

# Bibliotekarstudentens nettleksikon om litteratur og medier

Av Helge Ridderstrøm (førsteamanuensis ved OsloMet – storbyuniversitetet)

Sist oppdatert 23.01.20

Dette dokumentets nettadresse (URL) er:

<https://www.litteraturogmedieleksikon.no/cm4all/uproc.php/0/postkolonialisme.pdf>

## Postkolonialisme

“Postkolonialisme er en samlebetegnelse for en lang række forskjellige teorier og teksttilgange og ikke en metode eller en teori der umiddelbart kan eller skal anvendes på en tekst. Postkolonialisme brukes bl.a. om selve tiden etter koloniseringen af lande som fx Indien, Australien og mange afrikanske lande, men postkolonialisme betegner også studiet af de nye former for litteratur der opstod da de tidligere koloniserede lande fik deres selvstændighed [...] Overordnet kan man si ge at postkolonialismen beskæftiger sig med effekterne og konsekvenserne af kolonialisme. I sit udgangspunkt er postkolonialismen kritisk i den forstand at den ikke kun kortlægger og identificerer koloniale træk og konsekvenser af kolonitiden, men også kritiserer den kulturelle, litterære og intellektuelle dominans som Vesten har over tidligere koloniserede lande. Det er en grundantagelse inden for den postkoloniale teori at imperialismen og kolonitiden ikke kun gav sig udslag i fysisk og økonomisk dominans, men også som en diskurs der indebar viden og repræsentation, og at denne diskurs har medført en fortsat politisk, social og økonomisk ulighed mellem kolonimagten og det koloniserede samfund, også efter den formelle afkolonisering. [...] Postkolonialisme henviser både til postkolonial litteratur og til en måde at læse den på, altså både et genstandsområde og en metode. Den litteratur der kaldes og/eller læses postkolonialt, er litteratur skrevet af dels vestlige forfattere om det tidligere koloniale område og dels forfattere der selv kommer derfra. Fx vil både engelske og indiske forfattere der skriver om Indien, kunne betegnes som postkoloniale. [...] Den lokale postkolonialistiske litteratur er skrevet på det lokale sprog og henvender sig til den koloniserede part.” (La Cour 2011)

Det antas at ordet “kolonialisme” kommer fra det latinske “colonia”, som betyr bebyggelse og ble brukt om romerske bebyggelser i okkuperte land, men det er mulig at ordet kommer fra det latinske “colere”, som betyr å kultivere eller forme, og som sikter til kolonier som formbare territorier (Varela og Dhawan 2015 s. 21). Fra koloniherrenes side ble det noen ganger hevdet at bestemte folkegrupper var avhengig av hvite til å styre dem, at disse folkegruppene ønsket og krevde å få underkaste seg (Césaire 2004 s. 47).

Det har blitt hevdet at moderne kolonisering begynte i 1492 da Christopher Columbus gikk i land i Sør-Amerika som leder for en “opdagelsesreise” finansiert av det spanske kongehuset (Varela og Dhawan 2015 s. 22). En senere milepæl var opprettelsen av The East India Company i år 1600, som av dronning Elizabeth 1. fikk enerett til å handle med India og landene øst for India. East India Company ble det første overnasjonale konsernet i verden (Varela og Dhawan 2015 s. 23).

“During the nineteenth century Britain emerged as the largest imperial power, and by the turn of the twentieth century the British Empire ruled one quarter of the earth’s surface, including India, Australia, New Zealand, Canada, Ireland, and significant holdings in Africa, the West Indies, South America, the Middle East, and Southeast Asia. British colonial domination continued until the end of World War II, when India gained independence in 1947, and other colonies gradually followed suit. By 1980 Britain had lost all but a few of its colonial holdings.” (Tyson 2006)

Den martiniquisk-franske forfatteren og politikeren Aimé Césaire fastslo at evangelisering, utdanning og sykdomsbekjempelse som kolonisateurerne har kommet med, alltid har vært tydelig underordnet å finne ressurser og markeder for den vestlige økonomien (Césaire 2004 s. 9). Koloniseringen har fungert avsviliserende, brutaliserende, og Césaire kalte det en form for nazisme (Césaire 2004 s. 12-13). Slik Hitlers nazister behandlet folkegrupper i Europa, slik har hvite koloniherrer behandlet folkegrupper i India, Algerie og en lang rekke andre land (Césaire 2004 s. 14).

Europernes selvforståelse ble preget av de ukjente, “primitive” folkeslagene i deres kolonier. De europeiske nasjonene fikk en sterkere glans sett i motsetning til alle naturfolkene som var “uten kultur”. Vesten ble sett på som fullstendig overlegen på alle måter. For eksempel oppfattet europeerne i Vesten (Oksidenten) seg som rasjonelle, myndige, aktive og dydige, i motsetning til mennesker i Orienten, som ble oppfattet som irrasjonelle, barnslige, passive og syndige. De Andre var eksotiske på en negativ, foraktelig måte. De umyndige i koloniene kunne ikke engang forstå det de hadde rundt seg av egen kultur fra tidligere epoker – og oppgaven med å forstå, samle (stjele) og systematisere deres kulturytringer ble derfor europeernes oppgave (Ketil Volden i *Dag og tid* 15. juni 1995 s. 11).

“[T]he individualistic view of man was accompanied by the modern development of the social division of labour [...] To the social division one might certainly add the world division of labour and means. Looked at from this angle, not everybody was expected to apply for the prestigious status of world citizen. On the contrary, the majority of the world population was excluded from the forthcoming race in advance. The rift was now introduced into the corps of mankind by the global economy that spawned unequal development of various world zones. In the underdeveloped zones rare individuals were able or willing to accept the European standing invitation to transgression of all identity borders, fixity and finitude in the

name of 'unfinished adventure'. As a matter of fact, as Zygmunt Bauman astutely puts it, the majority of people were expected to serve this expanding European history instead of drawing profit from it. The unification of planet-wide humanity desperately needed its handmaidens, fuel stations and repair workshops to service its laborious process of remaking the world." (Biti 2011)

Flere steder i Det nye testamente (bl.a. Matteus 24,14 og 28,19-20, Markus 10,13 og 16, 15-16) pålegges kristne å misjonere, og varsler om at apokalypsen med Jesu gjenkomst skal skje når det kristne evangelium har blitt spredt til alle folk i verden. Derfor var det viktig å forkynne det kristne budskap for menneskene i nyoppdagete områder og kolonier (Lüdeke 2011 s. 269). Kristi gjenkomst var etterlengtet av kristne, fordi det ville bli frelsens store dag for dem. Men noen befolkningsgrupper var så fremmedartede at europeerne trodde at de ikke kunne ha sjel, og da kunne de behandles som dyr.

I en tale om Afrika i 1879 sa den franske dikteren Victor Hugo: "Hva ville Afrika vært uten de hvite? Ingenting. En haug med sand; natt; paralyse; månelandskap. Afrika eksisterer kun fordi den hvite mann har berørt det. Ser dere det som stenger? Det er der, foran dere, denne haugen av sand og aske, denne trege og passive massen som, i seks tusen år, var en hindring for den universelle framgang, dette monstrøse Cham som stopper Sem med sin enorme størrelse – Afrika. [...] Fremad, folk! Forsyn dere av denne jorden. [...] Ta denne jorden for Gud. Gud gir jorden til menneskene. Gud tilbyr Afrika til Europa. Ta det. Flytt deres befolkningsoverskudd til dette Afrika, og løs samtidig deres sosiale problemer, gjør deres proletarer om til jordeiere. Gjør det! Lag veier, lag havner, lag byer; dyrk, kultiver, koloniser, forøk." (sitert fra Saouli 2015 s. 10-11) Den i Vesten utbredte troen på at afrikanere ikke kan klare seg selv, har blitt kalt "afro-pessimisme" (María O. L. Gamallo i <https://dialnet.unirioja.es/descarga/articulo/4056797.pdf>; lesedato 10.10.19).

Den franske 1800-tallsforfatteren Guy de Maupassant skrev: "Algerie ble produktivt på grunn av anstrengelser fra de sist ankomne [altså koloniherrene]. Befolkningen som oppstår arbeider ikke bare for personlige behov, men også for franske interesser. Sikkert er det at jorden under disse menneskenes hender gir avkastning som den aldri har gitt mellom arabiske hender." (sitert fra Saouli 2015 s. 11)

Den franske antropologen og rasisten Georges Vacher de Lapouge hevdet at slaveri ikke var verre enn å temme en hest eller okse (Césaire 2004 s. 33). Franskmannen Jules Romain, som var medlem i Det franske akademi, mente at "den svarte rase" aldri kom til å gi menneskeheten en Einstein, en Stravinskij eller en Gershwin (gjengitt fra Césaire 2004 s. 35).

De koloniserte folkeslagene ble sett på som "intrinsically inferior, not just outside history and civilization, but also genetically predetermined to inferiority. Their subjection was not just a matter of profit and convenience, but also could be

constructed as a natural state. The idea of the ‘evolution of mankind’ and the survival of the fittest ‘race’, in the crude application of Social Darwinism, went hand in hand with the doctrines of imperialism that evolved at the end of the nineteenth century. [...] colonialism developed an ideology rooted in obfuscatory justification, and its violent and essentially unjust processes became increasingly difficult to perceive behind a liberal smoke-screen of civilizing ‘task’, paternalistic ‘development’ and ‘aid’. [...] these territories were the displaced sites of increasingly violent struggles for markets and raw materials by the industrialized nations of the West.” (Ashcroft, Griffiths og Tiffin 2013 s. 55)

“[T]he inhabitants were considered to be uncivilized and thus having no legal rights of ownership [...] exploration to trade and settlement, their original inhabitants killed, displaced or marginalized within European settler communities. In extreme cases, where peoples were seen to be without organizational forms recognizable as such to European eyes, as in Australia, the land was declared literally empty, a *terra nullius*.” (Ashcroft, Griffiths og Tiffin 2013 s. 113)

Postkolonial teori er interdisiplinær og blir utviklet ikke bare for å drive fundamental kritikk, men for å fremme endringer, forbedringer, politiske omformingsprosesser. Det er en nær forbindelse mellom teoriene og politisk aktivisme. Studiene kan berøre alle relasjoner mellom “nord” og “sør”, dvs. makt-relasjoner, økonomiske relasjoner, sosio-historiske relasjoner, kulturelle relasjoner m.m. Dette berører menneskerettigheter, overnasjonal lovgivning, religion, globalisering, u-hjelp, etnisitet, migrasjon m.m. Idealet i postkoloniale studier er “multi-perspektivisk, transnasjonal historieskriving” (Varela og Dhawan 2015 s. 16) for å fremme konstruktiv kritikk som kan bidra til samfunnsendringer. Postkolonialisme er “et sett diskursive praksiser [...] som yter motstand mot kolonialisme, kolonialistiske ideologier og deres tradisjoner” (Varela og Dhawan 2015 s. 17).

“Postcolonial criticism is particularly effective at helping us see connections among all the domains of our experience – the psychological, ideological, social, political, intellectual, and aesthetic – in ways that show us just how inseparable these categories are in our lived experience of ourselves and our world. In addition, postcolonial theory offers us a framework for examining the similarities among all critical theories that deal with human oppression, such as Marxism; feminism; gay, lesbian, and queer theories; and African American theory.” (Tyson 2006)

“Researchers point out, uncontroversially, that the west tends to:

1. view matters wholly through their own culturally-determined and often limited historical perspectives.
2. lump countries together in geographical or economic blocks, which overlooks vital differences in history, outlook and cultural practices.

3. oblige writers to adopt the language of the former colonial power, for practical convenience and/or economic control of the media or publishing houses. In many cases, the foreign language has traditions, social structures and textures that are not appropriate to what the new writers wish to say.

4. apply economic or political coercion. Countries are often given or denied aid on the basis of democratic assessments that are very simplistically applied. Worse, countries often need aid only because they are denied a proper market for their goods by trade organizations that perpetuate the old colonial rule.

[...] post-colonial studies can also be one-sided, ignoring the obvious, that:

1. however distorted the image the west imposes on the third world, an equally distorted view of the west prevails in many third world countries: perception is a larger problem than colonialism.

2. governments in third world countries often show colonial attitudes to their own peoples: blaming their colonial history is not the answer to more complex problems.

3. the European colonizing powers are unfairly singled out. More coercive and self-perpetuating, for example, were the Chinese and Ottoman Empires.

4. the record of colonialism is more mixed than many theorists allow, with some good and some bad.

5. theorists enjoy an intellectual freedom unknown in the countries before their 'occupation' by the colonial powers – one that has sometimes disappeared after Independence.

6. study is excessively theoretical, reliant on dubious Marxist ideology, and can be imperialistic in its turn, setting itself up as the ultimate (and necessarily western) vantage point.

7. theory becomes an end in itself. In general, the immense problems of the third world do not need such sophistry: they need action.

8. examples have been pushed to extremes, which has given the whole subject a bad name, perhaps as a ready way of securing tenure in difficult academic times.” (Colin John Holcombe i <http://www.textetc.com/theory/post-colonial-studies.html>; lesedato 28.11.18)

“Postkolonialisme inddrager viden fra fag som historie, kulturstudier, psykologi, antropologi og samfundsvidenskab, hvilket gør det til et meget bredt studium. Noget der bidrager til at gøre retningen yderligere kompleks, er at mange begreber defineres åbent, og de forskellige teoretikere er ikke enige om hverken begreberne

eller forudsætningerne for selve postkolonialismen. De teoretikere der anskuer kolonitiden som overstået, fx de australske teoretikere Ashcroft, Griffiths og Tiffin, bruger en bindestreg: *post-colonialism*, mens andre der betragter kolonitiden som vedvarende, skriver *postcolonialism* uden bindestreg. At man er begyndt at udvide postkolonialismens genstandsområde til andre litteraturer end de traditionelt postkoloniale, gør grænserne for teoriens anvendelsesområde endnu mere flydende. Det er stadig relativt nyt at anvende postkolonialistisk teori på dansk litteratur, selvom Danmark har en fortid som koloniasator af både Grønland, Vestindien og Trankebar. [...] Der er delte meninger om hvorvidt det postkolonialistiske ved teorien er dens genstand (altså et værk der defineres som postkolonialt pga. dets forfatter og/eller tema), eller om det er en særlig analysemetode, et særligt blik, der kan bruges på hvad som helst. Eller om begge krav skal være opfyldt: En særlig analysemetode der kan anvendes på litteratur skrevet i tidligere kolonier eller af forfattere fra tidligere kolonimagter. Ashcroft, Griffiths og Tiffin mener at postkoloniale tekster er specielle og anderledes end europæiske, og derfor kan de ikke læses på samme måde som man læser europæiske.” (La Cour 2011)

“[P]ostcolonial criticism seeks to understand the operations – politically, socially, culturally, and psychologically – of colonialist and anticolonialist ideologies. For example, a good deal of postcolonial criticism analyzes the ideological forces that, on the one hand, pressed the colonized to internalize the colonizers’ values and, on the other hand, promoted the resistance of colonized peoples against their oppressors, a resistance that is as old as colonialism itself.” (Tyson 2006)

Postkolonial teori kan bidra til nytenkning om de ulike konstellasjonene mellom kultur, nasjon og etnisitet i vår verden i dag (Varela og Dhawan 2015 s. 18).

“Ethnicity is a term that has been used increasingly since the 1960s to account for human variation in terms of culture, tradition, language, social patterns and ancestry, rather than the discredited generalizations of *race* with its assumption of a humanity divided into fixed, genetically determined biological types. Ethnicity refers to the fusion of many traits that belong to the nature of any ethnic group: a composite of shared values, beliefs, norms, tastes, behaviours, experiences, consciousness of kind, memories and loyalties (Schermerhorn 1974: 2). [...] both ethnicity and its components are relative to time and place, and, like any social phenomenon, they are dynamic and prone to change. [...] The term ‘ethnicity’, however, really only achieves wide currency when these ‘national’ groups find themselves as minorities within a larger national grouping, as occurs in the aftermath of colonization, either through immigration to settled colonies such as USA, Canada, Australia, New Zealand, or by the migration of colonized peoples to the colonizing centre.” (Ashcroft, Griffiths og Tiffin 2013 s. 98-99)

“Wherever postcolonial critics place themselves in terms of these debates [...], most interpret postcolonial literature in terms of a number of overlapping topics. These include, among others, the following common topics.

1. The native people's initial encounter with the colonizers and the disruption of indigenous culture
2. The journey of the European outsider through an unfamiliar wilderness with a native guide
3. Othering (the colonizers' treatment of members of the indigenous culture as less than fully human) and colonial oppression in all its forms
4. Mimicry (the attempt of the colonized to be accepted by imitating the dress, behavior, speech, and lifestyle of the colonizers)
5. Exile (the experience of being an "outsider" in one's own land or a foreign wanderer in Britain)
6. Post-independence exuberance followed by disillusionment
7. The struggle for individual and collective cultural identity and the related themes of alienation, unhomeliness (feeling that one has no cultural "home," or sense of cultural belonging), double consciousness (feeling torn between the social and psychological demands of two antagonistic cultures), and hybridity (experiencing one's cultural identity as a hybrid of two or more cultures, which feeling is sometimes described as a positive alternative to unhomeliness)
8. The need for continuity with a precolonial past and self-definition of the political future

These common topics illustrate postcolonial criticism's recognition of the close relationship between psychology and ideology or, more specifically, between individual identity and cultural beliefs. In addition, most postcolonial critics analyze the ways in which a literary text, whatever its topics, is colonialist or anticolonialist, that is, the ways in which the text reinforces or resists colonialism's oppressive ideology. For example, in the simplest terms, a text can reinforce colonialist ideology through positive portrayals of the colonizers, negative portrayals of the colonized, or the uncritical representation of the benefits of colonialism for the colonized. Analogously, texts can resist colonialist ideology by depicting the misdeeds of the colonizers, the suffering of the colonized, or the detrimental effects of colonialism on the colonized." (Tyson 2006)

Postkolonialt teorigrunnlag er ofte påvirket av både marxisme og post-strukturalisme (Varela og Dhawan 2015 s. 13). Den marxistiske tradisjonen har alltid kritisert kolonialisme, fra Marx og Engels' tid. Den polsk-tyske marxisten Rosa Luxemburg beskriver i boka *Kapitalens opphoping: Et bidrag til økonomisk forklaring av imperialismen* (1913) detaljert og skånselsløst koloniseringen av India, og kritiserer sterkt britenes imperialisme.

Det er “a number of similarities in the theoretical issues that concern feminist and postcolonial critics. For example, patriarchal subjugation of women is analogous to colonial subjugation of indigenous populations. And the resultant devaluation of women and colonized peoples poses very similar problems for both groups in terms of achieving an independent personal and group identity; gaining access to political power and economic opportunities; and finding ways to think, speak, and create that are not dominated by the ideology of the oppressor. These parallels between feminist and postcolonial concerns also underscore the double oppression suffered by postcolonial women. For they are the victims of both colonialist ideology, which devalues them because of their race and cultural ancestry, and patriarchal ideology, which devalues them because of their sex. Sadly, postcolonial women have suffered patriarchal oppression not only at the hands of colonialists, but within their own patriarchal cultures as well. As Anne McClintock observes, “In a world where women do two-thirds of the world’s work, earn 10 percent of the world’s income, and own less than 1 percent of the world’s property, the promise of ‘postcolonialism’ (national independence) has been a history of hopes postponed” (298). And predictably, international aid to developing countries reinforces this pattern, giving the money, the machinery, and the training to men alone, even in Africa, where “women farmers produce 65-80 percent of all agricultural produce, yet do not own the land they work, and are consistently bypassed by aid programs and ‘development’ projects” (McClintock 298).” (Tyson 2006)

Termen “double colonization” ble “coined in the mid-1980s, and usually identified with Holst-Petersen and Rutherford’s *A Double Colonization: Colonial and Postcolonial Women’s Writing* published in 1985. The term refers to the observation that women are subjected to both the colonial domination of Empire and the male domination of patriarchy. In this respect, Empire and patriarchy act as analogous to each other and both exert control over female colonial subjects, who are, thus, doubly colonized by imperial/patriarchal power. Feminist theory has propounded that women have been marginalised by patriarchal society and consequently the history and concerns of feminist theory have paralleled developments in postcolonial theory which foregrounds the marginalization of the colonial subject. [...] There is considerable disagreement, however, among postcolonial feminists about whether imperialism or patriarchy is the force most urgently in need of contesting. One, perhaps most celebrated example is Hazel Carby’s ‘White Woman Listen’ (1982)” (Ashcroft, Griffiths og Tiffin 2013 s. 89-90).

Koloniherrene var nesten alltid tydelige rasister, og anså at de selv tilhørte en høyere rase, sivilisasjon og kultur enn de menneskene og folkegruppene som ble erobret. Mange vestlige politikere før 1945 har i full offentlighet kommet med tydelige rasistiske uttalelser, og blitt populære i sitt hjemlands opinion for det. Før han ble valgt til amerikansk president uttalte Teddy Roosevelt: “I don’t go so far as to think that the only good Indians are the dead Indians, but I believe that nine out of every ten are, and I shouldn’t like to enquire too closely into the case of the



tenth. The most vicious cowboy has more moral principle than the average Indian.” (sitert fra Fields 1979 s. 124)

“Post-colonial studies apply the insights of hermeneutics and left-wing political theory to the literature of countries emerging from colonialism. Equally pertinent is the literature of the colonizing power – the unspoken and sometimes superior attitudes of European writers towards the culture of countries they control or once controlled.” (Colin John Holcombe i <http://www.textetc.com/theory/post-colonial-studies.html>; lesedato 28.11.18)

“[M]uch precolonial culture has been lost over many generations of colonial domination. In addition, many postcolonial theorists argue that, even had there been no colonization, the ancient culture would have changed by now: no culture stands still, frozen in time. Furthermore, most cultures are changed by cross-cultural contact, often through military invasion. For example, ancient Celtic culture was changed by the Roman legions who occupied the British Isles. And Anglo-Saxon culture was changed by the many generations of French rule that followed the Norman conquest of that same territory in the eleventh century. By the same token, the precolonial cultures of colonized peoples influenced European culture. For example, Picasso’s art was greatly influenced by his study of African masks. Therefore, many postcolonial theorists argue that postcolonial identity is necessarily a dynamic, constantly evolving *hybrid* of native and colonial cultures. Moreover, they assert that this *hybridity*, or *syncretism* as it’s sometimes called, does not consist of a stalemate between two warring cultures but is rather a productive, exciting, positive force in a shrinking world that is itself becoming more and more culturally hybrid. This view encourages ex-colonials to embrace the multiple and often conflicting aspects of the blended culture that is theirs and that is an indelible fact of history.” (Tyson 2006)

Arven etter kolonitiden er fortsatt svært tydelig. Det er enorme og systematiske forskjeller mellom verdens rikeste land (oftest i nord og vest) og fattige land (oftest i sør). Det finnes en slags “internasjonal arbeidsfordeling” (Varela og Dhawan 2015 s. 13), f.eks. ved at rike land investerer kapital i fattige land der det er lave sosiale og økologiske standarder, og med en arbeidskraft som er lett å utnytte til lavkostproduksjon av varer som konsumenter i rike land ønsker.

“As a historical term, the word postcolonial generally refers to the cessation of colonialist domination of one country by another. It is thus a problematic term. [...] the cessation of colonialist domination – the liberation of a colonized nation by the removal of the colonizers’ military and governmental forces – does not automatically result in the cessation of the cultural, social, or economic exploitation of the liberated nation by more technologically developed countries. And it is difficult to say that a nation is truly postcolonial if it continues to be exploited by, for example, multinational corporations taking unfair advantage of its cheap labor and its lack of environmental protection laws.” (Tyson 2006)

“Cultural colonization” har f.eks. vært “the inculcation of a British system of government and education, British culture, and British values that denigrate the culture, morals, and even physical appearance of formerly subjugated peoples. Thus, ex-colonials often were left with a psychological “inheritance” of a negative self-image and alienation from their own indigenous cultures, which had been forbidden or devalued for so long that much precolonial culture has been lost.” (Tyson 2006)

“Postcolonial theorists often describe the colonial subject as having a *double consciousness* or *double vision*, in other words, a consciousness or a way of perceiving the world that is divided between two antagonistic cultures: that of the colonizer and that of the indigenous community. [...] This feeling of being caught between cultures, of belonging to neither rather than to both, of finding oneself arrested in a psychological limbo that results not merely from some individual psychological disorder but from the trauma of the cultural displacement within which one lives, is referred to by Homi Bhabha and others as *unhomeliness*. Being “unhomed” is not the same as being homeless. To be unhomed is to feel not at home even in your own home because you are not at home in yourself: your cultural identity crisis has made you a psychological refugee, so to speak.” (Tyson 2006)

Kolonisering har ofte blitt oppfattet både som et “herredømme-, makt- og undertrykkelsessystem”, men også som et “erkjennelses- og representasjons-system”, der de Andre konstrueres og fastsettes i motsetning til et suverent, overlegent europeisk Selv (Varela og Dhawan 2015 s. 22). Konstruksjonen av de Andre foregår gjennom ulike former for vold. Kolonisering og nykolonisering har skjedd, og skjer fortsatt, gjennom fysisk vold og brutal militærmakt, med militær okkupasjon og utplydning av ressurser, men også gjennom mindre påfallende maktmidler. Samfunnsforskeren Johan Galtung og andre har brukt begrepet strukturell vold om samfunnsstrukturer/-systemer som skader mennesker uten at det brukes fysisk vold. Vold kan altså oppfattes på ulike måter og deles inn i forskjellige kategorier, f.eks. “fysisk, militær, epistemologisk og ideologisk vold” (Varela og Dhawan 2015 s. 27). Epistemologi er filosofi om grunnlaget for erkjennelse og hvordan vi erkjenner. Noen bruker uttrykk som “eurosentrisk vold” om Vestens hegemoni og maktbruk (Varela og Dhawan 2015 s. 13).

Det er en politisk handling å skrive og vise sin forskjellighet fra kolonimaktens forfattere (Michael Einfalt i Joch og Wolf 2005 s. 273). “Folkloristisk” underholdning blir akseptert av kolonimakten, mens kritiske stemmer derimot blir sensurert (Joch og Wolf 2005 s. 265). Koloniserte folkegrupper kunne prøve å holde hemmelig sine skikker, religiøse forestillinger og ritualer, altså fortie dem, for på den måten å beskytte dem mot koloniherrernes innflytelse (Varela og Dhawan 2015 s. 159).

Den algeriske forfatteren Rachid Boudjedra har kritisert den vestlige verdens dominans og ideologi: “I det øyeblikk man dominerer, er man universell. I det øyeblikk man er dominert, er man lokal, regional, spesiell. [...] Utenfor den vestlige litteraturen blir alle andre litteraturer lest på en etnologisk, politisk eller sosiologisk måte, ikke litterært.” (sitert fra Joch og Wolf 2005 s. 274) De ikke-vestlige kulturene er eksotiske, men ikke verdifulle.

Den britiske forskeren Martin Bernal's bøker *Black Athena* (tre bind; 1987, 1991 og 2006) forklarer hvordan europeere lenge så på egypterne som læremestere for de store greske, antikke mesterverkene. Men fra 1700-tallet og senere kunne ikke lenger det rasistiske Europa tåle tanken på en så sterk afrikansk påvirkning på Vestens kultur.

“Post-colonialism in literature includes the study of theory and literature as it relates to the colonizer–colonized experience. Edward Said is the leading theorist in this field, with Chinua Achebe being one of its leading authors. [...] In many works of literature, specifically those coming out of Africa, the Middle East, and the Indian Subcontinent, we meet characters who are struggling with their identities in the wake of colonization, or the establishment of colonies in another nation. For example, the British had a colonial presence in India from the 1700s until India gained its independence in 1947. As you can imagine, the people of India as well as the characters in Indian novels must deal with the economic, political, and emotional effects that the British brought and left behind. This is true for literature that comes out of any colonized nation. In many cases, the literature stemming from these events is both emotional and political. The post-colonial theorist enters these texts through a specific critical lens, or a specific way of reading a text. That critical lens, post-colonial theory or post-colonialism, asks the reader to analyze and explain the effects that colonization and imperialism, or the extension of power into other nations, have on people and nations. [...] post-colonialism asks the reader to enter a text through the post-colonial lens. [...] As a reader, you would look for the effects of colonialism and how they are addressed through the plot, setting, and characters’ actions.” (Elizabeth McKinley i <http://study.com/academy/lesson/post-colonialism-in-literature-definition-theory-examples.html>; lesedato 15.02.17)

Koloniherrene fryktet at kontakten med de innfødte kunne føre til at de selv på sikt var “going native”. “Joseph Conrad’s 1901 novel *Heart of Darkness* offers the most striking and well-known example of a narrative expression of European fears of atavistic reversion.” (Ashcroft, Griffiths og Tiffin 2013 s. 21)

“[M]ost postcolonial critics analyze the ways in which a literary text, whatever its topics, is colonialist or anticolonialist, that is, the ways in which the text reinforces or resists colonialism’s oppressive ideology. For example, in the simplest terms, a text can reinforce colonialist ideology through positive portrayals of the colonizers, negative portrayals of the colonized, or the uncritical representation of the benefits

of colonialism for the colonized. Analogously, texts can resist colonialist ideology by depicting the misdeeds of the colonizers, the suffering of the colonized, or the detrimental effects of colonialism on the colonized. Such analysis is not always as straightforward as this simple outline might lead you to expect, however. For the ideological content of literary texts is rarely able to confine itself to such tidy categories. Joseph Conrad's *Heart of Darkness* (1902), for example, is extremely anticolonialist in its negative representation of the colonial enterprise: the Europeans conducting the ivory trade in the Congo are portrayed as heartless, greedy thieves who virtually enslave the indigenous population to help collect and transport the Europeans' "loot," and the negative effects of the European presence on the native peoples are graphically depicted. However, as Chinua Achebe observes, the novel's condemnation of Europeans is based on a definition of Africans as savages: beneath their veneer of civilization, the Europeans are, the novel tells us, as barbaric as the Africans. And indeed, Achebe notes, the novel portrays Africans as a prehistoric mass of frenzied, howling, incomprehensible barbarians: "Africa [is a] setting and backdrop which eliminates the African as human factor. Africa [is] a [symbolic] battlefield devoid of all recognizable humanity, into which the wandering European enters at his peril" ("An Image of Africa" 12). In other words, despite *Heart of Darkness's* obvious anticolonialist agenda, the novel points to the colonized population as the standard of savagery to which Europeans are compared. Thus, Achebe uncovers the novel's colonialist subtext, of which the text does not seem to be aware." (Tyson 2006)

"[B]ecause postcolonial criticism defines formerly colonized peoples as any population that has been subjected to the political domination of another population, you may see postcolonial critics draw examples from the literary works of African Americans as well as from, for example, the literature of aboriginal Australians or the formerly colonized population of India. However, the tendency of postcolonial criticism to focus on global issues, on comparisons and contrasts among various peoples, means that it is up to the individual members of specific populations to develop their own body of criticism on the history, traditions, and interpretation of their own literature. Of course, this is precisely what African American critics have been doing for some time, long before postcolonial criticism emerged as a powerful force in literary studies in the early 1990s." (Tyson 2006)

Kolonimaktene ønsket at deres kolonier skulle være "kopier", mens fedrelandet var "originalen". Dette viste seg blant annet i hvor mange geografiske steder som ble kalt "Ny-" (Nueva Granada, New York, New Amsterdam, New Zealand) – en strategi som den indiske kritikeren Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak kaller "worlding" (Varela og Dhawan 2015 s. 27). "Den tredje verden" skulle til syvende og sist tilintetgjøres som atskilte territorier, dvs. de skulle bli som koloniherrenes hjemland. "Worlding" tar f.eks. form av kart der europeerne gir sine egne navn til områder, elver, fjell osv., og slik koloniseres store landområder gjennom språket, samtidig som det brukes fysisk makt for å tilvinge seg råderetten over områdene.

“I 1978 udkom Edward Saids epokegørende bog *Orientalism*. Denne bog cementerede postkolonial teori som kritisk metode og postkoloniale studier som disiplin og undersøgte “the processes by which the ‘Orient’ was, and continues to be, constructed in European thinking”. Saids anke er at Vestens syn på Orienten er præget af stereotypisering og fordomme som fx “det mystiske Arabien”. Orientalisme er ifølge Said én stor narrativ hvori øster- og vesterlændinge kontrasteres og polariseres. Alle vestlige og østlige kulturer skæres over hver deres kam som om der var tale om to homogene (og kontrasterende) masser. Orientalismen er ifølge Said indlejret i den almene kultur og kan betegnes som et fortolkningsfællesskab, et paradigme eller en diskurs [...] Vesten studerer Østen gennem en objektgørende optik som pacificerer Østen, og dermed skabes et ulige magtforhold. “Orientalismen er med andre ord en vestlig metode til at dominere, omstrukturere og få magt over Orienten”. Orientalisme-begrebets grundpræmis er at vestlige koloniserere “historically have constructed the East, the Orient as exotic, strange, exciting, dangerous, to be exhibited, tamed, silenced. Their imperialistic response always Otherises the East and people from the East (...)”. Orienten blev romantiseret og forbundet med spænding og eventyr, bl.a. af etnologistudiet, der opstod sidst i 1800-tallet. Said ønsker at gøre op med denne orientalisme og opfordrer til et mere nuanceret syn. Hans læsning af kolonialisme som orientalisme prægede den første bølge af postkolonialistiske studier. En anden af de mest indflydelsesrige postkoloniale teoretikere, Gayatri Spivak, er meget kritisk over for Said idet hun mener han er nationalistisk. Said kritiseres jævnligt for at hænge fast i en retorik der fastholder opdelingen i “koloniserer” og “koloniseret”; [...] risikoen for at postkolonialismen blot danner nye (falske) repræsentationer på samme måde som orientalistene.” (La Cour 2011)

“Said’s book ‘Orientalism’ (1978) is considered the foundational work on which post-colonial theory developed. Said, then, could be considered the ‘father’ of post-colonialism. His work, including ‘Orientalism’, focused on exploring and questioning the artificial boundaries, or the stereotypical boundaries, that have been drawn between the East and West, specifically as they relate to the Middle East. In doing this, Said focused specifically on our stereotypes of Middle-Easterners; however, these same ideas can be extended to include how we view all ‘others.’ This is the ‘us’–‘other’ mentality that many colonizers take with them into a new country. Such simple generalizations lead to misconceptions and miscommunications, which are often the basis of post-colonial analysis.” (Elizabeth McKinley i <http://study.com/academy/lesson/post-colonialism-in-literature-definition-theory-examples.html>; lesedato 15.02.17)

“Edward Said beskriver i verket *Orientalismen. Vestlige oppfatninger av Orienten* (publisert på engelsk 1978) hvordan Europa har skapt Orienten som kulturell motpart til seg selv, for å oppnå kontroll og makt over den og samtidig definere seg selv og styrke sin egen selvoppfatning. Orientalisme, slik Said oppfatter disiplinen, innebærer en kollektiv forestilling av “oss” europeere i motsetning til “dem” – alle ikke-vestlige. Vesten har gitt seg selv mandat til, med basis i egen vestlig bevissthet

og egne vestlige referanserammer, å granske den ikke-vestlige verden som en slags lukket teaterscene. Ut fra egoistiske motiver for å forske på og tilegne seg viten om Østen, har Vesten gjort Orienten til objekt; den er blitt kategorisert i vestlige termer, med vestlig språk og fremstillingsmåte uten selv å ha fått komme til orde. Europeerne har behandlet og oppfattet orientalerne som en uforanderlig størrelse, de har dannet seg generaliserende oppfatninger om orientalere for å kontrollere dem og holde dem på plass som stereotyper (Said 1994, s. 11-17, 22-23).” (Dyveke Gärtner i [https://www.duo.uio.no/bitstream/handle/10852/37877/NORskrift109\\_tekst.pdf](https://www.duo.uio.no/bitstream/handle/10852/37877/NORskrift109_tekst.pdf); lesedato 29.03.17)

Begrepet “contrapuntal reading” ble først brukt av “Edward Said to describe a way of reading the texts of English literature so as to reveal their deep implication in imperialism and the colonial process. Borrowed from music, the term suggests a responsive reading that provides a counterpoint to the text, thus enabling the emergence of colonial implications that might otherwise remain hidden. Thus a reading of Jane Austen’s *Mansfield Park*, for instance, can reveal the extent to which the privileged life of the English upper classes is established upon the profits made from West Indian plantations, and, by implication, from the exploitation of the colonized. By thus stressing the affiliations of the text, its origin in social and cultural reality rather than its filiative connections with English literature and canonical criteria, the critic can uncover cultural and political implications that may seem only fleetingly addressed in the text itself: ‘As we look back at the cultural archive, we begin to reread it not univocally but contrapuntally’ (Said 1993: 59). The overarching implication is the extent to which English society and culture was grounded on the ideology and practices of imperialism.” (Ashcroft, Griffiths og Tiffin 2013 s. 62-63)

Blant de første bøkene med postkolonial kritikk var en antologi utgitt av australierne Bill Ashcroft, Gareth Griffith og Helen Tiffin, med tittelen *The Empire Writes Back* (1989).

“Gayatri Spivak og Homi Bhabha, som er nogle af de mest indflydelsesrige teoretikere inden for den litterære postkolonialisme, er inspireret af især Jacques Derridas teori om dekonstruktion samt Michel Foucaults diskursanalyser og begreb om magt. Den danske litteraturforsker Hans Hauge mener at postkolonial teori primært består af poststrukturalistisk teori anvendt på postkolonial litteratur, hvilket vil sige at det i hans øjne er analyseobjektet (værket) der afgør om analysen er postkolonial. [...] Postkolonialisme har sine rødder i tanker og teorier fra anti-koloniale bevægelser, fx kampe i Afrika og Asien imod udnyttelse og for politisk uafhængighed. De postkolonialistiske teorier er dog selvreflekterende og ser ikke Europa som noget per definition dårligt, men der består en udfordring i at undgå at gentage Vestens repræsentation af de tidligere koloniserede ved at danne en elitær teoretisk repræsentation og dermed konsolidere det magtforhold man ønsker at dekonstruere.” (La Cour 2011)

Spivak bruker ordet “othering” (gjøre forskjellig) om å få koloniserte folkegrupper til å framstå som annerledes, barbariske, ikke-menneskelige (og dermed uten egenverdi). For eksempel ble den indiske skikken med enkebrenning brukt som et argument for at India trengte det britiske imperiet til å sivilisere landet (Varela og Dhawan 2015 s. 164). Britene skulle rense India for det “primitive” og “barbariske”. Mange folkeslag kunne bare bli siviliserte gjennom kolonisering, og var dermed avhengige av koloniherrernes velvilje, slik de sistnevnte så det.

“This practice of judging all who are different as less than fully human is called *othering*, and it divides the world between “us” (the “civilized”) and “them” (the “others” or “savages”). The “savage” is usually considered evil as well as inferior (the *demonic other*). But sometimes the “savage” is perceived as possessing a “primitive” beauty or nobility born of a closeness to nature (the *exotic other*). In either case, however, the “savage” remains other and, therefore, not fully human.” (Tyson 2006)

“Othering dehumanizes because it permits one to identify oneself as “the human being” and people who are different as something “other” than human. Othering thus facilitates the demonization of people we define as different from us [...] white supremacist backlash, for example as witnessed in the proliferation of racist hate groups; the persistence of covert racial discrimination, for example in housing, employment, and education; the othering of the homeless, indeed their virtual erasure from American consciousness and conscience; and all the forms of othering that still flourish in this country today make it clear that America’s neocolonialist enterprises around the globe will be accompanied by versions thereof at home for a long time to come.” (Tyson 2006)

“*Colonialist ideology*, often referred to as *colonialist discourse* to mark its relationship to the language in which colonialist thinking was expressed, was based on the colonizers’ assumption of their own superiority, which they contrasted with the alleged inferiority of native (indigenous) peoples, the original inhabitants of the lands they invaded. The colonizers believed that only their own Anglo-European culture was civilized, sophisticated, or, as postcolonial critics put it, *metropolitan*. Therefore, native peoples were defined as savage, backward, and undeveloped. Because their technology was more highly advanced, the colonizers believed that their whole culture was more highly advanced, and they ignored or swept aside the religions, customs, and codes of behavior of the peoples they subjugated. So the colonizers saw themselves at the center of the world; the colonized were at the margins. The colonizers saw themselves as the embodiment of what a human being should be, the proper “self”; native peoples were considered “other,” different, and therefore inferior to the point of being less than fully human. This practice of judging all who are different as less than fully human is called *othering*, and it divides the world between “us” (the “civilized”) and “them” (the “others” or “savages”). The “savage” is usually considered evil as well as inferior (the *demonic other*). But sometimes the “savage” is perceived as possessing a “primitive” beauty

or nobility born of a closeness to nature (the *exotic other*). In either case, however, the “savage” remains other and, therefore, not fully human.” (Tyson 2006)

“Spivak’s conceptualization [“othering”] is in accordance with contemporary uses of the concept: [...] [Ruth] Lister defines othering as a ‘process of differentiation and demarcation, by which the line is drawn between ‘us’ and ‘them’ – between the more and the less powerful – and through which social distance is established and maintained’ (2004, p. 101); [...] the process whereby a dominant group defines into existence an inferior group. [...] ‘The others’ are reduced to stereotypical characters and are ultimately dehumanized [...] Such processes imply reduction and essentialization in the sense that those who are othered are reduced to a few negative characteristics. [...] Generalizing such structural thinking to matters of social identity can be problematic since it sets up a frame of reference which fails to see the in-between, or the ‘thirdspace’, to borrow a term from social geography (Soja, 1996). Furthermore those who are othered do not appear as active subjects. Consequently Bhatt criticizes postcolonial theory for being ‘a kind of heroic, narcissistic victimology that cannot name itself as such’, and notes that ‘[i]n postcolonial theory, the subaltern is simply voiceless’ (2006, p. 101).” (Sune Q. Jensen i <http://ojs.statsbiblioteket.dk/index.php/qual/article/viewFile/5510/4825>; lesedato 12.06.17)

“Essentialism is the assumption that groups, categories or classes of objects have one or several defining features exclusive to all members of that category. Some studies of race or gender, for instance, assume the presence of essential characteristics distinguishing one race from another or the feminine from the masculine. In analyses of culture it is a (generally implicit) assumption that individuals share an essential cultural identity, and it has been a topic of vigorous debate within postcolonial theory.” (Ashcroft, Griffiths og Tiffin 2013 s. 96)

Spivak oppfatter litteratur som et “retorisk rom” der de undertrykte kan yte motstand og få fram andre perspektiver enn de dominerende (Varela og Dhawan 2015 s. 162).

Det finnes “a structure of economic, cultural and political relations that can both debase and idealize, demonize and erotize its subjects.” (Ashcroft, Griffiths og Tiffin 2013 s. 27)

“Koloniale stereotypiseringsprosesser” bidrar til å rettferdiggjøre kolonimaktens råderett over kolonien (Varela og Dhawan 2015 s. 223). Den indiske kritikeren Homi K. Bhabha vil ikke sette opp et klart, binært [= todelt] skille mellom koloniherrer og deres undersåtter fordi disse to gruppene er avhengig av hverandre, og de forhandler og prøver å manøvrere i forhold til hverandre (Varela og Dhawan 2015 s. 222-223). Bhabha mener at Said og andre postkoloniale forskere forenkler gjennom å sette opp slike absolutte motsetningspar. Ambivalensene som Bhabha fokuserer på viser seg blant annet i motsetninger i “den koloniale diskurs”. Den



“innfødte” kan oppfattes både som en vill kannibal og samtidig som en lydige tjener, både som kroppsliggjøringen av tøylesløs seksualitet og uskyldig som et barn, både primitiv, mytisk, enfoldig, lat, tilbakestående og falsk. Bhabha er opptatt av flertydighet, og av hullene i det postkoloniale “narrativet” eller “sannhetsregimet” (Varela og Dhawan 2015 s. 227).

“Bhabha gives us a wonderful example of the global orientation of much postcolonial criticism when he offers a new way to analyze world literature, not in terms of national traditions, which is how it generally has been studied, but in terms of postcolonial topics that cut across national boundaries. For example, Bhabha suggests that world literature might be studied in terms of the different ways cultures have experienced historical trauma, perhaps such traumas as slavery, revolution, civil war, political mass murder, oppressive military regimes, the loss of cultural identity, and the like. Or world literature might be seen as the study of the ways in which cultures define themselves positively by “othering” groups whom they demonize or otherwise devalue for that purpose. Or we might analyze world literature by examining the representations of people and events that occur across cultural boundaries, rather than within them, such as representations of migrants, political refugees, and colonized peoples. “The center of such a study,” Bhabha says, “would neither be the ‘sovereignty’ of national cultures, nor the universalism of human culture, but a focus on ... the unspoken, unrepresented pasts that haunt the historical present” (12). That is, we might study what world literature tells us about the personal experience of people whom history has ignored – the disenfranchised, the marginalized, the unhomed – such as are found in the work of South African writer Nadine Gordimer and African American writer Toni Morrison.” (Tyson 2006)

Etter et lands frigjøring er det aldri enkelt å etablere egne kulturelle tradisjoner som ikke henger tett sammen med kolonitidens politikk. Mange forfattere har opplevd en permanent lojalitetskonflikt (Michael Einfalt i Joch og Wolf 2005 s. 265). To lands tradisjoner trekker i hver sin retning. Vestlige, moderne verdier står ofte i kraftig kontrast til de gamle verdiene i det koloniserte landet. Men utviklingen har gått i retning “an increasingly migratory, globalized and hybridized world” (Ashcroft, Griffiths og Tiffin 2013 s. 102).

Det er ekstremt vanskelig, kanskje umulig, for en vestlig forsker å fri seg fra sin “eurosentrisme”. Noen har hevdet at postkolonialismen har blitt en “karriere-vei” for vestlige akademikere (Varela og Dhawan 2015 s. 289). Det er vanlig å legge til grunn at det bør finnes universelle normer knyttet til menneskerettigheter, uansett hvilken kultur, etnisitet, religion, kjønn eller andre forskjeller mennesker har. Det hevdes altså at mennesker må ha noen rettigheter uavhengig av historiske, kulturelle og økonomiske forskjeller (Varela og Dhawan 2015 s. 327). Vestlige ideer om demokrati og emansipasjon blir brukt som standard og målestokk – i en universalistisk ideologi for alle nasjoner og folkegrupper.

I Maghreb-regionen (som omfatter bl.a. Algerie, Vest-Sahara, Marokko og Tunisia) er ikke individet i sentrum, men fellesskapet. “Gud bevare oss for “jeg”!” er et uttrykk som brukes i området når noen må snakke om seg selv, og introspeksjon regnes som usunt (Déjeux 1992 s. 110). Fellesskapet og det sosiale er langt viktigere enn enkeltmennesket, mens kolonialismen brakte med seg et fokus på jeg’et. Den algeriske dramatiker Mahieddine Bachetarzi har uttalt at en forfatter innen Maghreb som dissekerer sin sjel, sjokkerer sitt publikum og det vekkes liten interesse for denne personen (gjengitt fra Déjeux 1992 s. 111). I 1935 skrev den tunisiske advokaten og politikeren Tahar Sfar at den kristne bekjennelse synes å være opprinnelsen til Vestens mange selvbiografier, memoarer, bekjennelser og intime dagbøker og brev, men at noe tilsvarende ikke finnes i hans eget land. Den som sier “jeg” der, splitter og utskiller seg fra det muslimske kollektiv (gjengitt fra Déjeux 1992 s. 111). Samtidig henger individfokus ifølge den marokkanske forskeren Kacem Basfao nært sammen med Vestens idealer om individuelle menneskerettigheter (gjengitt fra Déjeux 1992 s. 111).

Den algeriske forfatteren og filosofen Malek Bennabi ga i 1954 ut boka *Islams oppgave* (1954) der han skriver at kolonisatorene gjorde muslimene i Algerie til de Andre, men at muslimene også hadde ansvar ved sin passive “koloniserbarhet” (“colonisabilité”) (Déjeux 1992 s. 20). Britene klarte å kolonisere 400 millioner hinduer, fordi hinduene i India var koloniserbare. Tilsvarende gjaldt for andre land, også Algerie. Det ble en storm av protester mot boka. Bennabi ble nesten oppfattet som en forræder, i det minste en som ga algeriere skyldfølelse for at de var kolonisert og mindre grunn til å føle seg som ofre (Nour-Eddine Boukrouh i <https://oumma.com/pensee-de-malek-bennabi-la-colonisabilite/>; lesedato 06.01.20). Men Bennabis hensikt var snarere at algeriere og andre koloniserte folk skulle gå aktivt inn for å kvitte seg med utenlandske myndere. Han så en fare i at Algerie etter kolonialismen igjen kunne bli splittet i ulike stammer og klaner, uten evne til å samarbeide. Algerie kunne bli et udemokratisk land med omfattende lovløshet, korrupsjon og en serie statskupp. Et slikt land vil forbli et u-land, eventuelt forgjeldet og avhengig av utenlandske aktører.

Såkalt eurosentrisme er “the use of European culture as the standard to which all other cultures are negatively contrasted” (Tyson 2006). “An example of Eurocentric language can be seen in the terms *First World*, *Second World*, *Third World*, and *Fourth World* to refer to, respectively, (1) Britain, Europe, and the United States; (2) the white populations of Canada, Australia, New Zealand, and southern Africa (and, for some theorists, the former Soviet bloc); (3) the technologically developing nations, such as India and those of Africa, Central and South America, and Southeast Asia; and (4) the indigenous populations subjugated by white settlers and governed today by the majority culture that surrounds them, such as Native Americans and aboriginal Australians (and, for some theorists, nonwhite populations who have minority status in “First World” countries, such as African Americans). Although these four “worlds” are commonly referred to today, we should be aware of their Eurocentric implications. Such language makes sense

only if history begins with Europe and is organized in terms of European colonial conquest.” (Tyson 2006)

“Eurocentrism is masked in literary study by concepts such as literary universality, in history by authoritative interpretations written from the point of view of the victors, and in early anthropology by the unconscious assumptions involved in the idea that its data were those societies defined as ‘primitive’ and so opposed to a European norm of development and civilization. Some cultural critics have argued that anthropology as a discipline in its classic, unrevised form came into being in such a close relationship with colonization that it could not have existed at all without the prior existence of Eurocentric concepts of knowledge and civilization. Eurocentrism is also present in the assumptions and practices of Christianity through education and mission activity, as well as in the assumed superiority of Western mathematics, cartography, art and numerous other cultural and social practices which have been claimed, or assumed, to be based on a universal, objective set of values.” (Ashcroft, Griffiths og Tiffin 2013 s. 108)

“[I]t’s not unreasonable to be apprehensive that postcolonial literature will be “colonized” – that is, interpreted according to European norms and standards – by the cultural Eurocentrism that dominates literary education and literary criticism the world over.” (Tyson 2006)

Vestlige kvinner har villet “presse” sine egne feministiske idealer på kvinner i den tredje verden. De vestlige vil innføre vestlige måter å organisere samfunnet på, særlig demokrati. “For de som fortsatt blir brutalt undertrykt av bestående kjønns-, klasse- og kastesystemer, kan ikke demokratiets ritualer oppfattes som annet enn absurd teater.” (Varela og Dhawan 2015 s. 162)

Under Algerie-krigen i årene 1954-1962 var mange venstre-intellektuelle i Frankrike kritiske til den franske krigføringen. Dette ga grunnlag for å publisere i Frankrike forfattere fra Maghreb-regionen. Nesten alle store franske forlag publiserte verk av forfattere fra disse landene (Michael Einfalt i Joch og Wolf 2005 s. 264). Slik kunne franskmenn gjennom sine bokkjøp og sin lesing solidarisere seg på en symbolsk måte med algerierne og andre folk i Vest- og Nord-Afrika. Mange intellektuelle i Frankrike stilte seg på de kolonisertes side. Maghreb-forfattere støttet med sin litteratur f.eks. Algeries uavhengighetsbestrebelse, først og fremst ved å skape forståelse og innsikt gjennom litteraturen. Den franske opposisjonsbevegelsen og mer generelt den franske offentlighet fikk gjennom denne litteraturen oppleve algeriernes perspektiv.

I noen deler av Antillene, i noen land og regioner i Vest- og Sentral-Afrika og i Algerie er *fransk* kolonistorenes språk. Etter den politiske frigjøringen fra Frankrike har det oppstått en litteratur skrevet på disse landenes og områdenes egne språk, av forfattere som har et ambivalent forhold til fransk (Joch og Wolf 2005 s. 262). Fordi skolesystemet der har vært så influert av fransk, er det ofte knapt noe

alternativ til å skrive fransk for den som vil ha sine bøker publisert. Fransk er ofte embetsspråket, mens de lokale, muntlige stammespråkene ikke kommer i betraktning til slik bruk. I Antillene har noen forfattere, blant andre Raphaël Confiant fra Martinique, skriftliggjort det kreolske språket, men slike bøker når ikke et stort publikum. Kun på fransk kan disse forfatterne inngå i en “stor” litterær tradisjon, men noen forfattere avgrensner seg bevisst fra dette og vil heller bidra til en egen lokal, kulturell identitetsdanning (Michael Einfalt i Joch og Wolf 2005 s. 263).

Blant forfattere i Maghreb-området har det vært diskusjon om hvilke skriftspråk de bør bruke. Den marokkanske forfatteren Mohammad Berrada, som skriver på arabisk, spurte seg i boka *Lamalif* (1988) om en som skriver på fransk, kan gjengi den marokkanske virkeligheten, mens den tunisiske lingvisten Salah Garmadi derimot følte seg tynget av tradisjonen når han ikke skrev på fransk (gjengitt fra Déjeux 1992 s. 51). Noen forfattere har dårlig samvittighet når de skriver på fransk, andre opplever fransk som deres eget språk selv om det ikke er morsmålet.

I det koloniserte Tunisia ble fransk oppfattet som et gunstig virkemiddel for at landet skulle bli modernisert, og det var nødvendig å kunne fransk for å få jobb innen den statlige administrasjonen (Déjeux 1992 s. 52).

Algeriren Rachid Boudjedra har siden 1982 skrevet sine romaner på arabisk for å bli kvitt frustrasjonen og skyldfølelsen som fulgte med å skrive på fransk (Déjeux 1992 s. 93). Den kvinnelige algeriske poeten Fatima Bellahcene skrev i *Passionata* (1985) om sin sorg over å ha vært en “taus skygge”, og at hun måtte “lære seg å snakke” med sin egen stemme, samtidig som hun følte seg fremmedgjort fra andre algeriere ved å kunne skrive (Déjeux 1992 s. 80).

Den marokkanske romanforfatteren og sosiologen Abdelkébir Khatibi skrev i den franske avisen *Le Monde* i 1971 at man kan benytte seg av den Andres språk til en radikal undergraving, f.eks. ved å ødelegge dets vanlige syntaks og dermed gjøre f.eks. fransk til noe fremmed for franskmenn (Déjeux 1992 s. 106-107). Khatibi ønsket å være inkludert i “det estetisk moderne” slik det var idealet på det franske litterære feltet. Også algeriske forfattere som etter frigjøringen av Algerie i 1962 ville være synlige og ha et stort publikum, opptrådte ofte målrettet på det franske litterære feltet (Joch og Wolf 2005 s. 266). Etter en fase på 1960-tallet der Algeries forfattere “grep ordet” og skrev “etnografisk” og realistisk, ønsket mange av forfatterne å bli inkludert i verdenslitteraturen, og det krevde formfornyelse, med fare for å miste kontakten med de fleste av hjemlandets lesere (Joch og Wolf 2005 s. 267).

Kateb Yacine og en rekke andre forfattere i Algerie emigrerte til Frankrike, både før og etter frigjøringen av hjemlandet, i mer eller mindre frivillig eksil (Joch og Wolf 2005 s. 267). Deres bøker ble utgitt på franske forlag. De skriver om Algerie, men hovedsakelig for franske lesere: De “retter seg først og fremst til den franske

offentlighet” (Michael Einfalt i Joch og Wolf 2005 s. 267). De levde og lever i en tvetydig posisjon mellom integrasjon og distanse til det franske litteraturfeltet. De skriver i hovedsak romaner, som er den mest leste skjønnlitterære sjangeren i Frankrike, ikke poesi, som er den mest populære og leste fiksjonssjangeren i arabiske land (Joch og Wolf 2005 s. 268).

Den senegalesiske forfatteren Boubacar Boris Diops første roman, *Doomi Golo* (2003), ble skrevet på hans morsmål wolof, og deretter oversatt av Diop til fransk. Senere skrev han flere romaner på wolof, selv om befolkningen som snakker dette språket i liten grad har mulighet til å gå på skole og lære seg å lese, og heller ikke har råd til å kjøpe bøker. Diop ønsket ikke å skrive for en liten, franskspråklig elite i Senegal.

Marokkaneren Tahar Ben Jelloun pekte på problemene med å skrive for hjemlandets befolkning, der analfabetismen er høy, men der befolkningen til en viss grad kan nås hvis det skrives på arabisk, ikke på fransk (Joch og Wolf 2005 s. 270). Han valgte å skrive på fransk. Ben Jelloun sa på fransk TV i 1985 at han ikke hadde kunnet skrive *Sandbarnet* (1985) på arabisk, fordi romanen tematiserer ulydighet overfor islam, Koranen og foreldre. Det å skrive på fransk var et middel til å overskride arabiske tabuer (Déjeux 1992 s. 102). Å kritisere sine egne er ifølge noen arabiske forfattere lettere på et annet språk enn morsmålet (Déjeux 1992 s. 103). Ben Jelloun har likevel sammenlignet sin tospråklighet med bigami (gjengitt fra Déjeux 1992 s. 104). Den tunisiske forfatteren Taos Amrouche har også valgt et annet språk enn sitt morsmål, men hører “røttene stønne” når han bruker fransk (sitert fra Déjeux 1992 s. 103). Et språk kan bringes til taushet gjennom et annet (Déjeux 1992 s. 104).

Ben Jelloun ble en respektert offentlig person i hjemlandet, anerkjent for sin ubestikkelige ærlighet på vegne av alle undertrykte. Dette renommeet ble langt på vei ødelagt da det ble avslørt at han i mange år hadde kjent til det hemmelige fengselet Tazmamart for politiske fanger (Joch og Wolf 2005 s. 271). Politiske motstandere av det marokkanske regimet hadde levd under umenneskelige forhold i dette fengselet ute i ørkenen. Da Ben Jelloun fikk Goncourt-prisen i 1987, ble han gratulert av kong Hassan 2., og fikk en slags åndelig beskyttelse av kongen personlig. Ben Jelloun har sagt i et intervju at han, i likhet med nesten alle andre marokkanere, var redd for å kritisere regimet. Han visste om Tazmamart, men fryktet hva som ville skje hvis han konfronterte kongen. Først ni år etter at fengselet ble stengt, skrev han om det ([http://next.liberation.fr/culture/2001/01/15/ben-jelloun-s-enferre-dans-tazmamart\\_351003](http://next.liberation.fr/culture/2001/01/15/ben-jelloun-s-enferre-dans-tazmamart_351003); lesedato 15.05.17). Ben Jelloun tidde om det han visste for å opprettholde sitt gode forhold til kong Hassan 2. I tillegg har Ben Jelloun også blitt kritisert for å idyllisere den marokkanske fortiden og arabisk-folkelige tradisjoner (Joch og Wolf 2005 s. 271).

Den kenyanske forfatteren Ngũgĩ wa Thiong’o sa i et intervju: “I et koloniperspektiv, så var det sånn at det makthavernes språk gjorde med hjernen, kan

sammenliknes med det sverdet gjorde med kroppene til dem som ble kolonisert.” (*Dagbladet* 1. juni 2017 s. 25) Ngũgĩ wa Thiong’o skrev sine første bøker på kolonispråket engelsk. “Det gjorde han også med skuespillet “I Will Marry When I Want” fra 1977, om en bonde som ble fratatt sin jord av den korruperte eliten. Stykket ble oversatt til [språket] kikuyu, og ble spilt i seks uker før myndighetene fikk stoppet det. Forfatteren sendte de til et høyrisikofengsel, uten rettssak, i ett år. - Jeg hadde skrevet kritiske bøker før, uten at noe skjedde. Men at dette stykket nå ble spilt på morsmålet mitt, et språk vanlige mennesker forsto, tror jeg var grunnen til myndighetenes raseri. Og der i fengselet bestemte jeg meg for bare å skrive på kikuyu.” (*Dagbladet* 1. juni 2017 s. 25)

Mange “non-English-speaking writers who have chosen to write in English do so not because their mother tongue is regarded by them as inadequate, but because the colonial language has become a useful means of expression, and one that reaches the widest possible audience. However, writers such as Ngugi [den kenyanske forfatteren Ngũgĩ wa Thiong’o] argue that since access to English in the postcolonial societies themselves is often restricted to an educated elite, this ‘wider’ audience is largely outside the country, or restricted to the *comprador* class within the society. The debate has been a persistent and unresolved one. These arguments based on the political effect of choosing English as a medium of expression are frequently contested by the alternative claim that language itself somehow embodies a culture in a way that is inaccessible to speakers of another language.” (Ashcroft, Griffiths og Tiffin 2013 s. 20)

“Under the colonial system the creation of a middle class was intentionally prevented by Europeans and filled the gap with imported foreigners. But companies and plantations needed foremen who served as mediators and could speak the language of the employers, which led to the development of a new type of administrative African middle class. They were given the privilege of going to school and learned much of European culture. They began to read criticism against colonialism. Some of them reacted against the cultural oppression in the colonies. Some of them were against social discrimination as a group, but they were tempted to imitate the Europeans’ privileged way of life. From the beginning Ngugi was involved in that kind of contradiction. So, it is natural that while he was active as a creative writer and teacher at Nairobi University, he repeatedly asked himself: “For whom do I write?” He keenly felt the contradiction of language choice. He recalls: “I was a student at Leeds University in the mid-Sixties when I first strongly felt a sense of despair at that contradiction in my situation as a writer. I had just published *A Grain of Wheat*, a novel that dealt with the Kenyan peoples’ struggle for independence. But the very people about whom I was writing were never going to read the novel or have it read for them. I had carefully sealed their lives in a linguistic case. Thus whether I was based in Kenya or outside, my opting for English had already marked me as a writer in exile. Perhaps Andrew Gurr had been right after all. The African writer is already set aside from people by his education and language choice. The situation of the writer in 20th-century Africa mirrors that

of the larger society. For if the writer has been in a state of exile – whether it is physical or spiritual – the people themselves have been in exile in relationship to their economic and political landscape.” [...] Leadership was in the hands of the petty-bourgeoisie, itself split into three sections representing three tendencies: there was the upper petty-bourgeoisie that saw the future in terms of a compradorial alliance with imperialism; there was the middle petty-bourgeoisie which saw the future in terms of national capitalism; and there was the lower petty-bourgeoisie which saw the future in terms of some kind of socialism. The upper petty-bourgeoisie can be branded as comprador; and the middle and lower petty-bourgeoisie can be branded as nationalistic.” (<https://kojimatei.jp/tamada/works/ngugi/ngugi-writer-e.pdf>; lesedato 12.11.19)

Postkoloniale teorier undersøker ikke bare kolonisering og avkolonisering, men også nykolonisering (eventuelt rekolonisering), altså nykoloniale maktforhold og nye “kulturelle formasjoner” som følge av dette (Varela og Dhawan 2015 s. 18). Nykolonisering overlapper med “imperialistisk globalisering” (Varela og Dhawan 2015 s. 19).

“Neocolonialism[:] the control of less-developed countries by developed countries through indirect means. The term neocolonialism was first used after World War II to refer to the continuing dependence of former colonies on foreign countries, but its meaning soon broadened to apply, more generally, to places where the power of developed countries was used to produce a colonial-like exploitation – for instance, in Latin America, where direct foreign rule had ended in the early 19th century. The term is now an unambiguously negative one that is widely used to refer to a form of global power in which transnational corporations and global and multilateral institutions combine to perpetuate colonial forms of exploitation of developing countries. Neocolonialism has been broadly theorized as a further development of capitalism that enables capitalist powers (both nations and corporations) to dominate subject nations through the operations of international capitalism rather than by means of direct rule. [...] Neocolonialism came to be seen more generally as involving a coordinated effort by former colonial powers and other developed countries to block growth in developing countries and retain them as sources of cheap raw materials and cheap labour. This effort was seen as closely associated with the Cold War and, in particular, with the U.S. policy known as the Truman Doctrine. Under that policy the U.S. government offered large amounts of money to any government prepared to accept U.S. protection from communism. That enabled the United States to extend its sphere of influence and, in some cases, to place foreign governments under its control.” (<https://www.britannica.com/topic/neocolonialism>; lesedato 08.06.17)

“More broadly, neocolonial governance is seen as operating through indirect forms of control and, in particular, by means of the economic, financial, and trade policies of transnational corporations and global and multilateral institutions. Critics argue that neocolonialism operates through the investments of multinational corporations

that, while enriching a few in underdeveloped countries, keep those countries as a whole in a situation of dependency; such investments also serve to cultivate underdeveloped countries as reservoirs of cheap labour and raw materials. International financial institutions such as the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank also are often accused of participating in neocolonialism, by making loans (as well as other forms of economic aid) that are conditional on the recipient countries taking steps favourable to those represented by these institutions but detrimental to their own economies. Thus, although many people see these corporations and institutions as part of an essentially new global order, the notion of neocolonialism sheds light on what, in this system and constellation of power, represents continuity between the present and past.” (<https://www.britannica.com/topic/neocolonialism>; lesedato 08.06.17) Det finnes både økonomisk, medial og litterær nykolonialisme (Joch og Wolf 2005 s. 274).

“A monotonously simple pattern has emerged. Despite the hauling down of colonial flags in the 1950s, revamped economic imperialism has ensured that the United States and the former European colonial powers have become richer, while, with a tiny scattering of exceptions, their excolonies have become poorer. In Africa before decolonization, World Bank projects were consistently supportive of the colonial economies. Since formal decolonization, contrary to the World Bank’s vaunted technical “neutrality” and myth of expertise, projects have aggressively favored the refinement and streamlining of surplus extraction, cash crop exports and large-scale projects going to the highest bidders, thereby fostering cartels and foreign operators and ensuring that profits tumble into the coffers of the multinational corporations. During 1986, Africa lost \$19 billion through collapsed export prices alone. In 1988 and 1989, debt-service payments from the Third World to the United States were \$100 billion. At the same time, as [Frantz] Fanon predicted, Third World kleptocracies, military oligarchies and warlords have scrambled over each other to plunder the system. To protect these interests, the tiny, male elites of developing countries spent almost \$2.4 trillion on their militaries between 1960 and 1987, almost twice the amount of the entire Third World debt.” (Anne McClintock i [https://selforganizedseminar.files.wordpress.com/2011/07/mcclintock\\_imperial-leather.pdf](https://selforganizedseminar.files.wordpress.com/2011/07/mcclintock_imperial-leather.pdf); lesedato 29.05.17)

Den indiske forfatteren Pankaj Mishra uttalte i et intervju: “Det er ganske utrolig å se mennesker gjøre krav på humanismen mens de har ledet og tjent stort på en imperialisme som har vært dypt voldelig, rasistisk, ja, inntil det folkemorderiske. Mange har altfor mange illusjoner om seg selv og sine nasjoners prestisje. Dette får dem til å handle på svært destruktive måter: Nå skal vi gi demokratiets gave til russerne. Til irakerne, om nødvendig gjennom militær inngripen. [...] Mye av Vestens fremgang ble skapt gjennom midler som verken var eller er tilgjengelige for andre land: imperialisme, slaveri, uhindret adgang til ressurser og råvarer i store deler av verden. Uhindret, fordi de som forsøkte å stå i veien, enten ble ryddet av veien eller nøytralisert. Og dette ser man på som en historie om fremgang – som noe resten av verden bør imitere, og gjøre alt lynraskt, og alt samtidig, bli en



industriormakt, omfavne forbrukerkapitalismen og samtidig ha frie valg? Det er en fantasi, en farlig fantasi. [...] Militant vold er en like sentral del av moderniteten som opplysningen er. [...] Vi må se på dette fra ståstedet til folk som er blitt forfulgt, folk som er blitt invadert og okkupert, folk som har vært noe nær slaver i den store, globalt ekspanderende økonomien. Min egen guide er den svarte amerikanske forfatteren James Baldwin, som hevdet at humanismeprosjektet har vært en komfortabel løgn for Vesten, en liksomhumanisme som ikke gir noen egentlig historisk-moralsk autoritet. Vel, store deler av verden har alltid innsett dette.” (*Morgenbladet* 16. – 22. juni 2017 s. 44-45)

Litteraturkritikeren Colin John Holcombe mener det er svakheter ved postkoloniale oppfatninger av det orientalske, og sammenfatter sin kritikk slik: “The real difficulties arise when we look for evidence. Said’s *Orientalism* made three assertions. Firstly, that oriental studies functioned to serve political ends. Secondly, that *Orientalism* has produced a false description of Arabs and Islamic culture. And thirdly, that Orientalism helped define Europe’s self-image. None seems to be true. Colonial rule was not justified in advance by oriental studies but in retrospect. Second, if the views of oriental scholars were so wrong, it is hard to see how their adoption by the colonizing powers proved so successful, or why they are still used by native academics. Finally, Europe did not define itself against an oriental ‘other’: Europeans may well have thought themselves superior, but they did not construct an ‘other’ and define themselves against it. The accusation indeed commits the same stereotyping, now of the Europeans powers, that Said himself castigates. Matters are much more complicated, varying with period and countries concerned. The issues are contentious, and it is difficult to find a balanced position. The overarching faults of post-colonial studies are those of radical theory generally: belief in simple answers to complex matters, disdain for evidence, and a prose style that obscures the issues and sometimes prevents discussion altogether.” (Holcombe i <http://www.textetc.com/theory/post-colonial-studies.html>; lesedato 28.11.18)

Termen “contact zone” ble i postkolonial sammenheng “first used by [Mary Louise] Pratt as part of a *transcultural* pedagogic exercise to try to involve students in understanding their own subject-position in transcultural negotiation and confrontation. “The lecturer’s traditional (imagined) task – unifying the world in the class eyes by means of a monologue that rings equally coherent, revealing, and true for all, forging an ad hoc community, homogeneous with respect to one’s own words – this task became not only impossible but anomalous and unimaginable. Instead, one had to work in the knowledge that whatever one said was going to be systematically received in radically heterogeneous ways that we were neither able nor entitled to prescribe.” (Pratt 1991) The term was then developed by Pratt to describe social spaces where ‘disparate cultures meet, clash and grapple with each other, often in highly asymmetrical relations of dominance and subordination-like colonialism, slavery, or their aftermaths as they are lived out across the globe today’ (Pratt 1992: 4). Since then the term has proliferated.” (Ashcroft, Griffiths og Tiffin 2013 s. 62-63)

Begrepet “entanglement” i postkolonial sammenheng “comes from Nicholas Thomas, an anthropologist with a passionate interest in art. In *Entangled Objects: Exchange, Material Culture and Colonialism in the Pacific* (Harvard University Press, 1991), Thomas uses the concept of ‘mutual entanglement’ to show how modern anthropological paradigms fail to capture the complex relations that occur when different cultures come into contact with each other. Entanglement acknowledges diversity both within and between Indigenous and non-Indigenous cultures. It resists the notion of Indigenous people always inhabiting completely separate domains to non-Indigenous people without collapsing the two groups into each other. It’s a concept that helps us to break away from stereotypes and binaries – the black and white, ebony and ivory, them and us sort of thing.” (Jacqueline Wright i <https://griffithreview.com/coonardoo-katharine-susannah-prichard/>; lesedato 10.10.19)

“The questions that follow are offered to summarize postcolonial approaches to literature. Keep in mind that most postcolonial analyses, regardless of the issues on which they focus, will include some attention to whether the text is colonialist, anticolonialist, or some combination of the two, that is, ideologically conflicted.

1. How does the literary text, explicitly or allegorically, represent various aspects of colonial oppression? Special attention is often given to those areas where political and cultural oppression overlap, as it does, for example, in the colonizers’ control of language, communication, and knowledge in colonized countries.
2. What does the text reveal about the problematics of postcolonial identity, including the relationship between personal and cultural identity and such issues as double consciousness and hybridity?
3. What does the text reveal about the politics and/or psychology of anti-colonialist resistance? For example, what does the text suggest about the ideological, political, social, economic, or psychological forces that promote or inhibit resistance? How does the text suggest that resistance can be achieved and sustained by an individual or a group?
4. What does the text reveal about the operations of cultural difference – the ways in which race, religion, class, gender, sexual orientation, cultural beliefs, and customs combine to form individual identity – in shaping our perceptions of ourselves, others, and the world in which we live? Othering might be one area of analysis here.
5. How does the text respond to or comment on the characters, topics, or assumptions of a canonized (colonialist) work? [...] examine how the postcolonial text reshapes our previous interpretations of a canonical text.

6. Are there meaningful similarities among the literatures of different postcolonial populations? One might compare, for example, the literatures of native peoples from different countries whose land was invaded by colonizers, the literatures of white settler colonies in different countries, or the literatures of different populations in the African diaspora. Or one might compare literary works from all three of these categories in order to investigate, for example, if the experience of colonization creates some common elements of cultural identity that outweigh differences in race and nationality.

7. How does a literary text in the Western canon reinforce or undermine colonialist ideology through its representation of colonization and/or its inappropriate silence about colonized peoples? Does the text teach us anything about colonialist or anticolonialist ideology through its illustration of any of the postcolonial concepts we've discussed? (A text does not have to treat the subject of colonization in order to do this.)" (Tyson 2006)

### **Vestlig litteratur fra koloniene**

Litteraturforskerne er "interested in analyzing writing produced as a result of colonization, which means we're interested in literature written at any time following a nation's initial contact with a colonialist oppressor." (Tyson 2006)

Det er en "tension involved in constructing a distant place as 'home' by native-born descendants of the colonizers" (Ashcroft, Griffiths og Tiffin 2013 s. 109).

Den nederlandske forfatteren Multatuli (pseudonym for Eduard Douwes Dekker) vakte oppsikt med den kolonikritiske romanen *Max Havelaar: Eller det hollandske handelsselskapets kaffe-auksjoner* (1860; på norsk i 1982). "Max Havelaar – a Dutch civil servant in Java – burns with an insatiable desire to end the ill treatment and oppression inflicted on the native peoples by the colonial administration. Max is an inspirational figure, but he is also a flawed idealist whose vow to protect the Javanese from cruelty ends in his own downfall. [...] depicts the hypocrisy of those who gained from the corrupt coffee trade. Sending shockwaves through the Dutch nation when it was published in 1860, this damning exposé of the terrible conditions in the colonies led to welfare reforms in Java and continues to inspire the fairtrade movement today." ([penguin.co.uk/authors/multatuli/3608](http://penguin.co.uk/authors/multatuli/3608); lesedato 31.08.17) "This exceptional literary work, with its condemnation of Dutch oppression and exploitation in colonial Indonesia, became crucially important in the history of decolonization, which led to a new relationship between the Netherlands and its former colony in a process that still continues. The Indonesian writer Pramoedya Ananta Toer described it as "The Book that killed colonialism" (New York Times, April 18, 1998 [...]) Because of its literary power and universal appeal against oppression, the book is still topical and a source of inspiration. *Max Havelaar* is the most important work of Dutch literature and is still much read and studied, in the Netherlands as well as abroad. It was written in 1859 by the

former Dutch East Indies colonial civil servant Eduard Douwes Dekker (1820-1887), and published on May 14, 1860 under the Latin pseudonym “Multatuli”, meaning “I have suffered much.” [...] In 1856, Douwes Dekker, as assistant-resident of the department of Lebak on West Java, had lodged a formal complaint against the resident, the local authority, because of his abuse of power. The Dutch-Indies authorities rejected the complaint, after which Douwes Dekker’s resignation was accepted. He left for Europe and roamed about, before settling in a boarding house in Brussels in 1859. There he turned his complaint into literature; in less than a month, he wrote *Max Havelaar*. [...] The book was recognized as a literary masterpiece as soon as it was published. It is the best-known novel in Dutch literature, and in 2002 it was voted the best work of all time by the Society of Netherlands Literature [...] The internationally recognized “Max Havelaar” trademark shows how *Max Havelaar* is accepted as a source of inspiration for responsibility in world trade.” (Chantal Keijsper i [http://www.unesco.org/file\\_admin/MULTIMEDIA/HQ/CI/CI/pdf/mow/nomination\\_forms/netherlands\\_max\\_havelaar\\_manuscript.pdf](http://www.unesco.org/file_admin/MULTIMEDIA/HQ/CI/CI/pdf/mow/nomination_forms/netherlands_max_havelaar_manuscript.pdf); lesedato 09.08.17)

“Olive Schreiner’s life was distinguished by paradox. Born in 1855 to missionary parents in an obscure corner of colonial South Africa, she consecrated herself to an impassioned refusal of empire and God. [...] The publication in Britain of her novel, *The Story of an African Farm* [1883], won her overnight fame, the admiration of some of the great luminaries of her time and the distinction of being the first colonial writer to be widely acclaimed in Britain. [...] At odds with her imperial world, she was at times the most colonial of writers. Startlingly advanced in her anti-racism and political analysis, she could fall on occasion into the most familiar racial stereotypes. [...] *The Story of an African Farm*, “The Prelude” to *From Man to Man* and many of Schreiner’s early stories are haunted by the figure of the angry “old Ayah,” a reflection, however oblique and denied, of the domestic resistance and resentment of African women – a resistance and an ambiguity that would throw radically into question Schreiner’s monistic longing for a humanist unity, then later, a universal, feminist solidarity. Almost without exception, black women in Schreiner’s fiction are servants. In *The Story of an African Farm*, Africans pass like fitful shadows through the white people’s lives, unnamed and without identity. The notion that they might have lives of their own is not entertained. In “The Prelude” to *From Man to Man*, the African woman is simply called Old Ayah. She has no name; she bears only a labor category (nurse) and the identity of servitude. In Schreiner’s fiction, the black woman stands at the threshold of domesticity as a figure of intense ambivalence.” (Anne McClintock i [https://selforganizedseminar.files.wordpress.com/2011/07/mcclintock\\_imperial-leather.pdf](https://selforganizedseminar.files.wordpress.com/2011/07/mcclintock_imperial-leather.pdf); lesedato 29.05.17)

Den engelske forfatteren Henry Rider Haggards roman *King Solomon’s Mines* (1885) er “intimately concerned with events in South Africa following the discovery of diamonds and then gold: specifically, the reordering of women’s sexuality and work in the African homestead and the diversion of black male labor

into the mines. The story illuminates not only relations between the imperial metropolis and the colonies but also the refashioning of gender relations in South Africa, as a nascent capitalism penetrated the region and disrupted already contested power relations within the homesteads. Despite recent recognition that some of the crucial conflicts in the nineteenth century took place over the African homestead economy, for the most part the story of women's work and women's resistance has been shunted to the sidings of history. Because women were the chief farmers, they were the primary producers of life, labor and food in the precolonial era. Their work was thus the single most valuable resource in the country, apart from the land itself. Yet we know very little about how precolonial societies were able to subordinate women's work and as little about the changes wrought on these societies by colonial conquest and the penetration of merchant and mining capital. Haggard's *King Solomon's Mines* offers an unusual glimpse into some of the fundamental dynamics of that contest. The novel was in large part an attempt to negotiate contradictions in the colonial effort to discipline female sexuality and labor, both in the European metropolis and in the colonies. The conflicts between male and female generative power and between domesticity and imperialism, were not only the obsessive themes of Haggard's work but also a dominant preoccupation of his time. Much of the fascination of Haggard's writing for male Victorians was that he played out his phantasms of patriarchal power in the arena of empire, and thus evoked the unbidden relation between male middle- and upper-middle-class power in the metropolis and control of black female labor in the colonies. In this way, *King Solomon's Mines* becomes more than a Victorian curiosity; instead, it brings to light some of the fundamental contradictions of the imperial project as well as African attempts to resist it." (Anne McClintock i [https://selforganizedseminar.files.wordpress.com/2011/07/mcclintock\\_imperial-leather.pdf](https://selforganizedseminar.files.wordpress.com/2011/07/mcclintock_imperial-leather.pdf); lesedato 29.05.17)

Alle artiklene og litteraturlista til hele leksikonet er tilgjengelig på <https://www.litteraturogmedieleksikon.no>