dark Side of the Landscape: The Rural Poor in English Painting 1730-1840* (1983), and Ann Bermingham in *Landscape and Ideology: The English Rustic Tradition 1740—1860* (1986). Barrell explores how stock-scenes like "laborers at work" are used within British painting traditions, as tools to naturalize hegemonic structures (3). Bermingham identifies crucial links between landscapes and the enclosure process: "There is an ideology of landscape, and in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries a class view of landscape embodied a set of socially, and, finally, economically determined values to which the painted image gave a cultural expression" (3). The view that a landscape is a tool in the hands of hegemonic forces is also reiterated by Don Mitchell in his book *The Lie of the Land: Migrant Workers and the California Landscape* (1996). It could be

suggested that within critical geography, a landscape is being increasingly viewed as a political project of domination and control, legitimating as well as furthering the reproduction of relations of production. To the extent that a landscape operates as an aesthetic or cultural superstructure to economic and political projects of domination, it is a midwife of imperialism. As subsequent discussions suggest, imperial travel and expedition writings eagerly facilitate projects of Empire-building by producing landscapes as a prelude to territorialization and occupation.

Given the view that landscape is essentially an ideological prelude to territorial and material appropriation of space, it is necessary to approach it from a broader perspective. Instead of viewing a landscape as an aesthetic enframing of space, it is important to recognize that the production of landscape involves multiple strategies or practices some of which are not so explicit. W. J. T. Mitchell in *Landscape and Power* (1994), endorses the view that a landscape is best viewed as a performance. It is discussed later in this thesis how colonial travel and expedition writings host the transformation of pre-colonial space, not only as strategic visualizations but also as strategic performances.

Two vital aspects of the politics of landscape emerge from the above discussion. First, a landscape is a means or site to enact cultural visions and second, it is a means to formulate subject positions. Mitchell also endorses the view of landscapes as a dynamic "medium of exchange", a "site of visual appropriation" as well as a site for the formation of identities (1). Similarly, Wylie traces how cultural sensibilities like modernity are reproduced as landscapes (118). It is evident that the construction of space as landscapes implicates construction of subjectivities and subject positions. To this extent, landscape is an exercise in self-fashioning as well as inscribing ideologies. Imperialism is best viewed as an exercise in self-fashioning and narratives of travel and expedition is a key site of imperial self-fashioning.

As already suggested, instead of being viewed as an object to be seen or a text to be read, a landscape is better viewed as a condition as well as a consequence of performance. Landscapes do not merely signify or symbolize power relations. They actively participate in the politics of space and power. It is perhaps possible to view a landscape as a movement from a politics of vision to a politics of performance, only to facilitate the politics of power.

In colonial discourse in general and travel and expedition narratives in particular, a landscape is often used as a political trope to challenge preexisting claims over the colony as well as to convert the colony from a state of a supposed absence of order and meaning to that of discipline and meaning. This explains the crucial role travel and expedition writing play as a key site of landscape production within colonial projects. Landscapes in colonial discourse are viewed primarily as products of what Mary Louise Pratt in the book *Imperial Eyes: Travel Writing and Transculturation* (1992), refers to as the imperial gaze. What characterizes the imperial gaze is its eagerness to "look out and posses" (Pratt 7). Pratt elucidates colonial technologies and rhetorical convention that go into the production of landscape in colonial travel writings. She explores how the visual arrangement of sights derives from a desire to attain sweeping mastery over a scene. Pratt terms it as the 'monarch of all I survey' mode (201). This convention is regularly used in the narratives under review. Often the writer-traveler positions himself in vantages of privilege to 'survey' the landscape in ways that combine spatial arrangement with the strategic, aesthetic, or economic valorization of the landscape. It is important to add here that colonial travel and expedition writing is primarily driven by imperatives of foray and possession. This explains why landscapes in travel and expedition writings are almost always framed as surveys. This also explains why M L Pratt views imperial travel and expedition discourse primarily as a "discourse of accumulation" (192).

Colonial travel and expedition writings convert the colony into a geography of difference often with the help of metaphors. Landscapes often operate as a metaphor in these writings. As metaphors landscapes serve as prelude to more resolute and concrete attempts to produce space. In a way, landscapes are used to transforming space into a geography of difference and thereby as an instrument to back the territorial claims of the Empire.

One of the tropes that regularly participate in the construction of landscapes, in colonial travel writings, is what Pratt views as the "rhetoric of discovery" (Pratt 175). Pratt suggests that imperial travelers regularly employ discovery as a political trope in their writings. By constantly foregrounding the hazards encountered in the colony and also by regularly parading the imperial charisma, colonial travellers and officials not only transform the colony into a metaphor for hostility but also carry out acts of self-fashioning. In a way, the discourse of discovery, a key thread in colonial travel and expedition writings is also a strategic site of imperial self-fashioning. This rhetoric of

discovery serves not only to challenges pre-colonial landscapes but also any alternative claim over these spaces. Pramod Nayar in his book *Colonial Voices: The Discourses of Empire* (2012), suggests that the discourse of discovery involves three vital components, namely, the imaginative exploration and the fantasy of discovery; the narrative organization in the form of reportage and; the explication and documentation of the discovered through a process of inquiry (8). To this extent, the trajectory of space production in narratives of colonial travel and expedition is best viewed as a movement from imagining spaces of potential discovery to the ordering of a discovered space. This could also be viewed as a movement from visualization through realization to the actual production of space.

As suggested above, one of the important tropes that regularly participate in the construction of landscapes in colonial travel and expedition writings is what could be viewed as the rhetoric of danger. Often, anticipated uncertainties, topographical perils, and unfriendly natives pose a hindrance to the colonial advance. It facilitates acts of self-fashioning by the traveler-writer in that the imperial traveler regularly positions himself as a hero and transforms the landscape as a metaphor for the subjugated other.

It is possible to view the construction of landscapes in colonial travel writing as the coding of space. As the traveler-writer moves into the colony he tends to frame the colony as a cluster of dystopian or cornucopian landscapes. Whatsoever the orientation is, the key motive is always to produce empty spaces that yearn for imperial intervention and mastery. In other words, landscapes, in colonial travel and expedition writing, more than anything else, are visions of transformation. It could be said that the imperial traveler-explorer, possesses space by framing it as landscape.

Pratt offers crucial clues so as to probe into the dynamics of landscape aesthetic as it functions in imperial travel and expedition writing by identifying three key strategies going into the making of landscapes. First, imperial travel writings "aestheticize" the colonized space (204). Second, a density of meaning is generated by adding material and metaphoric referents to colonized spaces as landscape. Third, by transforming space into a landscape it is enticed into an asymmetrical relationship with the imperial traveler as well asthe metropolitan culture. Landscapes are made to concretize the mastery of the traveler over the colonized space. In *The Rhetoric of Empire: Colonial Discourse in Journalism, Travel Writing, and Imperial Administration* (1992), David Spurr refers to it

as an "economy of uneven exchange" (14). It goes without saying that tricks of reduction and expansion often aid these projects. It could be suggested that landscapes in colonial travel and expedition texts function as what Pratt terms as "imperial allegories" (181).

The politics of vision that the construction of landscape in colonial travel writing materializes, for the most part, operates through what Pratt views as negative aesthetic (218). The colonizer-traveler frames the encountered landscapes into negative tropes or in dystopian lights. Landscapes viewed as metaphors reduce as well as expand to transform fully alive social space to simplistic ideological statements. Spurr identifies the tropes which are often employed towards this end. For instance, some of them are-surveillance (13), appropriation (28), aestheticisation, and classification (50), debasement (76), and negation (89), etc. It is also important to note that, even though colonized landscapes are framed as cornucopias or affluent but unutilized assets, it is the supposed deficiencies of the space that is always highlighted. It goes without saying that the negative aesthetic aids in the imperial agenda of domination. As suggested by Pratt, the construction of landscapes in colonial travel writing is carried out primarily through two key strategies. They are aesthetic or poetic and scientific. It is possible to view the visualization of space, in travel and expedition writing, as metaphorics.

Pratt suggests that the landscape gaze, as functioning in colonial travel writings, is primarily a controlling gaze that de-semanticizes, depopulates as well as dehistoricizes the colonized landscape only to invest it with imperial ideological content. It explains why in colonial travel writings, the colony often figure in as blank landscapes. It could be viewed as symbolic erasure of other possible histories of land occupation and initiate claims over it. This way of framing landscapes corresponds to the imperial view of nature as a resource. It also frames space as spiritually and aesthetically empty cultural landscapes. Landscapes formulated thus convert the colony into a space already ready for improvement and transformation (Wylie 133). As untouched nature, the colonized landscape is pictured as ready for occupancy. Another regular expression is that of the irrational, awe-inspiring. It is the most evident in instances of colonial sublime. Within such aesthetics, the imperial subject undergoes rhapsodic experiences framed by the precepts of sublime aesthetics; a nature at once exotic, alluring, fearful, awesome and transformative; a framework within which an informed, rational and enlightened Western observer time and again gazes upon a rhapsodic otherness (135).

The production of landscapes in imperial travel and expedition writings is best viewed as a process of coding. While transformed into landscape, spaces are coded into new configurations through acts of convergence as well as partitioning. Notwithstanding the aesthetic part, the construction of landscapes in colonial travel and exploration writings pioneers a series of subsequent transformations that culminate in the generation of wealth. It is perhaps appropriate to conclude the discussion on the politics of landscape construction in colonial travel and expedition writing by saying that as vehicles of ideology, imaginings of landscape in these writings reflect an inherent urge to visualize space as potential territories as well carry out projects of self-fashioning.

II

Landscape repeatedly invites the attention of the colonial traveler-explorer. However, space without ownership is not only dangerous, but also meaningless. Therefore, space must be bounded for it to yield meaning. In other words, space must be converted to territories. In the book *The Birth of Territory* (1971), Stuart Elden defines a territory as a "bounded space" (3), controlled by apparatus of power. Elden also refers to territory as the most explicit "spatiality of power" (3). Robert Sack in *Human Territoriality: Its Theory and History* (1986), defines territory as "an area or place delimited and controlled through territoriality requiring constant effort to establish and maintain" (4), whereas David Delaney in *Territory: A Short Introduction* (2005), views territory as a "bounded meaningful social space founded on an inside/outside dichotomy" (15). Tim Creswell in his book *Place: A Short Introduction* (2004), mentions that a territory suggests "ownership or some kind of connection between a person and a particular location" (1).

It is possible to break up the definitions of territory outlined above into a few basic attributes that transform a space into a territory. First, the construction of territory begins with the marking space as definite or determinate units. In other words, a territory is all about demarcation, enclosure, and possession. To the extent that a territory is essentially premised on the notions of determinacy, ownership, and legitimacy, it is best viewed as a variant of administrative or juridico-political space. As subsequent discussions suggest, the politics of territorialization begins with acts of enumeration. Enclosure corresponds to the marking of boundaries which validates as well as gives visibility to territories. Second, territories are constructed around real and symbolic boundaries that partition space into a dichotomy between an interior and an exterior. It is important to note that

such dichotomization of space into territorial compartments involves narratives about the normative use of a particular space. To the extent that a territory represents the use of space as per institutional protocols, it is best viewed as a normative geography. The third attribute of territory which could be viewed as an extension of the first two attributes is best explained by referring to what Tim Cresswell in his book *In Place/Out of Space: Geography, Ideology, and Transgression* (1996), terms as transgression (17). Cresswell argues that the production of space is often determined by culturally defined spatial protocols. He mentions that places are spaces invested with specific meanings as well as specific mandates of use. Any deviations from normative spatial expectations or what is viewed as spatial protocols marks a place as a geography of transgression. It may be added here that the transformation of space into territories are inevitably premised on spatial protocols. In other words, territories are often operationalized by referring to narratives of transgression or trespassing. One should also note that colonial spatial imaginaries regularly draw on narratives of transgression to accomplish the expansionist agenda of the Empire.

It is obvious that any discussion on territories readily invokes the concept of territoriality. In fact, as a material geography, a territory is essentially an outcome of territoriality. Sack views territoriality as "a strategy to affect, influence, and control people, phenomena, and relationships by delimiting and asserting control over a geographic area" (1). Delaney looks at it as "the assertion of control over a segment of well-demarcated space" (4). If landscapes, in the context of the Empire and imperial travel writing, correspond to the coding or visualization of space, a territory corresponds to a fuller realization of the imperial will to possess. To this extent, colonial territory production could be viewed as the reproduction of natural space as what Lefebvre views as conceived space. It goes without saying that these conceived spaces are made to operate as conditions and consequences of colonial power. What is important is that the materiality of space assumes a certain degree of visibility with its conversion into a territory.

What distinguishes a territory from other forms of social space is its embeddedness in visions or designs of power. To this extent, a territory is best viewed as a geography of power. It is also important to note that the construction of territories travels along different paths in different societies. For instance, Sack observes a key difference

between Western and what could be viewed as tribal modes of organizing space into territories (7). Whereas in tribal societies the marking of territorial space is not founded on the idea of bounded and exclusive space as well as definite boundaries, in European non-tribal societies, the marking of territorial space are essentially founded on the idea of exclusive space, absolute ownership, and narratives of transgression. Referring to what is viewed as tribal modes of territorialities, Sack writes:

> Territoriality is not used as an abstract mold classifying and separating people and place, but rather as a device to promote their union. People do not see territory as modern people often do, as a mold or container with clear and precise boundaries that can be conceptually and actually emptied and filled. For them, a territory is a place on the earth inextricably tied to events and the events are intimately and naturally associated with the place. (*Human* 62-63)

It is evident that European hegemonic territorialities are regularly founded on the notion of an abstract, emptiable, fillable and thus malleable space. Sack refers to this as "emptiable space" (32). It is important to recall David Harvey's observations on the ways hegemonic projects such as capitalism convert spaces into a social or cultural blankness only to reproduce space as assets or utilities.

Insofar as the construction of territories in colonial travel and expedition writings, it is important to note that colonial territories are designed not only to serve the geopolitical agenda of the Empire but also as an instrument of containment, repulsion, and further territorialization of space. The production of territories in the colonial contact zone is also linked to the imperial politics of self-fashioning. The transformation of space into a colonial territory, in some way or the other, always serves to endorse the rhetoric of difference. In other words, colonial territoriality operates as an instrument to perpetuate what JanMohamed views as the allegory of difference between the colonizing Self and the colonized Other. In other words, the production of territories in colonial travel writings often involves the use of what is viewed as Manichean binaries like that of order/chaos, identity/ difference, presence/absence. These ideological investments that regularly go into the formulation of territories facilitate further territorialization of colonized space.

It is important to note that colonial spatiality is almost always a capitalist one and is underpinned by a strong desire for economic incentives. This explains the desperateness displayed by the colonial travellers and agents to transform natural space into functional spaces or economic and military assets. It also explains the fundamental difference between colonial and non-colonial territorialities as pointed out by Sack beforehand. It may be recalled that colonial territoriality is almost always premised on the notion of absolute ownership of space, whereas territorialities other than the colonial do not mandatorily equate territory with that of absolute ownership of geography. In *This Fissured Land: An Ecological History of India* (1993), Gadgil and Guha study the encounter between the differing territorial imaginings in pre-colonial and colonial India. Gadgil and Guha explore the ways the Empire incorporates pre-colonial geographies into newly designed grids of territorial space. They argue that the very agenda of transforming what is viewed as pre-colonial peasant or ethnic space into "State property" of the Empire is pursued through the notion of parcellized and occupiable functional territories (115). As suggested by Gadgil and Guha, these transformed spaces are best viewed as political territories.

What is important is that acquisition and utility are the foremost determinants of the construction of colonial space. It is clear that the production of territory within colonialism is not only determined by functional imperatives but also the agenda of othering. What is also important is that colonial attempts to territorialize also tend to pose as innocuous attempts at a scientistic and rational organization of space. For instance, often a rhetoric improvement is used as a territorializing instrument by the Empire.

It may be added here that the transformation of space into a colonial territory is essentially an act of reduction. The Empire often views space as an already available resource or commodity. In other words, space is viewed entirely as an economic or military asset. This is understood better when one looks at ways the Empire converts colonized spaces into a terrain. Visualizing space as terrain is tantamount to territorializing space since both entail a strategic vision, a will to possess, and manipulate. It is also important to note that the framing of space as terrain is often the first attempt at its conversion into a territory. Colonial travel and expedition writers regularly participate in these projects of transforming space into territories through their acts of surveys. To this extent, colonial travel and expeditions not only participate in the

project of coding spaces but also develop the conditions for subsequent transformation of spaces into occupied territories. In short, they push for the metamorphosis of space from visions to realizations of control. To this extent, colonial travel and expedition writings function as an instrument of territorialization.

It is important to note that the production of a colonial territory often begins with a narrative or visualization of conflict. To this extent, colonial territory production is a condition and consequent of visions of confrontation. It could be explained better by referring to James Hevia's study *The Imperial Security State: British Colonial Knowledge and Empire-building in Asia* (2012), where he explores imperial strategies of converting space into territories or military assets. Hevia mentions that these acts of converting spaces into a terrain involve the mapping not only of space as terrain but also an assessment of the capabilities of the Other. The 'Other', in this instance, corresponds to a real or imagined adversary. Travel and expedition writings frequently use parables of conflicts as a prelude to expeditions or reconnaissance. To the extent that travel and expedition writing enforce and enact visions of possession, they are best viewed as territorial projects. These narratives and the military gaze underscoring them operate through a predominantly techno-scientific reflection on space, yielding what is viewed as military geography and statistics. It is also important to note that the construction of territory in these texts is a layered project. In other words, layers of military sub-texts underlie apparently innocuous observations on space. From this perspective, what is encountered as plain observations on the environment could be viewed as camouflaged military or strategic information.

One of the important ways colonial travel and expedition writings transform space into a territory is to incorporate space into visions of the Empire. In these writings, space is converted into a cluster of divisible units, and to be more precise, as fragments of distance and segments of time. Hevia writes: "Reconnaissance resulted in route reports, which divided movement along a track, usually between inhabited settlements, into segments of time and distance, the technical term for which was the stage of a march" (74). This reduction of real spaces into grids such as log, route and map-entries in colonial travel and expedition writings could be viewed as an attempt interpellate colonized spaces with ideologies of the Empire. It goes without saying that this strategy on the part of the traveller and military agent helps the colonial architects of space to further transform space into territories or assets. To this extent, colonial travel and

expedition writing transforms space into a strategic instrument. As suggested by Hevia, statistics of the war-making capacities of a potential enemy is an important component of the territorializing gaze of the Empire. To this extent, colonial travel and expedition writings regularly participate in the imperial project of transforming space into a measured and mapped geography of surveillance.

As suggested above, the production of territories involves acts of imagination. As Hevia mentions, a foremost tool of converting space into territories in narratives of travel and expedition is "imperial fantasies" (9). These fantasies often manifest as accounts of the imperial traveler-writer traversing virgin, unvisited spaces and fascinating the natives by their sheer charismatic presence.

It is clear that travellers, as agents of the Empire, imagine spaces as economic and military assets. However, the production of territory in colonial discourse does not remain confined to the pursuit of economic and military imperatives. Colonial territoriality not only bypasses pre-colonial spatialities but also inscribes what Metcalf views as ideologies of the Empire on the colonized space. These often manifest as symbolic narratives or metaphorics. To this extent, the construction of colonial space is also a cultural project. Cultural sub-texts underlie the more apparent visions of spatial transformation. It links up colonial territory production to the politics of othering. To this extent, colonial territory production is best viewed as an exercise in symbolic geography making. It is clear that the idea of territory, as used in the study, goes beyond the formal meaning of physical space alone. Rather, it refers to spaces identified for the purpose of expressing some form of jurisdiction: appropriative, scientific, ethnographic, or conservationist. Their predictive and speculative aspects transform them into territories.

It is obvious that by mapping and classifying lands and people, colonial travelers and agents facilitate the commodification and instrumentalization of colonized spaces. In other words, the coding of space as a 'desirable' is followed, in their writings, by more specific proposals to transform space into assets. It could be viewed as a politics of space. The production of a territory in these writings is best viewed as a movement away from generalized and often metaphoric suggestions of otherness towards more exact and unambiguous marking of space as a resource or a deterrent. In other words, space transforms from metaphors of difference to cartographies of power or for that matter from percepts to concepts.