

Postcolonial Haunting: Anxiety, Affect, and the Situated Encounter

Michael F. O'Riley
Ohio State University

In large part, the advent of postcolonial consciousness has emphasized the imperative of returning to occluded colonial history through a reckoning with the specters of the nation's colonial heritage. Postcolonial theory has relied, to a great extent, upon the idea of haunting in order to bring awareness of colonial history to the present while revising the conception of the contemporary nation and of cultural relations. The haunting of the colonial frequently turns on what is undoubtedly a well-intended desire to relate to the Other, the silenced, and the hidden, but it also reveals a more problematic inability to situate resistance, and mobilize memory for such purposes, in relation to ever-increasing transnational conditions that often deny or obfuscate forms of situated or positioned resistance.¹

Haunting is pervasive in postcolonial thought precisely because of its affective dimension, a dimension that creates a sense of the imminently important, present, and disruptive. This disruptive quality of postcolonial haunting is frequently portrayed as the Freudian *unheimlich* of history and is figured as an interruptive or affective moment in the course of Western consciousness where the repressed colonial scene returns. It is exactly this affective dimension of the unheimlich of history as a disruptive presence that I will explore here by focusing on the way such instances are figured as situated or positioned hauntings from which theories of postcolonial resistance arise. The reference to an affective and situated colonial encounter found in the deployment of haunting suggests a desire to focus a theory of resistance through reference to concrete encounters of the colonial type. Yet, the use of haunting in postcolonial theory as a placeless yet always-quotable mode of resistance also suggests a lurking anxiety

¹ This critique of the turn to a situated realm of ethnic and cultural conflict somewhat rejoins Michael Hardt and Antonio Negri's argument in their popular book *Empire*, that the "Leftist strategy of resistance to globalization and defense of locality is also damaging because in many cases what appear as local identities are not autonomous or self-determining but actually feed into and support the development of the capitalist imperial machine" (45). While there are contradictions and inherent problems in their notion of the end of imperialism, Hardt and Negri do seem attentive here to the ways that the global can give the impression of allowing local sovereignty while actually controlling that domain. Moreover, for the purposes of this discussion, they call attention to the ways that resistance, defined through the local and situated encounter, can frequently overlook the larger power dynamics of the global.

concerning the ways that situated conflicts and encounters are not always aligned with the often intangible nature of new transnational realities and postcolonial forms of oppression. Viewed this way, we might say that the deployment of haunting in postcolonial theory represents a suspended condition, in-between because it is symptomatic of an era poised between the traces of an increasingly inoperative colonial history and uncertain transnational forms of hierarchy and oppression. As new forms of neo-imperialism and transnational capital become commonplace, active imperialism characterized by visible and situated forms of conflict related to nation-states has receded to a great extent. However, while we might say that colonial history becomes inoperative in this way, it is not necessarily easy to locate tangible forms of neo-imperialism, particularly given their transnational nature.

Although part of the emphasis on the haunting of the colonial past stems from a return of that which has been written out of history, another part of the widespread postcolonial reliance on the aesthetics of haunting is due to the difficulties encountered in the inscription of colonial history; difficulties primarily related to issues of place and perspective. While place is frequently referenced as a means of according specificity to the effaced or hidden histories of the colonial era, position is often identified as a means of attenuating the ideological dilemmas that accompany the postcolonial recovery of places and their histories. Stuart Hall has noted the imperative of both place and position in the recovery and transmission of occulted histories: “The attempt to snatch from the hidden histories another place to stand in, another place to speak from—that moment is extremely important” (184). Hall’s notion of historical recovery underscores the importance of the subject’s position and agency in the negotiation with ideological positions of the past. Conscious of the issues surrounding place and position, postcolonial discourse theory, for instance, has noted that while the turn to place frequently enables a recoding of history, it often produces complex dilemmas for those choosing to evoke occulted colonial histories. How, for instance, does one recover specific occulted colonial histories without participating in the imperialist gesture of appropriation and effacement so related to place, without inadvertently entering into the dynamics of lingering colonial specters in contemporary claims to cultural and national identity? How might one avoid the reinscription or exacerbation of continuing ideological conflicts from the colonial era in the return to sites of imperialist history and memory?²

² Gayatri Spivak is arguably the most adamant concerning the vicissitudes of resurrecting unproblematically the occulted colonial subject of history and advises the historian against viewing the subaltern as “object” of study. Spivak echoes Robert Young, who signals “the hidden ways in which nominally radical, or oppositional historians often unknowingly, or even knowingly, perpetuate the structures and presuppositions of the very systems which they oppose” (*Colonial Desire* 161-162). The haunting temporality of colonialism, however, frequently returns to trouble even those endeavors with the best intentions.

Although contextual and ideological placement of formerly suppressed historical figures and their narratives incurs the risk of strategic appropriation by conflicting claims to their memory, avoidance of the commemorative act obscures the myriad positions of the past and its oppressed subjects. How, then, might the past, the pasts, be narrated? In this respect, Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak and Sneja Gunew have proposed a critical awareness of the postcolonial critic's positioning, what they term "a historical critique of your position as the investigating person," as a potential strategy for the postcolonial writing of history (197). Relying to a great extent on strategic positioning as a revisionist method, postcolonial theories and historiography have turned to haunting or the spectral aura of occulted histories in their investigation of the colonial era.³ Certain theories, drawing on a poststructuralist tone, have emphasized the ghostly figure of the trace in an attempt to attenuate the dilemmas of inscription of colonial histories and their places. Gyan Prakash, for instance, proposes that the violence constitutive of history's erasures and appropriations be evoked and transcended through a testimonial silhouette that haunts the moment of historical recovery with a "spectral" aura: "by writing histories of irretrievable subject-positions, by sketching the traces of figures that come to us only as disfigurements not in order to restore the original figures but to find the limit of foundations in shadows that the disfigurements themselves outline" (496). Drawing attention to the disruptive quality of these "potent traces" of the colonial past in the postcolonial rewriting of history, Iain Chambers argues that, "an absence, the 'lost' world of the past...returns to haunt modernity" (17). Focusing on the delay or "time lag" that accompanies the postcolonial emergence of these spectral figures of colonial history, Homi Bhabha points to the "furious emergence of the projective past" (*Location* 254). For Bhabha, the belated postcolonial staging of colonial-era history, "impels the past, projects it, gives its dead symbols the circulatory life of the sign of the present. . ." (254). As a haunting figure, the "time lag" figures the return of the colonial repressed, the disavowed temporality of colonialism. Bhabha references "the obscure signs of the spirit world," and employs the metaphor of the haunted house found in works by authors such as Toni Morrison and Nadine Gordimer to convey how place might testify to the "haunted site" of the postcolonial appearance of once-hidden colonial histories ("The World" 450).⁴ Spivak

³ See among others, Lopez; Ronell; Gordon. Gordon asserts that, "haunting rather than history (or historicism) best captures the constellation of connections that charges any 'time of the now' with the debts of the past and the expense of the present" (142). Frequently, postcolonial criticism implicitly or explicitly reinscribes the haunting images of imperialist practice and ideology in its critique of colonial history, positioning its discoveries in what Emily Apter calls a "frozen twilight temporality" (214).

⁴ Contrary to my assertions regarding its reliance on place, Bhabha's postcolonial hauntology has sustained the critique, most notably by Aijaz Ahmad, of completely dispensing with "a sense of place, of belonging, of some stable commitment to one's class or gender or nation that may be useful for defining one's politics" (*In Theory* 14). Bhabha's reliance on haunting nonetheless turns upon the idea of a placeless place, combining poststructuralist displacement with a politics of location or placement.

has also argued for a similar mode of conceiving of the colonial erasure of the Other that would, “open our minds to being haunted by the aboriginal” (“Supplementing Marxism” 109). The postcolonial act of writing the hidden stories of subjects of colonial oppression is thus figured by the limit of consciousness where recovered histories emerge in traces as spectral figures of colonial conflict and erasure.

Conventional symbols of historical and psychic dissonance, haunted places have been employed to figure the postcolonial recovery of a past beyond appropriation yet historically emblematic. Yet, where do such strategies lead us when postcolonial places trade violently on the spectral images and trace memories of colonialism and its positions? What occurs when the projection of the colonial past fuels the haunting dissonance of human violence and produces a politics of victimization and culpability? What if evocations of competing colonial memories within meeting places of the postcolonial diaspora are at odds with one another and impede cohesion across ethnic lines? What if, as in the case of many former colonies, place remains haunted by the memories of imperialism, doomed to linger in a time lag that condemns it to repeat the conflicts of its colonial past? Most importantly, perhaps, what if time-lagged representations of colonial-era oppression hold little relevance to new and emerging forms of neo-imperialist oppression, the strategies of which may bear little resemblance to Manichean conflicts of the colonial period?

The compulsion to figure colonial history as a haunting trace does not necessarily lead to a so-called ethical relationship with the Other, nor does it result in an avoidance of some of the theoretical issues related to place, history, and appropriation mentioned above. Frequently, haunting as a mode of recovery of colonial history leads to a focus on the aesthetics of the experience of colonial oppression. Such aesthetics can, in part, be a useful point of departure for our understanding of imperialist strategies of oppression. However, when taken too far they can obsess memory and divert the critical gesture from contemporary issues requiring intervention and immediate attention. My intent here is not to join my voice to the numerous materialist critics of postcolonial theory that charge it with too much attention to discursive or aesthetic considerations, too little attention to actual material conditions, and the creation of an ensuing opposition between history and textuality.⁵ I would argue that any memory of the colonial era that haunts, be it conventionally textual or not, might be viewed as aesthetic since it represents a structured dimension of the cultural imaginary. Therefore, attention focused on the material aspects of oppression, when driven by memories of the ways colonial-era oppression once functioned, is as ineffective as a narrow focus on the purely textual and linguistic qualities of power relationships. What becomes crucial is a theorization of the way that colonial memories function in relation to contemporary contexts that find postcolonial communities grappling with

⁵ See for instance, Ahmad (1992); Chrisman (1995); Dirlik; Parry (1987, 1994), San Juan Jr; Moore-Gilbert (1997).

globalization as well as the sharing of diverse, often conflicting memories of colonialism.

In this article, I will discuss various seminal instances of the turn to the affective charge of haunting found in postcolonial studies. These instances exemplify a concern with locating an affective dimension in the encounter with the colonial past. Such an affective charge is treated as the nexus of a transformational haunting. The anxiety located in the interruptive, belated, and ebullient nature of situated encounters with the colonial as a form of resistance will be my focus in these theories of postcolonial haunting. I will approach the nature of the return of the colonial scene as a situated moment of anxiety in the belated dynamics of Homi Bhabha's engagement with colonial history, in Ian Chambers's Heideggerian take on the limitations of Western consciousness, and in Robert Young's discussion of the semiotics of anxiety within the colonial image and archive. In all of these instances, my focus will be on the ways that a visual recognition of injustice positioned in the situated encounter with colonial history underscores the production of anxiety as a mode of critical engagement and resistance. The focus on the production of anxiety in postcolonial models of haunting, I will argue, suggests a postcolonial anxiety about the possibility of mapping or situating resistance under conditions of transnational empire and globalized incarnations of imperialism. These situated and affective dimensions of the return of colonial history betray a profound desire to locate and theorize resistance to contemporary forms of imperialism that remain more difficult to situate.

Homi Bhabha's conception of the time-lag mentioned above represents perhaps the most concerted attempt to utilize the idea and the aesthetics of haunting as a way of rethinking notions of cultural heritage. While many critics have identified problems in Bhabha's conception of hybridity as a form of postcolonial agency, I would like to draw attention very briefly to the haunting temporality found in Bhabha's increasing attempts throughout his career to rethink "the geopolitics of the historical present" through the memory of colonial experience (Copjec 210).⁶ To be sure, haunting presents problems similar to those of agency and history identified in Bhabha's conception of hybridity, yet it is important to underline its relationship in Bhabha's work to a conception of cultural memory and intervention, since the haunting form of memory proposed by Bhabha is so widespread in postcolonial theory and culture.

Much of Bhabha's theory of haunting can be traced to his engagement with what he calls "scenes" of oppression described in the

⁶ Most critics of Bhabha's concept of hybridity point to its reliance upon poststructuralist theory and a resultant textualization of politics that never specifies precise moments of intervention. See, for instance, Ahmad (1992); Parry (1994); Moore-Glibert (1997). See also Peter Hallward's critique of Bhabha's theory of hybridity as an ultimately "singular" project "because it refers back, immediately, to that one logic, [difference], that positions every possibility" (26). Hallward's opposition of the singular and specific in the postcolonial provides a framework for my discussion of haunting below as an essentially non-relational logic based on synchronic notions of national temporality and identity.

work of Frantz Fanon. The opening scene of Fanon's *Black Skins, White Masks*, describing how a Negro is subjected to racist terms, serves as a recurring scene in Bhabha's work from which he devises the notion of a haunting colonial temporality, what he identifies as, "the belatedness of the black man" (*Location* 236). Bhabha argues that Fanon's repetition of the scene/seen of oppression serves as a haunting point of identification through which the colonial past and its scenes of oppression are reiterated and projected into modernity as a means of questioning "the ontology of man" (238). This destruction of ontology, creates a hauntology, according to Bhabha, that revises the very dynamics of the black man's subjection and of the white man's supremacy.

According to Bhabha, the belated temporality of colonial history and its repressed subjects, which finds formerly displaced colonial subjects and histories reclaiming places and voices in the contemporary context, is an essentially disruptive force. As a disruptive temporality, the "[t]ime lag keeps alive the meaning of the past" (254); it provides an alternative way of understanding what constitutes time, and therefore cultural heritage, and "fractures the time of modernity" (252). According to Bhabha, within this fracture, the colonial past returns to hybridize the present, creating "a signifying time for the inscription of cultural incommensurability where differences cannot be sublated or totalized" (177). Bhabha thus draws upon the "memorial map" of "Slavery, War, Holocaust, migration, diaspora" as histories which might counter contemporary experiences of transnational culture that homogenize and create inequalities ("Anxious" 203). The colonial past is "repeated" or "projected" through in the present (*Location*, 254), and therefore disrupts "the continuum of history," those monumental scripts of cultural heritage (*Location* 257). Although Bhabha's view of this return of the colonial past is designed as a disruptive intervention, it "flashes up" because it already inhabits modernity, is very much a part of its heritage (*Location* 257). The time-lag, then, is a form of cultural memory that unconsciously haunts the present.

Bhabha's time-lag transforms the colonial into a mythical experience that is always lingering as it "keeps alive the meaning of the past" even as it emerges to disrupt the present. The most important question here is how a projected haunting of the colonial past in the form of a colonial unconscious, always already present, might effectively counter new and evolved contexts of what Bhabha identifies as "transnational" forms of "destitution" ("Anxious" 203). While Bhabha claims that the "anxious," "affective power"—the haunting nature—of the projection of occluded colonial histories provides a disruptive force, it is difficult to imagine how the memory of colonial conflict might counter those forms of neo-colonial oppression that have evolved so as to be frequently invisible or so transnational that they are intangible (222).⁷ Moreover, although Bhabha

⁷ This is in no way meant to suggest that all forms of neo-imperialist oppression are invisible or intangible. However, it is imperative to question how such globalized forms

is attentive to the ways the haunting of the time lag unites different ethnic and diasporic groups through a “temporality of repetition that constitutes those signs by which marginalized or insurgent subjects create a collective agency,” he doesn’t consider how diverse and conflicting colonial memories projected into the metropolis or ex-colony might simply engender a repetition of cultural tensions (199).⁸ The hauntings of colonial history, especially when evocative of national loss, might simply fuel nationalist sentiment and cultural and ethnic conflict, as well as a sense of affiliation to a former nation in the case of diasporic individuals, particularly when the souvenir of colonial oppression installs a sense of victimization. Further, such repetitious reminders of the oppressive nature of colonial culture can create a sense of culpability that impedes those who might otherwise attempt to transform oppressive conditions. Rather than creating awareness of contemporary conditions of inequality, such a haunting can produce a retrospective gaze that tends to archive instances of colonial injustice, transforming them into colonial sites of memory.⁹ Such notions of Western culpability and formerly colonized victimization often restrict and simplify potentially productive formations of postcolonial community.

Using language and themes similar to those of Bhabha, Iain Chambers focuses on the hauntings of colonial history that might interrupt or give rise to a questioning of contemporary forms of oppression while ultimately overlooking contemporary contexts suggestive of evolved forms of colonial-era inequality. Chambers turns to postcolonial France and its legacy of Arab immigration to illustrate the concept of the hauntings of colonial history without reflecting on the cultural, economic, or political conditions of French colonialism and immigration. Suggesting a supernatural experience that exceeds understanding, Chambers argues that “[w]hat comes out of the [colonial] past bears more than any individual can contain or explain” (65). For Chambers, the colonial inheritance and its “temporal interruption” produce an anxiety that suggests the limits of Western being and temporality (65). In a postcolonial version of Baudelerian *flânerie* in Paris and its Arab immigrant neighborhood of Barbès, the cosmopolitan intersection of the *Gare du Nord* and *Gare de Londres* with their high-speed Eurostar trains that cross the English Channel in under three hours, Chambers argues how

of oppression might be effectively approached through a spectral return of the colonial past.

⁸ Perhaps the most damaging aspect of Bhabha’s theory of belatedness comes from the implication that if difference is inherent in identity and a part of all cultural formations, then the belated, haunting temporality of the colonizer’s identity and power formed through difference might also be projected as a haunting temporality. On this, see Bart Moore-Gilbert (121). I suggest that this belated, nationalist sentiment—a holdover from the colonial era—is very much lurking within concepts of postcolonial haunting.

⁹ In my discussion of the belated nature of postcolonial haunting, I am indebted to Ali Behdad’s prescriptive warning that “postcolonial belatedness” can only be an effective means of intervention if it uses its historicity to critique ongoing cultural conditions that produce unequal relations of power (78).

the haunting encounter with the vestiges of colonial history forces a rethinking of Western time.

Referring to an Arab scribe with a portable desk, wrapped in a *djellaba* and wearing a turban, Chambers claims that he can “register a trace, not merely of another world largely hidden from my eyes and understanding, but rather the trace of a language and history that seeks a response, and a responsibility in mine...his presence both interrupts and reconfigures my history, translating the closure of my ‘identity’ into an aperture in which I meet an other who is in the world yet irreducible to my will” (206). Acknowledging the limits of anthropological discourse and the exoticism of the Western gaze intent on reconfirming its own subjectivity, Chambers claims that this encounter embodies a limit for Occidental consciousness:

In this ambiguous space in which historical transit betrays and befuddles the desired transparency of translation, I register the historically positioned limits of my voice, of my claims on the world. The Arab scribe as referent of my discourse both unfolds towards me and away from me, is both object of my narrative and a subject in a world that is never simply mine. He is witness not merely to the power of my gaze, desirous of egotistical confirmation, but also to the interval that emerges between us as subjects and that renders my language locatable and limited. (206)

In this situated encounter, reminiscent of a Heideggerian unfolding of being and otherness, that evokes “the unhomely,” Chambers focuses on a form of postcolonial “anxiety” that comes from the haunting encounter, the return of the colonial repressed in the form of the Freudian *unheimlich* (207): “For in the horror of the unhomely pulses the dread for the dispersal of Western humankind: the dread of a rationality confronted with what exceeds and slips its grasp. To be claimed by what exceeds immediate understanding is to run the risk of ultimately having little to say” (196). Aside from the Western appropriation of this encounter, much to Chambers’s claim to the contrary, this scene provides an example of how the anxiety of colonial haunting is frequently constructed and then imposed upon otherwise expected situations in the “worldly state” of postcolonial displacement and diaspora (207). Indeed, it is difficult to see precisely what is “interruptive” in this normal encounter.¹⁰

¹⁰ Without a doubt Chambers imbues this encounter with a “culturally authentic Other” with a haunting aura. The turn to a situated, authentic image of culture in postcolonial criticism is pervasive. As Peter Hallward argues, “the spectre of cultural authenticity haunts postcolonial criticism at every step” (37). A focus on the local, situated, and authentic cultural encounter traced back to the colonial era suggests the yearning for a depth model in the fragmented and uncertain environment of postmodern conditions. Haunting itself seems to play into this search for historical depth and affect, providing a highly charged sense of conflict, resistance, and purpose. In this regard, Fredric Jameson’s characterization of the postmodern loss of historical depth and the dissolution of iconic national figures and modernist affect is particularly relevant. Jameson’s now classic work, *Postmodernism or the Cultural Logic of Late Capitalism*, posits that such losses of depth produce a profound nostalgia for the past, or at least for the illusion of its organizing principles of depth (59). The valorization of haunting, the culturally authentic,

What is most telling about this scene is what remains as background description, truly haunting the situated encounter itself. Chambers never mentions the relationship between this encounter and the forms of globalization and high-speed technology represented by the trains of France's new *Gare de Londres*. Might this postcolonial encounter actually interrupt the transnational capitalism and high-speed displacement represented by the scene's backdrop? What is the nature of the relationship between the Arab scribe and such forms of globalization as he waits, as Chambers tells us, for illiterate clients—presumably immigrants from the Maghreb and elsewhere—to pay him a meager sum to write letters in Arabic? What is the relationship between the French colonial legacy, the representation of a new high-speed economy suggested by the train, and this scene of haunting? The turn to a haunting colonial encounter neglects how globalized forms of oppression might or might not be resisted by the specters of colonialism.¹¹ Most importantly, for our purposes, this scene demonstrates how colonial history in putatively critical contexts is frequently figured as a haunting that ultimately diverts attention away from contemporary realities that beg our attention. The problem here is not so much what many Marxist critics have denounced as a focus on hybridity, ambivalence, and contingency in postcolonial theory to the detriment of a critical appraisal of globalization, but rather a fetishism of colonial history that presumes it capable of addressing postcolonial encounters of inequality today. An obsessive focus on colonial history is particularly risky when tense colonial memories continue to circulate both within and between former colonizing and colonized country. Nevertheless, it suffices to say that a wholesale rejection of colonial memory as a means of thinking resistance to globalization is as dangerous a proposition as a fascination with it.

Like Iain Chambers, Robert Young also turns to colonial scenes in the Francophone world to formulate a theory of postcolonial resistance based on haunting, but for Young it is precisely the return to the haunting colonial archive of Franco-Algerian conflict that obfuscates the critical perspective. Young's *Postcolonialism: An Historical Introduction*, provides an exhaustive survey of how the political determination of colonial revolution proved transformative. Young argues that the organic

and the situated encounter in the proliferation of colonial memory sites suggests the search for depth models of historical authenticity and affect in the context of postmodern fragmentation.

¹¹ Slavoj Žižek is one of the most vigilant critics of the ways that, "a series of crucial motifs and aspirations of the oppressed" are organized in such a manner as to play directly into the hands of globalized forms of power, ultimately becoming "compatible with the existing relations of domination" (30). See Dirlik as well. More recently, Shemie Shih has shown how a turn to the cultural has evacuated the category of race of its oppositional potential: "Race becomes culturalized to such an extent that it all but disappears, even though it continues to structure hierarchies" (23). The turn to cultural encounters of colonial haunting demonstrates the way that existing relations of domination in relation to race are frequently overlooked by a focus on the culturalization of race.

ebullition of this movement should serve as an example of how postcolonial consciousness might cultivate its interventionist nature in the face of neo-colonial and global forms of power (ii). There is, in a great part of Young's work, an attempt to rethink political determination through a privileging of the anti-colonial liberation struggles of the Francophone world. At the same time, however, Young's return to an ethnic and gendered realm of colonial memory in his evocation of the Algerian War fascinates with images of the colonial spectacle of violence, ultimately leading to a fixation with the colonial era that haunts its claims to intervention. Young's desire to historically situate revolt as a haunting and unpredictable presence, to write the frequently overlooked history of the Algerian War into a haunting narrative, the effects of which would prove resistant to forms of power in the contemporary period, leads him to turn to the colonial dynamics of the eroticized gaze and the gendered aestheticization of terrorism.

The preface to Young's work is exemplary in this respect. Outlining the affective charge of two photos from colonial Algeria, Young locates "traces of the violence, defiance, struggles, and suffering of individuals, that represent the political ideas of community, equality. . . and dignity" (ix). Young begins with an evocation of photos he claims haunted him during the writing of the book and which provide a salient embodiment of the postcolonial according to him (ix). The first photo, entitled "Les porteuses de bombes des stades: l'âge de Juliette, l'âme de Ravachol," 'Stadium Bomb Carriers: The Age of Juliette, the Soul of Ravachol,' presumably shows Djouher Akhor and Baya Hocine, the young unveiled Algerian women who were arrested for placing bombs in the Algiers and El-Biar stadiums on 10 February 1957 and whose history interested Simone de Beauvoir. Young quickly identifies in this photo the efficacy with which the unveiled revolution entered into the everyday psychic life of colonial space as an unpredictable and unidentifiable event of spasmodic eruptions like those described by Frantz Fanon writing of the effects of the unveiling of Algeria in his essay "Algeria Unveiled" (Fanon 1959). In the context of this unpredictable eruption of revolt, Young identifies the colonial anxiety which pursues the colonizers in their everyday activities and which serves as the basis for the destabilization of the colonizer's authority. While we might already question the precise relevance of colonial anxiety as an effective form of resistance to the challenges of global forms of imperialism and transnational capital—the targets that motivate Young's critical return to the sites of anti-colonial struggle—Young's particular, and sexualized, identification with the haunting quality of colonial-era conflict obfuscates contemporary resistance and further removes his critique from the contemporary context.

So anxious is Young to historicize and situate postcolonial resistance in what he conceives as a haunting domain of colonial ethnic and cultural conflict, that he turns to the colonial dynamics of sexuality in his location of emancipatory struggle. In the intense gaze of the close-up shot of the two young women, Young distinguishes "a slightly sensual aura" (viii).

The tension of this aura, found in the “defiant eyes” and “slightly parted” lips of one of the young women, is conflated with a solemn, if unveiled, sexuality when Young characterizes the emancipatory nature of the photo as “Algeria unveiled indeed” (viii). Echoing the translation of Fanon’s 1959 essay, “Algeria Unveiled,” which traces the Western phallic unveiling of Algerian women as it is “transformed into a technique of camouflage, into a means of struggle,” Young repeats the fascinated male gaze of colonial culture mentioned by Fanon, which seeks behind the veil, in the Algerian woman’s would-be sexuality, the essence and eruption of resistance (Fanon 61).

This haunting of Young’s criticism by the visual memento and fantasy of colonial-era sexuality and phallic dynamics is only reinforced by his evocation of a second photo, this time featuring a scene he identifies as homoerotic.¹² Young describes a “nature morte” depiction of four European men holding up a naked man, “clearly an Algerian,” as if “giving him the bumps, the homoerotic play of sportsmen” (ix). Here, Young detects the anxiety of the Algerian, whose exposed genitals evoke “a contorted ‘spread shot’ in a pornographic magazine,” in the man’s look of “abject, fear, misery, and terror” (ix). The rather bizarre reference to homoeroticism here seems placed gratuitously so as to imbue the scene with the anxiety of a more historically situated, contemporary form of cultural conflict: “What were the colons about to do to him, as he was posed for the photograph, poised between life and death?” (ix). While it is difficult to imagine what is homoerotic in a scene of “abject fear, misery, and terror” defined by colonial struggle, it is clear that Young turns to the anxiety within the struggles of rape and seduction that permeate colonial space through reference to the affective dimensions of both homosexual and heterosexual psychic life. Conflated with political struggle and intervention, these colonial sites become an ideological space, according to Young, from which the ideals of postcolonial resistance might be derived. However, ultimately the haunting memorabilia from the colonial era draw in the critical gaze and divert attention from its intended objectives.

In many ways, the affective domain related to a haunting aura is always implicated in such endeavors, particularly because of the complex colonial legacy still circulating in and between former imperialist centers and their peripheries. There is, on one hand, the imperative of an awareness of histories that have never been recorded, a desire to relate to

¹² Young’s turn to colonial history through the photographic memento is particularly surprising given his agreement with Said’s salutary warning in *Orientalism* regarding the potential stagnation of colonial discourse analysis. See Edward Said, *Orientalism* (327). Young argues that “colonial-discourse analysis as a general method and practice has reached a stage where it is itself in danger of becoming oddly stagnated, and as reified in its approach” as colonial discourse (*Colonial Desire* 164). Young’s analysis of these colonial-era photos can be understood as the reading of a visual form of colonial discourse, an act of interpretation that also returns to a reified approach to the contextualization of colonial discourse in the contemporary period.

that which is, and was made, other. Yet, there is also a widespread tendency in such endeavors to create monuments of the colonial, to transform it into a mythical and unproblematic domain, unproblematic precisely because it is always assumed to be so problematic, so utterly disruptive to the way we think of it.¹³ The hauntings of the colonial examined above include both of these tendencies. They do so because the obsessive desire to relate to the Other, to establish a “relational” form of memory through the image and memory of the colonial Other, often collapses into a type of thought that is ultimately not at all relational or plural and, moreover, hardly seems disruptive (Hallward 329).

In this respect, Peter Hallward’s examination of these postcolonial tendencies is most useful to my discussion. Although he does not discuss the hauntings of the colonial, Hallward’s contention that the postcolonial is by and large characterized by a “singular,” rather than relational, or plural, orientation is directly relevant to cultural memory and its hauntings by the colonial. According to Hallward, the postcolonial proceeds through a process of self-generation, becoming “its own absolute and exclusive point of reference” (23). This is so not because it doesn’t gesture toward a relation with the Other, but because in doing so it ultimately creates singular definitions of the Other and of difference, categories that are always inherently hybrid and plural anyway.¹⁴ Hallward’s observations are important to my discussion of the hauntings of the colonial because they illustrate how the impulse of returning to colonial memory sites as a means of establishing a relational theory is often a singular project, one that establishes its own privileged, oft situated, and frequently mythical version of the Other that excludes those conditions in which others find themselves today. The relational intent of a haunting memory thus frequently excludes those encounters that really affect our relationships with others. Often, such hauntings of cultural memory by the colonial experience suggest an appropriation of the experience of occluded history rather than a relation to its Other.¹⁵

¹³ In his analysis of Holocaust memorials, James Young argues that “[o]nce we assign a monumental form to memory, we have to some degree divested ourselves of the obligation to remember” (5). My argument concerning the static, non-relational quality of colonial sites of memory suggests a similar dynamic of cultural memory.

¹⁴ Hallward shows that even those attempts to promote cultural specificity or the specificity of the Other, frequently end in the “singularization of the specific,” a non-relational form of engagement with the Other (17). While Hallward does not delve into the workings of memory as a relational category, I would argue that they remain central to a relational framework, particularly in the postcolonial context. Hallward argues that the relational takes place somewhere between the purely singular and specific, taking account of both poles. I would argue that any form of relational postcolonial memory must also take account of the singular and the specific of individual, national, and ethnic differences and memories in order to negotiate both subjective and collective claims to heritage, cultural memory, and citizenship within postcolonial contexts.

¹⁵ In a discussion of the competing realms of postcolonial histories in the multicultural context, Dipesh Chakrabarty has noted the intransigent character of European History: “There is a peculiar way in which all these other histories tend to become variations on a master narrative that could be called “the history of Europe” (1). Chakrabarty’s

The hauntings of colonial history align, in this respect, with Jean Baudrillard's notion of a pervasive turn to simulacra, in this case of situated Manichean conflicts, in the uncertain history of the present. According to Baudrillard, the retreat of the tangible and readily situated, which characterizes many new transnational realities, creates simulacra of the real, the tendency toward "an esthetic hallucination of reality" (142). The widespread proliferation of narratives and images of colonial conflict and oppression can also be seen as simulacra of truly affective encounters of confrontation and resistance in the contemporary context where such spectacular national forms of conflict and oppression at times take on a more intangible nature, leaving us with the question of how to focus resistance and understand oppression in postmodern conditions. The theoretical examples I have examined above point to the creation of just such a retreat to an aesthetic and simulated dimension of conflict in the creation of colonial memory sites, and ultimately demonstrate how such simulacra haunt contemporary endeavors to be interventionist.

How, then, might postcolonial criticism draw upon memory to resist oppression when that very oppression is complex, multiple, and frequently emanates from diverse locations and nations? How might formerly colonized nations mobilize memory as a form of resistance when they are dealing with the images and memories of a not-so-distant experience of colonization and the ever-increasing images and strategies of transnational power? How to avoid forgetting an integral part of the nation's heritage? The theoretical examples underscored here suggest that it is only in conceiving of cultural memory as a structure not haunted by the image of the Other or colonial temporality, but as relational to the extent that it seeks hard answers to the ways that group, individual, and national memories of colonial-era loss and oppression affect one another, that a true relation to the Other might take place. Moreover, these examples suggest that it is only in dispelling the haunting aura of the experience of the colonial that cultural memory might be mobilized toward intervention within the present.¹⁶

discussion of the ways that other histories within the postcolonial are appropriated by the narrative of "the history of Europe" is relevant to my identification of how the haunting of the colonial Other does not constitute a relational form of cultural memory.

¹⁶ See Alain Finkielkraut who argues that we must put aside the notion of the "devoir de mémoire," "the duty of memory," and consider instead precisely how memory and the dead body of history might be best oriented toward the present and future: "La mémoire est nécessaire, mais il faudrait ajouter aussitôt: 'en vue de faire quoi' ... Nous ne devons pas nous soustraire aux tâches du présent, nous ne devons pas oublier non plus que les morts ont besoin de nous pour eux," "Memory is necessary, but it is also necessary to add: 'to what end' ... We must not extract ourselves from the tasks of the present, we cannot forget either that the dead rely on us themselves" (13...35).

Works Cited

- Ahmad, Aijaz. *In Theory: Classes, Nations, Literatures*. New York: Verso, 1992.
- . “The Politics of Literary Postcoloniality.” *Race and Class* 36.3 (1995): 1-20.
- Apter, Emily. *Continental Drift: From National Characters to Virtual Subjects*. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1999.
- Baudrillard, Jean. *Simulacra and Simulation*. Trans. Sheila Faira Glaser. Ann Arbor: U of Michigan P, 1994.
- Behdad, Ali. “Une Pratique Sauvage: Postcolonial Belatedness and Cultural Politics.” *The Pre-Occupation of Postcolonial Studies*. Eds. Fawzia Afzal-Khan and Kalpana Seshadri-Crooks. Durham and London: Duke UP, 2000. 71-85.
- Bhabha, Homi. *The Location of Culture*. New York: Routledge, 1994.
- . “Anxious Nations, Nervous States.” *Supposing the Subject*. Ed. Joan Copjec. London: Verso, 1994.
- . “The World and the Home.” *Dangerous Liaisons: Gender, Nation, & Postcolonial Perspectives*. Ed. Anne McClintock, Aamir Mufti, and Ella Shohat. Minneapolis: U of Minnesota P, 1997.
- Chakrabarty, Dipesh. “Postcoloniality and the Artifice of History: Who Speaks for ‘Indian’ Pasts?” *Representations* 32 (Winter): 1-26.
- Chambers, Iain. *Culture After Humanism: History, Culture, Subjectivity*. London and New York: Routledge, 2001.
- Chrisman, Laura. “Inventing Post-Colonial Theory: Polemical Observations.” *Pretexts* 5 (1995): 205-212.
- Dirlik, Arlif. “The Postcolonial Aura: Third World Criticism in the Age of Global Capitalism.” *Critical Inquiry* 20.2 (1994): 328-56.
- Fanon, Frantz. *Les damnés de la terre*. Paris: Maspéro, 1961.
- . *A Dying Colonialism*. Trans. H. Chevalier. New York: Grove, 1965. (Originally published as *L’an cinq de la révolution Algérienne*. Paris: François Maspéro, 1959.)
- Finkielkraut, Alain, and Tzvetan Todorov, and Richard Marienstras. *Du bon usage de la mémoire*. Paris: Editions du Tricorne, 2000.
- Gordon, Avery. *Ghostly Matters: Haunting and the Sociological Imagination*. Minneapolis: U of Minnesota P, 1997.
- Hall, Stuart. “The Local and the Global: Globalization and Ethnicity.” *Dangerous Liaisons: Gender, Nation, & Postcolonial Perspectives*. Eds. Anne McClintock, Aamir Mufti, and Ella Shohat. Minneapolis: U of Minnesota P, 1997. 173-187.
- Hallward, Peter. *Absolutely Postcolonial: Writing between the Singular and the Specific*. Manchester: Manchester UP, 2001.
- Hardt, Michael and Antonio Negri. *Empire*. Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1999.
- Jameson, Fredric. *Postmodernism or the Cultural Logic of Late Capitalism*. Durham: Duke UP, 1991.

- Kraniauskas, John. "Hybridity in a Transnational Frame: Latin-Americanist and Post-Colonial Perspectives on Cultural Studies." *Hybridity and its Discontents: Politics, Science, Culture*. Eds. Avtar Brah and Annie E. Coombes. New York: Routledge, 2000.
- Lopez, Alfred. *Posts and Pasts: A Theory of Postcolonialism*. New York: SUNY P, 2001.
- Moore-Gilbert, Bart. *Postcolonial Theory: Contexts, Practices, Politics*. London: Verso, 1997.
- Parry, Benita. "Problems in Current Theories of Colonial Discourse." *Oxford Literary Review* 9 (1987): 27-58.
- . "Signs of our Times: Discussion of Homi Bhabha's Location of Culture." *Third Text* 28-29 (1994): 1-24.
- Prakash, Gyan. "Postcolonial Criticism and Indian Historiography." *Dangerous Liaisons: Gender, Nation, & Postcolonial Perspectives*. Eds. Anne McClintock, Aamir Mufti, and Ella Shohat. Minneapolis: U of Minnesota P, 1997. 491-500.
- Ronnell, Avital. *Dictations: On Haunted Writing*. Lincoln: U of Nebraska P, 1993.
- Said, Edward. *Orientalism*. New York: Random House, 1979.
- San Juan, E. Jr. *Racism and Cultural Studies: Critiques of Multiculturalist Ideology and the Politics of Difference*. Durham and London: Duke UP, 2002.
- Shih, Shu-Mei. "Global Literature and the Technologies of Recognition." *PMLA* 119.1 (2004): 16-30.
- Spivak, Gayatri Chakravorty. "Supplementing Marxism." *Whither Marxism? Global Crises in the International Context*. Eds. Bernd Magnus and Stephen Cullenberg. London: Routledge, 1995.
- . *A Critique of Postcolonial Reason: Toward a History of the Vanishing Present*. Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1999.
- Spivak, Gayatri Chakravorty and Sneja Gunew. "Questions of Multiculturalism." *The Cultural Studies Reader*. Ed. Simon During. London: Routledge, 1993. 193-202.
- Young, James. *The Texture of Memory*. Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1998.
- Young, Robert. *Colonial Desire: Hybridity in Theory, Culture, and Race*. London: Routledge, 1995.
- . *Postcolonialism: An Historical Introduction*. London: Blackwell, 2001.
- Zizek, Slavoj. "Multiculturalism or, The Cultural Logic of Multinational Capitalism." *New Left Review* 225 (1997): 28-51.