

An Introduction to Post-Colonial Theory

Peter Childs and R.J. Patrick Williams



Prentice Hall
Harvester Wheatsheaf

London New York Toronto Sydney Tokyo Singapore
Madrid Mexico City Munich Paris

Introduction: Points of departure

When is the post-colonial?¹

The obvious implication of the term post-colonial is that it refers to a period coming after the end of colonialism. Such a commonsense understanding has much to commend it (the term would otherwise risk being completely meaningless), but that sense of an ending, of the completion of one period of history and the emergence of another, is, as we shall see, hard to maintain in any simple or unproblematic fashion. On the face of it, the era of the great European colonial empires is over, and that in itself is a fact of major significance. The Anglo-Irish novelist J.G. Farrell, a post-colonial chronicler of the British Empire's moments of crisis, and certainly no supporter of the system, nevertheless singled out the decline and dissolution of the Empire as the important event of his lifetime.² Whether Farrell's view is rather too Anglocentric, or whether there is some point to the privileging of the British experience is not at issue here. The dismantling of structures of colonial control, beginning in earnest in the late 1950s and reaching its high point in the 1960s, constituted a remarkable historical moment, as country after country gained independence from the colonizing powers.³ That so many millions now live in the world formed by decolonization is one justification for the use of the term post-colonial.

Post-colonialism may then refer in part to the period after colonialism, but the questions arise: after whose colonialism? after the end of which colonial empire? Isn't it unacceptably Anglocentric or Eurocentric to be foregrounding the mid-twentieth century and the end particularly of the British and French empires? What about, for example, early nineteenth-century Latin America and the end of Spanish and Portuguese control? or the late eighteenth century and the independence of the United States of America? Clearly, there has not been just one period of colonialism in the history of the world – indeed, the

sense in which a colonizing power may itself have once been a colony is one of the starting-points for Joseph Conrad's *Heart of Darkness*. Although, as we shall see later, there may be ways in which Latin America and the United States can fit into the model of post-colonialism which is proposed, there certainly are problems with broadening the historical or conceptual frame too far, as the Indian critic Aijaz Ahmad argues:

But I have seen articles in a great many places, in the special issue of *Social Text* on postcoloniality, which push the use of the term 'colonialism' back to such configurations as the Incas, the Ottomans and the Chinese, well before the European colonial empires began; and then bring the term forward to cover all kinds of national oppressions, as, for example, the savagery of the Indonesian government in East Timor. 'Colonialism' then becomes a trans-historical thing, always present and always in process of dissolution in one part of the world or another, so that everyone gets the privilege, sooner or later, at one time or another, of being coloniser, colonised and post-colonial – sometimes all at once, in the case of Australia, for example.⁴

He then goes on to accuse Anne McClintock of inflating the term to such an extent that 'all territorial aggressions ever undertaken in human history' are included under the same heading, which, if true, would render the term analytically useless. Whether or not we would want to agree with all the points made by Ahmad (particularly his criticism of Anne McClintock) there is value in what he says. At the same time, it is worth noting, as part of the complexity of the area we are dealing with, that although the final sentence in Ahmad's quotation is obviously meant to demonstrate the absurdity of the positions he is outlining, there might in fact be good grounds for suggesting precisely that form of paradoxical simultaneity in a case like Australia.⁵

A major contention in post-colonial studies is that the overlapping development of the ensemble of European colonial empires – British, French, Dutch, Spanish, Portuguese, Belgian, Italian, German – from the sixteenth century onwards (but especially in the nineteenth), and their dismantling in the second half of the twentieth century, constitutes an unprecedented phenomenon, and one with global repercussions in the contemporary world, so that one answer to the question 'When is the post-colonial?' is 'Now'. Another, and much more contentious answer, and one which complicates the simple sense of historical periods just outlined, is offered by the authors of *The Empire Writes Back*. As its subtitle indicates, the book looks at 'theory and practice in post-colonial literatures'; it was the first to do so under such a rubric and on such a scale, and no book – perhaps wisely – has, in the six years since it was published, attempted as much. In the

opening chapter, the authors provide a definition which has become somewhat notorious:

We use the term 'post-colonial', however, to cover all the culture affected by the imperial process from the moment of colonisation to the present day. This is because there is a continuity of preoccupations throughout the historical process initiated by European imperial aggression.⁶

Among the difficulties created by this are, first, whether it is actually possible to identify a 'continuity of preoccupations' over such an expanse of time, and, secondly and more importantly, whether, even if that were possible, it would justify the loss of specificity which results from the inevitable eliding of periods, processes and practices which this entails. For a critic such as Abdul JanMohamed, for instance, we are dealing with two very different periods which, in a somewhat Gramscian sense, he labels dominant and hegemonic.⁷ Although JanMohamed arguably does not go on to exploit this as much as he might, it remains an important distinction, emphasizing as it does that substantially altered relations – cultural, economic, and, above all, political – obtain, and these have substantial implications for the processes of cultural production which are one of the particular concerns of post-colonial theory.

An indication of why it might be important to adopt a position such as that of *The Empire Writes Back*, which at the same time complicates further the question of historical periods, is given by the Canadian critic Stephen Slemon:

Definitions of the 'post-colonial' of course vary widely, but for me the concept proves most useful not when it is used synonymously with a post-independence historical period in once-colonised nations, but rather when it locates a specifically anti- or post-colonial discursive purchase in culture, one which begins in the moment that colonial power inscribes itself onto the body and space of its Others and which continues as an often occulted tradition into the modern theatre of neo-colonialist international relations.⁸

In this formulation, 'continuity of preoccupations' becomes the more substantial process of anti-colonial cultural practices (which introduces the other most important meaning of post-), in other words, one dimension of the resistance to imperialism which has been an increasingly important aspect of post-colonial thinking, and which is discussed in a number of contexts in different chapters in this book. The other meaning of post- is one which is shared with those sets of theories which use the compound term, especially post-structuralism, where the emphasis may not be so much on the chronologically subsequent – i.e. coming after structuralism, modernism or feminism – but

on conceptually transcending or superseding the parameters of the other term. In this perspective, texts which are anti-colonial, which reject the premises of colonialist intervention (the civilizing mission, the rejuvenation of stagnant cultures) might be regarded as post-colonial insofar as they have 'got beyond' colonialism and its ideologies, broken free of its lures to a point from which to mount a critique or counter-attack.

^{① metaphorical} The additional complexity or blurring of the question of historical periods occurs with the phrase 'in the moment when colonial power inscribes itself onto the body and space of its Others'. Although certain post-colonial critics use the verb inscribe rather loosely or metaphorically, if we retain its more or less literal sense of writing (textual inscription) then we face another historical paradox, since the colonial powers frequently wrote about their civilizational Others (Africa, or the Orient) either officially or in the shape of individual novelists or poets – and hence inscribed themselves 'onto the body and space' of those Others – long before they actually intervened against them in any properly colonialist sense (through the occupation or direct control of their territory). Accordingly, if post-colonial texts as anti-Western counter-discourse are said to operate to oppose Western inscriptions, then we have a formidably paradoxical post-colonialism, which, not content with beginning at the moment of colonization (the version in *The Empire Writes Back*), potentially starts years, even centuries before colonialist incursions.

^{② real} In both Slemon's and *The Empire Writes Back*'s formulations, there are possible or actual conceptual gains, but also a variety of problems, losses or hostages to fortune in the move away from what is presumably regarded as an over-simple period-based model of post-colonialism. In some ways, their shared preference for post-colonialism as a form of writing which it is difficult to pin down in chronological terms, recalls older debates about whether modernism (and subsequently postmodernism) was best understood as an historical period or a literary/cultural style. It also links up with the definition offered in the introduction to *Past the Last Post*, where it is suggested that like post-modernism, post-colonialism could be seen as having two 'archives':

The first archive here constructs it as writing (more usually than architecture or painting) . . . from countries or regions which were formerly colonies of Europe. The second archive of post-colonialism is intimately related to the first, though not co-extensive with it. Here, the post-colonial is conceived of as a set of discursive practices, prominent among which is resistance to colonialism, colonialist ideologies and their contemporary forms and subjectificatory legacies.⁹

The resurgence of the earlier period/style debate in another form suggests the difficulty for critics, even those who are definitely post

Structuralism – and therefore aware of the problems of binary thinking – of escaping from these two-part conceptual models.

Another complication of the periodizing implied by post-colonialism relates to the persistence of colonialism. Although we began this chapter by referring to the dismantling of the colonial empires, there are important ways in which European control is very much present. One of the most obvious is that colonial powers still operate colonies: for instance, Britain, with its rump of Hong Kong, the Falklands/Malvinas, and – though it was never officially admitted as being a colony – Northern Ireland. The continuation of direct colonial control in this way makes any un-nuanced talk of post-colonialism – and especially a generalized 'post-colonial condition', of which some critics are rather fond – difficult to sustain. A further complicating factor, sometimes gestured towards, but more usually overlooked in post-colonial studies, is as Slemon says 'the modern theatre of neo-colonialist international relations'. In the period after decolonization, it rapidly became apparent (to the newly independent nations, at least) that although colonial armies and bureaucracies might have withdrawn, Western powers were still intent on maintaining maximum indirect control over erstwhile colonies, via political, cultural and above all economic channels, a phenomenon which became known as neo-colonialism. For a growing number of analysts, it was clear that the overriding concern was the ability to go on extracting profit from formerly colonized areas, and that the relation between colonialism and neo-colonialism made most sense in the context of even larger historical processes. From the late fifteenth century, the unrelenting, if uneven, expansion of capitalism from its West European base has been a constant – some might say *the* constant – of world history, to the point where there is now no part of the globe left untouched by it – though not all are equally subjected to it. This larger, still incomplete project of the globalization of capitalism is what a number of post-colonial critics, especially those working with Marxist, or Marxist-derived concepts, understand as imperialism. For them, it is perhaps the key explanatory concept. With the framework it provides, colonialism can be seen to be a particular phase or modality of imperialism, an appropriate form of intervention corresponding to capitalism's needs at that time, but which by the mid-twentieth century had run its course. What the precise needs of capitalism might be are not necessarily a matter of consensus. For Marx and Engels, 'The need for a constantly expanding market for its goods chases the bourgeoisie over the whole surface of the globe. It must nestle everywhere, settle everywhere, establish connections everywhere.'¹⁰ For others, however, 'The search for markets as an explanation simply does not hold. A much more plausible explanation is the search for low cost labour forces.'¹¹

The latter obviously was an important dimension of the colonialist phase, with the mass movements of millions of slaves from Africa and indentured labourers from Asia and the Indian subcontinent as the best-known examples of a general pattern of directing cheap labour to places where it was needed. The end of colonialist control means that it is no longer possible physically to force workers to migrate to the place of work, though that does not automatically mean an end to the patterns of diasporic displacement which had been established. In the current phase of imperialism, the most striking change is that instead of bringing workers to the point of production (Caribbean sugar plantations, South African diamond mines, etc.), capitalism takes the point of production to the workers, as transnational corporations endlessly relocate factories to the zones of lowest-cost labour, such as Central America or the Pacific rim, providing themselves with a workforce which is low-paid, non-unionized, and which will have job security only as long as it stays that way.

While the directly coerced migration of labour may not be part of current capitalist strategy, semi-large-scale movements do still take place, as workers from economically disadvantaged areas (North Africa, Turkey, the Indian subcontinent) converge on areas of core capitalist activity. Traditionally, that has meant the movement of non-white, non-Western groups to white, Western areas, but factors such as the collapse of state Communism and the existence of 'core' capitalist areas outside the West have complicated the situation. While these movements still help to provide a potential pool of low-cost labour, the fact that they are not directly regulated by capitalism means that they tend to be unwelcome and subject to obstructive or repressive measures by state authorities.

At the beginning of his book *Culture and Imperialism*, Edward Said suggests that imperialism is 'a word and an idea today so controversial, so fraught with all sorts of questions, doubts, polemics and ideological premises as nearly to resist use altogether'.¹² We would argue that it is precisely because the term has been, and still is, used in a variety of (often contradictory) ways, and because the phenomenon to which it relates is of such magnitude in world history, that it is important both to retain the term and to debate and clarify its usage. While the scope of this book does not allow for that particular extensive debate, we have briefly indicated above what we see as the most helpful way of understanding imperialism. However, even if the 500-year expansionary dynamic of capitalism-as-imperialism is accepted as the 'big picture' within which colonialism and post-colonialism are phases, that does not exhaust the debates about post-colonialism and historical period. For instance, in 'Notes on the "Post-Colonial"', Ella Shohat asks, 'When exactly then does the "post-colonial" begin?',¹³

and the historian Arif Dirlik, 'Misreading the question deliberately [supplies] an answer that is only partially facetious: When Third World intellectuals have arrived in First World academe.'¹⁴ This kind of approach shifts the question to the plane of institutional politics, and suggests different criteria for periodizing. While the connotations or implications of Dirlik's 'misreading' may be negative ones of vested interests, special pleading or political correctness, his remark nevertheless draws attention to the importance of intellectuals in this area.

A different sort of problem with the temporality of post-colonialism is expressed by the Caribbean poet Lorna Goodison: 'When is post-coloniality going to end? How long does the post-colonial continue?'¹⁵ A pertinent question, and one which compounds the problems of periodizing. If the 'obvious' answer to the opening question 'When is the post-colonial?' is 'Now'; if the 'difficult' answer of *The Empire Writes Back* is 'Then and now'; an alternative answer might be 'Not (quite) yet'. As we have already pointed out in this section, post-colonialism can in no sense be regarded as a fully achieved state. Anne McClintock, for example, in the article mentioned earlier, has criticized the use of the term as 'prematurely celebratory'. We could, however, argue for post-colonialism as an anticipatory discourse, recognizing that the condition it names does not yet exist, but working nevertheless to bring that about. In *The Political Unconscious*, Fredric Jameson highlights the ways in which theories, ideologies and intellectual practices contain a Utopian dimension, for instance, dialectical thought as 'the anticipation of the logic of a collectivity which has not yet come into being'.¹⁶ If even unsavoury ideologies such as Fascism can project a Utopian aspect, how much more so sets of theories which are grounded in the histories and experiences of the formerly- or still-colonized world, and which articulate their aspirations? There is a form of perverseness in taking the label 'post-' for a state which is not yet fully present, and linking it to something which has not fully disappeared, but in many ways that paradoxical in-betweenness precisely characterizes the post-colonial world. As Gayatri Spivak says, 'We live in a post-colonial neo-colonized world'.¹⁷

Post-structuralism also offers a sense of the 'not-quiteness' which the 'post-' may legitimately contain. In *Writing and Difference*, the leading post-structuralist thinker Jacques Derrida says that we are still 'within' structuralism to the extent that the latter represents a particular 'vision' or way of formulating questions. Clearly, no one is suggesting an equivalence between structuralism and colonialism. Nevertheless, colonialism as 'vision' or powerful ideology is still with us, even in its brute form (witness numbers of articles in British and American newspapers and magazines in recent years calling for the recolonization of Africa), while slightly attenuated notions of Western

superiority and the right to intervene are founding assumptions of much imperialist activity.

A final aspect of the 'When?' of post-colonialism is the question of history itself, and the ways in which it is theorized, categorized, narrated and written about. Although this will be discussed further in the final chapter, it is necessary at this stage to make some preliminary points. Since the West has a deplorable record of simultaneously denying the existence of any worthwhile history in areas it colonized (Africa is the most obvious example) and destroying the cultures which embodied that history, an important dimension of post-colonial work has been the recovery or revaluing of indigenous histories. A representative example (which is discussed in the next chapter) is C.L.R. James's account of the slave rebellion in what became Haiti. While its component terms – black, slave, rebellion – would normally have been enough to consign it to historical oblivion, its particular importance lies in its depiction of black people making their own history, rather than being passive participants in history made by others.

Aijaz Ahmad is one critic dissatisfied with history made by others, or in this case with models of history constructed on others' terms, and for him one of those problematic terms is post-colonialism:

It is worth remarking, though, that in periodising our history in the triadic terms of pre-colonial, colonial and post-colonial, the conceptual apparatus of 'postcolonial criticism' privileges as primary the role of colonialism as the principle of structuration in that history, so that all that came before colonialism becomes its own prehistory and whatever comes after can only be lived as infinite aftermath.¹⁸

The idea of post-colonialism as an 'infinite aftermath' is no doubt not the answer Lorna Goodison would want to her query 'When will it end?' Apart from that, one response to Ahmad might be that given the global impact of colonialism, the fact that it affected some areas for centuries, and that its effects are still felt, it would be irresponsible not to give it due weight, which is not the same as making it the 'primary . . . principle of structuration' of other people's histories.

The refusal to write histories which are predicated on Western-derived priorities or concepts can be taken even further. The post-colonial Indian critic Gayan Prakash argues:

we cannot thematize Indian history in terms of the development of capitalism and simultaneously contest capitalism's homogenisation of the contemporary world. Critical history cannot simply document the process by which capitalism becomes dominant, for that amounts to repeating the history we seek to displace.¹⁹

Prakash's position is criticized from different perspectives by Aijaz Ahmad and Arif Dirlik in the articles already mentioned. In addition,

there seems to be a strange conflation happening in the quote: the idea that acknowledging that capitalism had a formative effect on the creation of contemporary India is taken as somehow equivalent to merely repeating the history of its incursions and triumphs, and that that acknowledgement supposedly leaves you incapable of contesting capitalism. There appears to be something like what one might call a will-to-powerlessness at work here, a strange determination to refuse the positions which would empower a critique.

The idea of the Western-ness of history, either in origin, orientation or ideology, is one which post-colonial critics debate (and, as such, one which recurs in various forms in the course of this book).

The significance of history for post-colonial discourse lies in the modern origins of historical study itself, and the circumstances by which 'History' took upon itself the mantle of a discipline. For the emergence of history in European thought is coterminous with the rise of modern colonialism, which in its radical othering and violent annexation of the non-European world, found in history a prominent, if not *the* prominent, instrument for the control of subject peoples.²⁰

Among the points worth noting here are: do the terms 'History' and history relate to the same things? (Robert Young, for instance, stakes a lot on the idea of 'History' as a totalizing concept); what are the implications of the alleged 'coterminous' nature of history and colonialism? (again, for Young, Marxism's contemporaneity with colonialism is one aspect of its ideological complicity with it); and finally, does the argument that history is 'the prominent instrument for the control of subject peoples' – rather than, for example, armies, police forces, bureaucracies, laws or economic policies – represent a dangerous over-inflation of the power of discourse in general and one discourse in particular?

For some critics, the Western-ness of history would appear to be inescapable: Dipesh Chakrabarty, for instance, sees its influence and centrality extending even to those instances – so important for post-colonialism – of indigenous attempts to narrate their own histories:

insofar as the academic discourse of history – that is, 'history' as a discourse produced at the institutional site of the university – is concerned, 'Europe' remains the sovereign, theoretical subject of all histories, including the ones we call 'Indian', 'Chinese', 'Kenyan' and so on. There is a peculiar way in which all those other histories tend to become variations on a master narrative that could be called 'the history of Europe'.²¹

Depressing as this may be as a possible description, it does at least leave open the possibility of other, non-institutional or non-academic, histories, as well as forcibly highlighting the difficulty and complexity of the production of post-colonial histories and alternative periodizing.

Where is the post-colonial?

Difficulties connected with the temporality of post-colonialism also introduce questions of its spatial location. Again, there is an 'obvious' geography of post-colonialism – those areas formerly under the control of the European colonialist powers – and tracking the immensity of colonialist acquisition and control is less of a problem:

Consider that in 1800 the Western powers claimed 55% but actually held 35% of the earth's surface, and that by 1878 the proportion was 67%, a rate of increase of 83,000 square miles per year. By 1914, the annual rate had risen to an astonishing 240,000 square miles, and Europe held a grand total of roughly 85% of the earth as colonies, protectorates, dependencies, dominions and commonwealths. No other set of colonies in history was as large, none so totally dominated, none so unequal in power to the Western metropolis.²²

In the face of the enormity and the global impact of colonialism, calls to move on to topics other than the (post-) colonial can only seem hasty; indeed, if, as argued in the previous section, the overall framework is one of imperialist expansion, it is difficult to see what a responsible moving-on would involve, caught up as we are in imperialism's relentless unfolding dynamic.

Though he himself does not comment on it, Said's list of the various modalities of domination indicates an important fact about colonialism – its extreme unevenness: we are dealing with different empires, different needs, different strategies, different trajectories of expansion or contraction, different levels of territorial penetration, control and exploitation. Unevenness manifests itself, too, in the fact that . . . some other areas, notably the Middle East and China, were not colonies, but were more affected by "colonialism" than many countries that were.²³ It carries over in a variety of ways into the post-colonial period, not least via the different histories and experiences of the recovery of territory with decolonization: some like Ghana, Nigeria or Senegal were relatively swift and generally peaceful; others, like Algeria, Kenya, Mozambique or Vietnam were protracted, vicious and bloody. Some processes of decolonization were completed long ago; others are still incomplete. The fact that what Gayatri Spivak calls 'decolonized space' is not evenly distributed or inhabited means that for critics like Anne McClintock it is probably too soon to talk about post-colonialism, particularly in a generalized sense:

Ireland may at a pinch be 'post-colonial', but for the inhabitants of British-occupied Northern Ireland, not to mention the Palestinian inhabitants of the Israeli Occupied Territories and the West Bank, there may be nothing 'post' about colonialism at all. Is South Africa 'post-colonial'? East Timor? Australia? By what fiat of historical amnesia can

the United States of America, in particular, qualify as 'post-colonial' – a term which can only be a monumental affront to the native American peoples currently opposing the confetti triumphalism of 1992?²⁴

These are important and complex questions: easier to ask than to answer, no doubt, and for which, indeed, there may be no ready or conclusive answer. Certainly, McClintock's questions present a range of situations which are similar but not necessarily equivalent. Risking charges of Eurocentric bias, some might wish to exclude areas such as the Israeli Occupied Territories or East Timor on the grounds that they are not examples of Western aggression (even if they are examples of profound complicity or criminal indifference on the part of the West), nor are they part of the colonialist-imperialist process in the same way as other areas. The fact that the United States is a former part of the empire at the centre of the colonialist enterprise, and is currently the leading force in the economic and cultural globalization of imperialism, as well as perpetrator of quasi-colonialist military actions worldwide, make it an especially difficult case. There may, however, be good reasons to include work being produced there as post-colonial, as we shall see in Chapter 2. A different case needs to be made for the decolonizing metropolises such as France and Britain, where a particular post-colonial phenomenon is the large-scale immigration of groups from former colonies, creating the possibility of something like internal colonization, despite the dissolution of the empire. It is internal colonization, along with other factors, which renders problematic the inclusion of the white settler colonies of Australia, Canada and New Zealand in the category of the post-colonial, but here, too, there is a case to be made.

If the colonialist moment brought about particular spatial and geographical configurations – for instance, the core and/versus the periphery within the same imperial economy, or empire versus empire as competing power blocs, as bitter rivals warring for control of the same territory (as in eighteenth-century India), or collaborating colleagues calmly sharing out a continent (as with Africa in the nineteenth century) – the post-colonial period is even more complex, with connections from the colonial era remaining (for example, in the shape of the British Commonwealth, or the network sustained by the French system of 'Coopération'), and new relations being constituted. Colonialism's principal mode of the investment and organization of space was via the bounded territory of the nation-state and the latter's extension into colonies, with Sir John Seeley's image of the British Empire as *The Expansion of England*, or Dilke's of it as a *Greater Britain* just two of the better-known examples from the late nineteenth century, while the idea of nationhood as colonialism's greatest gift to the colonies was a long-lived ideological mainstay. Against this, sceptical commentators

such as Basil Davidson have argued that the gift was more of a poisoned chalice in terms of its irrelevance to the needs and conditions of colonized peoples, not to mention the often crippling economic and social legacies it brought with it. It is also possible to argue that colonialism's 'magnificent bequest' is something of an historical irrelevance, as the emphasis in the post-colonial period has shifted from bounded spatial entities to what Masao Miyoshi has termed the 'borderless world',²⁵ almost as much as colonialism's direct territorial control had become irrelevant to the operations of capitalism. Although the post-colonial period may indeed be marked by an intensification of forms of transnationalism, things are perhaps not as simple as some theorists of globalization, enthusiastically proclaiming the end of the nation-state, might like to suggest:

We hear a good deal these days about the *postnational* status of global capitalism and postcoloniality. Such conclusions ignore the ferocious recoding power of the concept/metaphor 'nation state' and remain locked in the reversal of capital logic and colonialism.²⁶

In that sort of perspective, post-colonial spatial relations are likely to be dominated by a power struggle to shore up the boundaries of the nation-state against all those forces which would ignore or bypass them.

Who is the post-colonial?

Once again, as point of departure, there is an 'obvious' post-colonial population – those peoples formerly colonized by the West. From what we have already seen, however, while such a grouping may be (obviously) correct, it may offer no more than a very partial picture. The unevenness and incompleteness of the process of decolonization is one factor in that: if territories cannot be considered post-colonial (in the sense of being free from colonial control), can their inhabitants? Another level of complexity is added when the territory is arguably decolonized or post-colonial, but it may be difficult to regard all the ethnic or cultural groups who inhabit it in that way. That is particularly true of the situation of First Peoples, of the condition of internal colonization, and is one of the factors which unsettles the claims of white settler colonies to post-colonial status.

Questions of the relation of populations and territories to post-colonialism are further complicated by the major diasporas which mark the colonial and post-colonial periods, to which we have already referred, and to which we will return in the final chapter. Although certain population movements in these periods might see themselves as

in opposition to colonialist incursion (with the trekking Boers as a highly paradoxical example) the most important – the African and Asian diasporas – were the deliberate (and in some ways indirect) result of imperialism. While the numbers involved may not be as large, and conditions usually less violent (though instances such as Rwanda and Bosnia could scarcely be more violent), migrations in the post-colonial period do not necessarily represent a great improvement:

For the demography of the new internationalism is the history of post-colonial migration, the narratives of cultural and political diaspora, the major social displacements of peasant and aboriginal communities, the poetics of exile, the grim prose of political and economic refugees.²⁷

Although diasporic population movements may not amount to what the Caribbean poet Louise Bennett once rather optimistically called 'colonization in reverse', the arrival of sizeable populations from former colonies in the imperial heartlands creates conditions under which the latter may in some senses claim to be post-colonial. As Homi Bhabha says: 'The Western metropole must confront its postcolonial history, told by its influx of postwar migrants and refugees, as an indigenous or native narrative *internal to its national identity* . . .'²⁸ The idea that post-colonial groups and their histories, far from being alien or Other to carefully constructed and guarded Western identities, are in fact an integral part of them, derives ultimately from Said's insights on the colonial period in *Orientalism*, but is even truer in the post-colonial period when the Other comes 'home'. The sort of criticism which is sometimes made of post-colonial work in this area is that it appears more interested in migrants as a metaphor than in migrants as real people or actual political issue. That type of accusation is perhaps easily levelled at the playful use of the term in Rushdie's novels – or indeed in Bhabha's theorizing – but one can just as easily point to empirically based work such as Keya Ganguly's 'Migrant Identities'²⁹ as an attempt to understand how people construct or negotiate identities in the unsettling conditions of post-colonial migrancy.

The question of identity traverses post-colonial thinking, from the Negritude of Senghor discussed in Chapter 1 to the complexity of Gayatri Spivak's theorizing in Chapter 5. The problem of unsettled or unsettling identities which Bhabha's quote raises is an issue at the heart of post-colonialism. If the colonial powers fundamentally disrupted many indigenous cultures and identities in the past, then, as Bhabha's quote suggests, post-colonial migrant groups could be seen as returning the compliment, in however modest a fashion. In one sense, to ask the question 'Who is post-colonial?' seems to assume identities already in place, which can then be judged to be

post-colonial or not, whereas for many groups or individuals, post-colonialism is much more to do with the painful experience of confronting the desire to recover 'lost' pre-colonial identities, the impossibility of actually doing so, and the task of constructing some new identity on the basis of that impossibility. 'Who is the post-colonial?' then becomes at least temporarily or partially unanswerable: to the extent that major reformulations are taking place, with the identities of both the formerly colonized or diasporic groups and the imperial nations unsettled in different ways by colonial and post-colonial histories, attempts to define or circumscribe in advance the content of that Who? are premature.

As well as its substantive populations, post-colonialism also has its representative or emblematic individuals or types, among whom intellectuals and activists are prominent. (At one level this book could be seen as a study of diverse intellectual positions and practices in relation to the field designated as post-colonialism, and an obvious criticism of a project such as this is that it merely increases the (supposedly over-inflated) status of 'star' intellectuals such as Said or Spivak. Several of the chapters address questions of the nature and role of intellectual activity in the contested sphere of post-colonialism. In addition to those figures currently active, we examine the work of important thinkers, some of whom did not survive into the post-colonial period (such as Fanon and Cabral), others who did (like C.L.R. James), and who constitute the essential grounding and continuing inspiration for much current analysis. Without the combination of their writings and anti-colonial activism – whether 'merely' textual, or armed and revolutionary – the field of post-colonialism would be literally unthinkable.)

The important role of intellectuals as participants in, and theorizers of, anti-colonial and anti-imperial struggles risks giving intellectuals in general an unearned, or at least unexamined, heroic status in certain quarters. In fact, it is very much part of the 'uneven' natures of colonialism and post-colonialism that intellectuals can occupy positions and embody attitudes ranging from thoroughgoing complicity with the West to outright rejection of it, and in *The Wretched of the Earth* Franz Fanon famously outlines the stages by which some intellectuals move from the former stance to the latter. The fact that intellectuals in the post-colonial field are not automatically praiseworthy has already been indicated in the somewhat cynical remark of Arif Dirlik quoted earlier. Dirlik is not the only critic to attack what is perceived as the self-interested institutionalizing of certain issues by Third World academics, especially those settled in the West. Anthony Appiah, for example, has criticized the actions of what he calls 'a *comprador* intelligentsia',³⁰ meaning that they supposedly behave in the cultural/

intellectual sphere like the early post-colonial bourgeoisie did in the economic, as 'compradors' (literally, buyers) who specialized in the handling of foreign goods, produced nothing themselves, and were thus essentially parasitic.

Gayatri Spivak has also voiced anxiety regarding post-colonial intellectuals, but for her the danger seems to lie with the institution and its practices, rather than with individuals:

As a result of a decade of colonial discourse studies percolating into disciplinary pedagogy and its powerful adjuncts, and of the imbrication of techniques of knowledge with strategies of power, who claims marginality in the larger postcolonial field? What might have this to do with the old scenario of empowering a privileged group or a group susceptible to upward mobility as the authentic inhabitants of the margin?³¹

Another possible answer to the question 'Who is post-colonial?' is 'Not me!'. Resistance to what is seen as an irrelevant or imposed label (which is by no means a problem confined to post-colonialism) tends to occur more among writers than academics or theorists, such resistance to categorization going hand in hand with other typical resistances to theory, or to suggestions that their 'art' is political.³² In *Black Women, Writing and Identity*, Carole Boyce Davies questions the relevance of post-coloniality to black women writers, and applauds their reluctance to be labelled (though she is simultaneously unhappy at Lauretta Ngcobo's unwillingness to be labelled as a woman writer, rather than just African). However, even if women do accept labels, they aren't allowed to get away with it:

I want to assert unequivocally that I see few 'Third World women' or 'women of color' or Black women 'doing post-coloniality' even when a few use the language of post-colonial discourse, or name themselves and their work as such.³³

Part of the problem here, we would suggest, is the model of post-coloniality which Carole Boyce Davies constructs, a question to which we will return in the next section.

What is the post-colonial?

In this final section, we aim to draw together some of the debates about the nature of post-colonialism, and in particular, some of the criticisms which have been levelled against it. One such area of debate concerns the implications of terminology, for instance the relative merits of post-colonialism and post-coloniality. Although perhaps the majority of people would use the two interchangeably, some critics want to differentiate them. Gayatri Spivak, for instance, says:

Neo-colonialism is not simply the continuation of colonialism; it is a different thing. That is what I call 'postcoloniality', and I find the word postcolonialism just totally bogus.³⁴

While Spivak does not go on to explain the vehemently drawn distinction, we can perhaps assume that her objection is to the implication of an achieved state beyond colonialism. (It is ironic that Spivak's terminological precision is not matched by her publishers. In *Outside in the Teaching Machine*, she uses 'postcoloniality' throughout; the editors, however, have turned this into 'postcolonialism' in the index . . .) Although Spivak sees positive dimensions to post-coloniality (for example, 'In postcoloniality, every metropolitan definition is dislodged. The general mode for the postcolonial is citation, reinscription, re-routing the historical.'³⁵) others are less convinced. Ella Shohat is typical:

The globalizing gesture of 'the post-colonial condition', or 'post-coloniality', downplays multiplicities of location and temporality as well as the possible discursive and political linkages between 'post-colonial' theories and contemporary anti-colonial, or anti-neocolonial struggles and discourses.³⁶

For Anne McClintock, too, absence of the necessary multiplicity is a problem:

If the theory promises a decentering of history in hybridity, syncretism, multi-dimensional time, and so forth, the *singularity* of the term [post-colonialism] effects a re-centering of global history around the single rubric of European time. Colonialism returns at the moment of its disappearance.³⁷

Arguably, this is to place too much weight on the term, and to ignore the work being done under its aegis. Where actual post-colonial analysis deals in the 'singular and ahistorical abstraction(s)' which McClintock sees as tied to the term, then it is in need of rectification, but to align 'the postcolonial' with the other 'historically voided categories' like 'the Other', 'the signifier', 'the subject', 'the phallus', raises the question as to how many terms or categories ever carry their full freight of historical content with them, as opposed to having it supplied by critics; and, indeed, one could argue that of all the terms McClintock lists, post-colonial is the *only* one which signals any kind of history – however inadequately it may be felt to do so.

Among the limitations for which Aijaz Ahmad criticizes post-colonialism is a kind of historical amnesia, a forgetting or ignoring of the fact that the term post-colonial had already emerged in political theory, in debates about the composition of states after decolonization. Given that the work we are concerned with here derives from a different disciplinary area – broadly, literary and cultural theory – it

displays some of the shortcomings typically associated with any discipline, especially ignorance of work done elsewhere. It needs to be said, however, that, with Said's example to follow, post-colonial work has always had a measure of interdisciplinarity, and that the best of it is sensitive to debates in areas such as sociology and political economy in a way few of those areas could emulate. (There is also the question of the extent to which acknowledgement or inclusion of earlier work in other disciplines should be a requirement.)

A rather different, and more disturbing, form of amnesia is identified by Dirlik: 'Postcolonial, in other words, is applicable not to all of the postcolonial period, but only to that period after colonialism when, among other things, a forgetting of its effects has begun to set in.'³⁸ In this perspective, post-colonialism appears almost as a pathology, a diseased sign of the times.

While some criticisms of post-colonialism are apposite, others have a distinct feel of the 'urban myth' about them, gaining currency by force of repetition, rather than any particular substance or coherence:

I am reminded of something that the Cuban-American critic, Roman de la Campa, said to me in conversation, to the effect that 'postcoloniality' is postmodernism's wedge to colonise literatures outside Europe and its North American offshoots – which I take the liberty to understand as saying that what used to be known as 'Third World literature' gets rechristened as 'postcolonial literature' when the governing theoretical framework shifts from Third World nationalism to postmodernism.³⁹

This type of recycled dismissal ignores the fact that a book like *Past the Last Post*, which concentrates on the relationship between post-colonialism and postmodernism, sees them as substantially different, if not fundamentally opposed, rather than locked in a relationship of complicity and manipulation. The fact that it is *Past the Last Post*, a collection edited and authored by critics connected with *The Empire Writes Back* and its 'soft' (discourse-centred) form of post-colonial theory, which is arguing for post-colonialism as consistently more politicized than postmodernism and resistant to the latter's hegemonic propensities, says much about the weakness of this type of denigration.

A similar pejorative aligning of post-colonialism and postmodernism is made by Carole Boyce Davies: 'I would further offer that post-coloniality can only have meaning if we accept postmodernism as the only current legitimizing narrative.'⁴⁰ Apart from the fact that, after Lyotard, constituting itself as a 'legitimizing narrative' is surely the last thing postmodernism would want to be doing, it is not clear why post-coloniality having any meaning should be dependent upon acceptance of the precedence of postmodernism. Boyce Davies's model of post-coloniality is heavily reliant on an article by Arun Mukherjee, 'Whose Post-Colonialism and Whose Postmodernism?',⁴¹ but Mukherjee's

discussion takes *The Empire Writes Back* to stand for the whole of post-colonial theory, which is by any account an over-simplification, and, unfortunately, one which Boyce Davies's approach compounds.

As mentioned earlier, post-coloniality is typified for Anthony Appiah by a particularly meretricious form of intellectual activity:

Postcoloniality is the condition of what we might ungenerously call a *comprador* intelligentsia: a relatively small, Western-style, Western-trained group of writers and thinkers who mediate the trade in cultural commodities of world capitalism at the periphery. In the West they are known through the Africa they offer; their compatriots know them both through the West they present to Africa and through an Africa they have invented for the world, for each other, and for Africa.⁴²

If this seems a very pessimistic assessment, that is because for Appiah post-coloniality is precisely a condition of pessimism. While the quote presents very forcibly the idea of intellectual complicity which we touched on in the last section, it offers a bleak picture in which few post-colonial intellectuals might recognize themselves – still less wish to be recognized – nor in which there would seem to inhere much scope for the forms of resistance which are otherwise so important to post-colonialism (though in the course of the article Appiah does manage to locate strategies of 'delegitimation' opposed to imperialist and post-colonial nationalist assumptions, and grounded in ethical universals and notions of continental solidarity).

The problems of taking post-colonialism as referring to intellectuals of a certain type is continued in Aijaz Ahmad's article where, apparently glossing Dirlik, he states:

Following on which is the attendant assertion that only those critics, who believe not only that colonialism has more or less ended but who also subscribe to the idea of the end of Marxism, nationalism, collective historical subjects and revolutionary possibility as such, are the *true* postcolonials, while the rest of us, who do not quite accept this apocalyptic anti-Marxism, are not postcolonial at all.⁴³

While it is true that some post-colonial critics have questioned the sort of categories Ahmad lists, it is hard enough to think of any individual who would readily accept Ahmad's apocalypse *in toto*, and it certainly cannot be held to constitute anything like a general description of the theoretical or political positions of post-colonial critics, 'true' or not.

One article which aims to assess (not uncritically) work in the post-colonial field, but which, unlike many of the examples we have mentioned so far, tries to put forward a useful model of its own, is 'What is post(-)colonialism?' by Vijay Mishra and Bob Hodge. The authors offer an extended critique of what they see as the excessive homogenization at the heart of *The Empire Writes Back*, arguing for example that:

It must be possible to acknowledge difference and insist on a strongly theorized oppositional postcolonialism as crucial to the debate, without claiming that this form is or has been everywhere the same wherever the coloniser's feet have trod.⁴⁴

Despite that, a statement such as the following, with its echoes of positions adopted by Slemon, or Ashcroft et al., might appear to run the risk of their type of homogenization:

When we drop the hyphen, and effectively use 'postcolonialism' as an always present tendency in any literature of subjugation marked by a systematic process of cultural domination through the imposition of imperial structures of power . . .⁴⁵

One way out of the homogenization, they argue, is through the model of post-colonialism divided between oppositional and complicit forms (the latter picking up once again, in a different way, the theme of complicity). Oppositional post-colonialism appears most strongly in post-independence societies, while complicit post-colonialism is 'an always present underside within colonization itself'⁴⁶ – pervasive but not universal, they say elsewhere (in case the former expression should give the wrong idea). The idea that some kinds of post-colonial production may side with the forces of control and exploitation is an interesting, and no doubt necessary, corrective to those critics who would see post-colonialism as (all too easily) resistant. Somewhat in the same manner as we have suggested in this chapter, they regard post-colonialism as an uneven phenomenon:

Postcolonialism, we have stressed, is not a homogenous category, either across all postcolonial societies or even within a single one. Rather, it refers to a typical configuration which is always in the process of change, never consistent with itself.⁴⁷

Though their overall assessment is nothing like as pessimistic as Appiah's, and though they look forward to the emergence of a 'new' post-colonialism, oppositional but not fixated on questions of national independence, Mishra and Hodge feel that complicit post-colonialism is becoming the 'literary dominant of postcolonialism' – a phrase which echoes Fredric Jameson's famous description of postmodernism as a cultural dominant, and in a rather more detailed and nuanced way than Boyce Davies or Ahmad they examine the way in which – ironically, in view of some of the arguments we have already discussed – the project of *The Empire Writes Back* could be considered as 'essentially postmodern'.

For Aijaz Ahmad, as we have already seen, post-colonialism is unacceptable because it apparently privileges colonialism as the structuring principle of other people's histories. In a similar way, the term is a problem for Anne McClintock because it implies commitment to a variety of Western concepts: linear time, development, progress, all of which have

troubled histories. If, however, McClintock is wary of the term because it reinserts and recentres colonialism, others are unhappy about post-colonialism because they see it as an all too hasty turning away from colonialism and its legacies – as, for instance, in the kind of ‘forgetting’ described by Dirlik, above. Dirlik himself assumes that this is the case:

What then may be the value of a term that includes so much beyond and excludes so much of its own postulated premise, the colonial?⁴⁸

To argue this is to ignore the work actually produced under the sign of post-colonialism which does address the colonial period, sometimes exclusively and sometimes as the pre-history of the post-colonial present, as well as the history of post-colonial theory as an academic terrain and its emergence from the earlier field of what was known as Colonial Discourse Analysis – a fact marked in certain book titles,⁴⁹ or the way a recent reassessment of Orientalism can discuss Said and work done since entirely in terms of Colonial Discourse and without once mentioning post-colonial theory.⁵⁰

Another problem of definition or description occurs when Ahmad sums up

postcolonial *writing*. This . . . refers simply to literary compositions – plays, poems, fictions – of non-white writers located in Britain and North America – while efforts are now underway also to designate the contemporary literatures of Asia and Africa as ‘postcolonial’ and thus to make them available for being read according to the protocols that metropolitan criticism has developed for reading what it calls ‘minority’ literatures.⁵¹

In historical terms, this is strictly back to front: it was the literatures of former colonies which were originally designated post-colonial, and the current ‘efforts’ are to examine ways in which the ‘minority’ literatures in Britain and the United States are locatable within the post-colonial paradigm. Also, the ‘protocols’ by which metropolitan criticism has hitherto most eagerly read post-colonial texts have been those of more or less standard literary criticism, rather than the theoretically informed ‘minority literature’ approach⁵² (which is both more recent and not at all widespread), or indeed any other overtly theoretical perspective. That situation is of course undergoing quite rapid change; nevertheless, there are worrying aspects to the kind of criticisms made by Ahmad and Dirlik, and these will be considered in the concluding section of the chapter.

Conclusions?

After all that has been discussed so far, attempting to conclude would be a particularly rash exercise. It is nevertheless worthwhile offering a

few remarks on our own position – which has of course been indicated at certain points along the way. Some of the negative definitions – those things we do not think post-colonialism is – may have come through more clearly. So, for example, we do not think that post-colonialism is a singularized ahistorical abstraction; we do not think that it is an adjunct of some hegemonic project of postmodernism; nor do we think that it is constituted by the actions of a comprador intelligentsia (or any other similarly demonized group of intellectuals) – though of course there is nothing preventing a co-opted intellectual from producing an account of post-colonialism which presents it as an ahistorical adjunct of postmodernism . . . As mentioned earlier in the chapter, we do think that post-colonialism as an historical period is best understood as a phase of imperialism, in turn best understood as the globalizing of capitalism, but that it is not simply or everywhere reducible to these categories. This means that post-colonialism has an inescapable global dimension, but it does not mean that post-colonial *theories* are inevitably totalizing in an overweening effort to master and explain everything (totalizing in its ‘bad’ sense). Nevertheless, part of being involved in such periods and processes means that some critics and theorists do want to try to understand or explain as much of what is going on as possible, but in a non-reductive way. This ‘good’ totalizing, totalizing defined by Fredric Jameson as no more than ‘making connections between phenomena’,⁵³ is, it seems to us, certainly worth retaining – indeed, it is probably essential to have this kind of understanding in order to generate useful political strategies (which is still – the perils of institutionalization notwithstanding – the aim of many post-colonial theorists). If at the theoretical level post-colonialism includes approaches which aim for a certain explanatory breadth, as well as others which in the wake of Foucault’s emphasis on micro-analysis prefer a more localized application, that is no more than appropriate in a world which is experiencing the conflicting pulls of forces which are globalizing and fragmenting, at economic, cultural and political levels, though to say that is emphatically not to suggest theory as a mere reflection of events in the ‘real’ world.

In terms of cultural production, post-colonial analyses similarly range from the panoptical sweep of a book like Said’s *Culture and Imperialism* to those readings which concentrate on one text, or one aspect of one text. All of these mean that attempts to suggest homogeneity, uniformity or univocality in post-colonial work can have little credibility. The theories themselves are in dialogue – sometimes collaborative, sometimes highly critical – with all the major areas of contemporary critical theory: feminism, Marxism, post-structuralism, and, yes, postmodernism; and their own internal debates and complexities also impact on post-colonialism.

It is clear from the questions it wishes to address and the theoretical areas it draws on that post-colonial work is – must be – interdisciplinary. This is wholly to be welcomed, but it does have its drawbacks. The professional formation of modern academics is ever-more specialized, and in certain institutions disciplinary boundaries seem to be more jealously policed than ever. Venturing across those boundaries has its dangers: articles such as those we have discussed by Dirlik and Ahmad, which offer highly critical assessments of post-colonialism from the ‘outside’ as it were, may be – indeed usually are – very impressive in the area of the author’s specialism (history, international relations, politics, etc.) but may be rather less convincing as analyses of post-colonialism. Conversely, we find Said being criticized by a historian for not being a good enough historian. The problems of interdisciplinarity in the post-colonial field which Gayatri Spivak, for instance, has indicated in terms of the difficulty of learning another culture, or even just one of its languages, do not stop there.

There are implications in this for academic work in terms of both pedagogy and the production of knowledge. For a number of years, feminism has argued for an end to, or at least a reduction in, the habitually competitive and adversarial nature of academic practice, and some post-colonial critics have built on these insights. Feminism is interested in power relations in the academy, and obviously in their gendered nature; post-colonialism introduces racial and cultural dimensions into the analysis. As just one example of the possibilities which exist in this area, the revolutionary pedagogy of Paulo Freire is a post-colonial practice of wholesale liberation from which the contemporary education system could learn a great deal, if it dared.

Spivak has commented on post-colonial pedagogy at length, and warned against university teachers claiming ‘spurious marginality’ or trying to dissimulate their involvement in the ‘teaching machine’. She has also argued against the position of the expert or specialist:

To get a grasp on how the agency of the post-colonial is being obliterated in order to reinscribe him and her as marginals, culture studies must use specialisms, but also actively frame and resist the tyranny of the specialist.⁵⁴

This might appear paradoxical – why be a university lecturer, why write a book, if you are not an expert? – but there are general and historical reasons why this is a less paradoxical suggestion than it might appear. At a general level, adopting the position of the expert is immediately to adopt a position of power, frequently a gendered position, and one which is not particularly helpful in an educational context. Historically, within a structure like Orientalism, knowledge production was very much tied to the individual figure of the expert as

observer, analyst and systematizer – though it could be argued that that individualized prominence simply served to disguise the large-scale systemic nature of Orientalism – and in that context, expertise was an aspect of racial and imperialist superiority. In terms of post-colonial knowledge production and the refusal of the tyranny of the expert, implications would include the need to be critically aware of the power invested in the particular locations from which one speaks and writes, the need for a certain humility in making interdisciplinary judgements, the need, as Spivak has said, to undertake ‘the careful project of un-learning our privilege as our loss’,⁵⁵ and the need for more collaborative projects as a move away from the individualizing of expertise. While we would not wish to make any inflated claims for our own collaborative venture, we feel that it has been productive and mutually enlightening, and hope that it manages to convey a sense of engagement with thinkers and issues, rather than a mastery of all theoretical areas – an engagement which we aim to pursue in the chapters which follow.

Notes

1. Various commentators have criticized post-colonialism for its apparent over-attachment to terms which indicate homogeneity or singularity (‘the post-colonial condition’, or ‘the post-colonial intellectual’), rather than multiplicity or difference. We would like to emphasize that, contrary to any impressions given by the section headings in this chapter, we are firmly on the side of multiplicity.
2. J.G. Farrell, ‘Epitaph for the Empire’, *Observer Magazine*, 24 September 1978, pp. 73 & 75.
3. See, for example, Bernard Porter, *The Lion’s Share: A Short History of British Imperialism*, Harlow: Longman, 1985 (second edition); V.G. Kiernan, *European Empires from Conquest to Collapse*, London: Fontana, 1982; D.A. Low, *Eclipse of Empire*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991; John Darwin, *The End of the British Empire: The Historical Debate*, Oxford: Blackwell, 1991.
4. Aijaz Ahmad, ‘The Politics of Literary Postcoloniality’, *Race and Class*, 36, 3, 1995, p. 9.
5. See Chapter 2 below, on metropolitan theorizing.
6. Bill Ashcroft, Gareth Griffiths and Helen Tiffin (eds.), *The Empire Writes Back: Theory and Practice in Post-Colonial Literatures*, London: Routledge, 1989, p. 2.
7. Abdul JanMohamed, ‘The Economy of Manichean Allegory: The Function of Racial Difference in Colonial Fiction’, *Critical Inquiry*, 12, 1, 1985.
8. Stephen Slemon, ‘Modernism’s Last Post’ in Ian Adam and Helen Tiffin (eds.), *Past the Last Post: Theorizing Post-Colonialism and Post-Modernism*, Hemel Hempstead: Harvester Wheatsheaf, 1991, p. 3.

9. Adam and Tiffin (eds.), *op. cit.*, p. xii.
10. Marx and Engels, 'Manifesto of the Communist Party', in Marx, *The Revolutions of 1848* (Political Writings, vol. 1), ed. David Fernbach, Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1973, p. 71.
11. Immanuel Wallerstein, *Historical Capitalism*, London: Verso, 1983, p. 39.
12. Edward Said, *Culture and Imperialism*, London: Chatto, 1993, p. 3. The literature on imperialism is extensive, ranging from works such as George Lichtheim, *Imperialism*, Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1974, to Anthony Brewer, *Marxist Theories of Imperialism*, London: Routledge, 1980; or V.G. Kiernan, *Imperialism and Its Contradictions*, London: Routledge, 1994.
13. Ella Shohat, 'Notes on the "Post-Colonial"', *Social Text*, 31/32, 1992, p. 103.
14. Arif Dirlik, 'The Postcolonial Aura: Third World Criticism in the Age of Global Capitalism', *Critical Inquiry*, 20, Winter 1994, p. 329.
15. Lorna Goodison, quoted in Carole Boyce Davies, *Black Women, Writing and Identity: Migrations of the Subject*, London: Routledge, 1994, p. 95.
16. Fredric Jameson, *The Political Unconscious*, London: Routledge, 1983, p. 286.
17. Gayatri Spivak, *The Post-Colonial Critic: Interviews, Strategies, Dialogues*, ed. Sarah Harasym, London: Routledge, 1990, p. 166.
18. Ahmad, *op. cit.*, pp. 6-7.
19. Gayan Prakash, 'Postcolonial Criticism and Indian Historiography', *Social Text*, 31/32, 1992, p. 13.
20. Bill Ashcroft, Gareth Griffiths and Helen Tiffin (eds.), *The Post-Colonial Studies Reader*, London: Routledge, 1995, p. 355.
21. Dipesh Chakrabarty, 'Postcoloniality and the Artifice of History: Who Speaks for "Indian" Pasts?', *Representations*, 37, Winter 1992, p. 1.
22. Said, *op. cit.*, p. 6.
23. Porter, *op. cit.*, p. x.
24. Anne McClintock, 'The Angel of Progress: Pitfalls of the term "Post-colonialism"', *Social Text*, 31/32, 1992, reprinted in Patrick Williams and Laura Chrisman (eds.), *Colonial Discourse and Post-Colonial Theory: A Reader*, Hemel Hempstead: Harvester Wheatsheaf, 1993, p. 294.
25. Masao Miyoshi, 'A Borderless World? From Colonialism to Transnationalism and the Decline of the Nation-State', *Critical Inquiry*, 19, Summer 1993.
26. Gayatri Spivak, *Outside in the Teaching Machine*, London: Routledge, 1993, p. 81.
27. Homi Bhabha, *The Location of Culture*, London: Routledge, 1994, p. 5.
28. *ibid.*, p. 6.
29. Keya Ganguly, 'Migrant Identities: Personal Memory and the Construction of Selfhood', *Cultural Studies*, 6, 1, 1992.
30. Anthony Appiah, 'Is the Post- in Postmodernism the Post- in Post-colonial?', *Critical Inquiry*, 17, Winter 1991, p. 348.
31. Spivak, *op. cit.*, p. 59.
32. See, for example, Evelyn O'Callaghan, "'It's all about Ideology: There's no Discussion about Art': Reluctant Voyages into Theory in Caribbean Women's Writing", *Kunapipi*, XIV, 2, 1992.
33. Boyce Davies, *op. cit.*, p. 87.

34. Gayatri Spivak, 'Neocolonialism and the Secret Agent of Knowledge', *Oxford Literary Review*, 13, 1-2, 1991, p. 224.
35. Spivak, *Outside in the Teaching Machine*, *op. cit.*, p. 217.
36. Shohat, *op. cit.*, p. 104.
37. McClintock, *op. cit.*, p. 293.
38. Dirlik, *op. cit.*, p. 339.
39. Ahmad, *op. cit.*, p. 1.
40. Boyce Davies, *op. cit.*, p. 86.
41. Arun Mukherjee, 'Whose Post-Colonialism and Whose Postmodernism?', *World Literature Written in English*, 30, 2, 1990.
42. Appiah, *op. cit.*, p. 348.
43. Ahmad, *op. cit.*, p. 10.
44. Mishra and Hodge, 'What is post(-)colonialism?', *Textual Practice*, 5, 3, 1991, reprinted in Williams and Chrisman (eds.), *op. cit.*, p. 289.
45. *ibid.*, p. 284.
46. *ibid.*, p. 284.
47. *ibid.*, p. 289.
48. Dirlik, *op. cit.*, p. 339.
49. As, for instance, Williams and Chrisman (eds.), *op. cit.*, and Francis Barker, Peter Hulme and Margaret Iversen (eds.), *Colonial Discourse/Postcolonial Theory*, Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1994.
50. See John M. MacKenzie, *Orientalism: History, Theory and the Arts*, Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1995, especially Chapters 1 and 2.
51. Ahmad, *op. cit.*, p. 8.
52. See, for example, the collection edited by Abdul JanMohamed and David Lloyd, *The Nature and Context of Minority Discourse*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1990.
53. Jameson, *Postmodernism, or the Cultural Logic of Late Capitalism*, London: Verso, 1991, p. 403.
54. Spivak, *Outside in the Teaching Machine*, *op. cit.*, p. 74.
55. Spivak, *The Post-Colonial Critic*, *op. cit.*, p. 9.