Progress in Human Geography 24,4 (2000) pp. 591–612

Postcolonial geographies: an exploratory essay

James D. Sidaway

School of Geography and Environmental Sciences, University of Birmingham, Edgbaston, Birmingham B15 2TT, UK

Abstract: This article is about debates concerning the 'postcolonial'. The term bears a variety of inter-related sets of meanings. In the first place 'postcolonial' has been used in reference to a condition that succeeds colonial rule. But 'postcolonial' also signifies a set of theoretical perspectives. Mindful of this diversity, I present a tentative and speculative geography of the varied and complicated senses (and non-senses) of the conditions and approaches purported to be described by the term.

Key words: geopolitics, imperialism, postcolonialism.

'The Morning of Freedom', *August 1947*

This stained light, this night-bitten dawn –
This is not the dawn we waited for.
This is not the dawn for which we set out . . .
The night is as oppressive as ever.
The time for the liberation of heart and mind.
Has not come as yet.
Continue your arduous journey.
This is not your destination.

(Faiz Ahmed Faiz, 1988: 36)

I Introductions

1 On the 'Freedom trail'

Like dozens of other British academics, I attended the meeting of the Association of American Geographers that took place in Boston, Massachusetts, in March 1998. Attracted by the historical, academic and cultural associations of the city, I timed my travel across the Atlantic to allow a few days of wandering around before the convention began. In between bars, cafés and bookstores, I spent a morning following

 0309–1325(00)PH296RA

something called the 'Freedom trail'. This amounts to a red line on the sidewalk that links together a set of key historic sites of the American revolution. Such formal celebration of historical places in a North American city is not confined to Boston. Indeed, the linking of certain sites and their elevation into a kind of sacred geography that presents a set of official meanings for the visitor has become quite commonplace in Canadian and US cities. Kenneth Foote (1997: 31) notes how:

> The invention of tradition has powerfully influenced the American landscape. Over time virtually every significant site has been marked, including not only watershed events but places associated with the lives and works of great Americans. Today people take many of these sites – battlefields, tombs, and shrines – for granted, when in reality their selection for commemoration was far from inevitable.

Many of the sites-sights on the 'Freedom trail' were indeed 'national monuments', icons of American power and manifest destiny. In this 'nationalization' of memory, other histories, such as the Boston once known as Shawmut (lively-waters) before the arrival of Europeans in 1625, or the significant African and Native American presence in colonial Boston were either forgotten or overwritten and incorporated into an official American story of Freedom.

Walking along the 'Freedom trail', I saw the old State House where the American Declaration of Independence was first read publicly in 1776. Inside the State House there was an exhibition of flags and a section on the 'Citizen-soldier today' with photographs of the Massachusetts National Guardsmen raising the flag in the Arabian desert during the Gulf war. I also saw the restored (200 years-old) *USS Constitution*, which had seen action against the British, French and Spanish. In the adjacent naval-history museum, I read more about manifest destiny, saw notes that (retrospectively) described the USA in 1844 as 'an emerging market economy' as well as the oil-painting of the first-ever US Navy 'co-ordinated land and sea attack': the capture of Tripoli (Libya) early in the nineteenth century, led by a ship named *The Enterprise*.

Seeing these things along a path that celebrated the struggle for American independence served as a vivid reminder and embodiment of academic debates (some of which will be detailed below) that I had read concerning the 'postcolonial' status of the USA. Was this a society best described as 'postcolonial'? Or was it more appropriate to understand the USA as 'neoimperial'? Or was it impossible to decide? I had been reading and thinking about such debates for several years. More specifically, in human geography the term 'postcolonial' has cropped up in lots of different texts (Rogers, 1992; Corbridge, 1993; Blunt and Rose, 1994; Crush, 1994; Gregory, 1994; Jackson, 1994; Jacobs, 1995; Glassman and Samatar, 1997; McEwan, 1998; Simon, 1998; Robinson, 1999) which seem to use it to signify rather different things. In the context of such an array of postcolonialisms (and foregrounding the kinds of questions raised along the 'Freedom trail'), what follows offers a tentative and speculative geography of the varied and complicated senses (and non-senses) of postcolonial geographies.

Some of the tentativeness originates in the important sense in which any 'mapping' of the 'postcolonial' is a problematic or contradictory project. This arises from the impulse within postcolonial approaches to invert, expose, transcend or deconstruct knowledges and practices associated with colonialism, of which objectification, classification and the impulse to chart or map have been prominent. The prospect of 'exploring' postcolonial geographies that is promised in the title is intentionally contradictory and ironic. Therefore, like calls for a postcolonial history (for example,

Chakrabarty, 1992), any postcolonial geography 'must realise within itself its own impossibility', given that geography is inescapably marked (both philosophically and institutionally) by its location and development as a western-colonial science. It may be the case that western geography bears the traces of other knowledges (see Sidaway, 1997) but the convoluted course of geography, its norms, definitions and closure (inclusions and exclusions) and structure cannot be disassociated from certain European philosophical concepts of presence, order and intelligibility. Feminist and poststructuralist critiques may have sometimes undermined these from within, but they could never credibly claim to be *straightforwardly* outside or beyond those institutions and assumptions that have rooted geography amongst the advance-guard of a wider 'western' epistemology, deeply implicated in colonial-imperial power.

I begin with some reconsideration of different and diverse demarcations of the postcolonial. The focus on diversity necessarily leads (in section II) to critical consideration of ways that societies may be described as postcolonial (in the sense of formal independence) but experience or exercise continued neocolonial or imperial power and/or contain their own internal colonies (as indicated so vividly on Boston's 'Freedom trail'). So the initial mapping of the varied and complicated senses of postcolonialism also becomes a review of neocolonialism, internal colonialism and imperialism. Whilst this is a selective and inevitably limited tour through overwhelmingly English-language academic sources, section III returns briefly to the (im)possibility and promise of some other kinds of postcolonial geographies.

2 (Re)demarcations of the postcolonial

For Arif Dirlik (1994: 329), the term 'postcolonial' is: 'the most recent entrant to achieve prominent visibility in the ranks of those "post" marked words (seminal among them, postmodernism) that serve as signposts in(to) contemporary cultural criticism.' Already something of an intellectual and publishing phenomenon, it has come to be deployed in a variety of ways. In the introduction to a *Postcolonial studies reader*, Ashcroft *et al*. (1995: 2) point out that: 'the increasingly unfocused use of the term "post-colonial" over the last ten years to describe an astonishing variety of cultural, economic and political practices has meant that there is a danger of it losing effective meaning altogether.' But rather than fearing excess or loss, perhaps we should celebrate the open constellation of meanings associated with a term that crops up in academic writings, journalism and literature. A few examples follow.

In a review of the latest novel by the (UK-based) Zanzabari writer Abdulrazak Gurnah, Maya Jaggi (1996: 11) notes how 'The novel's outrage at the "petty hardships" of African shortages and blocked toilets, and its satire on obscenely self-serving leaders, is uncompromising. Yet Gurnah is acutely aware of the hazards of raging against post-colonial Africa'. Similarly, in a newspaper article article about conflict in Northern Ireland, Robert Fisk (1994: 7) referred to the formation in the 1970s of 'a power-sharing "executive" in Belfast endorsed by London and Dublin which proved to be as fragile as those other post-colonial power-sharing governments in Cyprus and Lebanon'.

Northern Ireland may be a particularly ambiguous case (of which more below), but in the references to Cyprus, Lebanon and Africa, Fisk and Jaggi are using the term 'post-colonial' to signify a particular form of state or society – one which is a *successor* to (yet

derives some of its parameters from) colonialism. Sometimes too this is broadened to refer, in a related fashion, to the 'post-colonizers'. For example, when Anna Marie Smith (1994: 14) refers to the fact that 'When [the racist British politician Enoch] Powell campaigned against black immigration in the late 1960s and early 1970s, and when Thatcher successfully translated an unnecessary and distant military skirmish [in the Falklands/Malvinas] into legitimation for her domestic policies, both figures were addressing Britain's postcolonial condition'.

Elsewhere, however, the term postcolonial is being granted a rather different (though related) application. For Stephen Sleman (1991: 3):

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

Yet until comparatively recently, postcolonial has usually been used to describe a condition, referring to peoples, states and societies that have been through a process of formal decolonization. This is what Fisk or Jaggi denote in the quotations above, or roughly what Alavi (1972) was seeking to describe in an agenda-setting essay on 'The state in post-colonial societies'.[1] Until the later part of the 1980s these were the most frequent uses of the term. However, the quotation from Sleman provides an example of the way that postcolonial is also used to signify aesthetic, political and theoretical perspectives (which have mostly been elaborated in literary and cultural theory). In these senses, postcolonial approaches are committed to critique, expose, deconstruct, counter and (in some claims) to transcend, the cultural and broader ideological legacies and presences of imperialism. In literary criticism this has meant rereading the 'canonical' texts to reveal how the backdrop of colonial power and its social and 'racial' relations are variously diffused through, structure and frame them, even those that may appear on the surface to have nothing to do with issues of empire or colonialism. More specifically, however, it is also about the possibility and methods of hearing or recovering the experiences of the colonized (in literary terms, to broaden the range of texts that are studied to include more contributions representing the experiences of colonized peoples).

This later set of meanings (though with significant precedents in earlier anti-colonial politics and writings) are arguably the most challenging and potentially significant for the content and nature of cultural and academic production, as recent surveys such as Williams and Chrisman (1993); Pieterse and Parekh (1995); Hall (1996); Rattansi (1997) and Loomba (1998) have argued. However, such challenges will be conducted against a set of longer-established issues, topics and political debates about an historical-geographical condition of postcolonialism. The latter, more 'traditional' senses of postcolonialism deserve a re-airing and reassessment, particularly in the context of a widely shared sense of a shifting world order.

The relative amnesia regarding the 'old' debates about postcolonial states and politics in the 1970s has been noted in a recent article by Aijaz Ahmad (1995: 1), who expresses: 'a peculiar sense of *déjà vu*, even a degree of fatigue' on coming across the current discussions of postcolonialism in the domain of *literary* theory in so much as the 'term resurfaces in literary theory, without even a trace of memory' of earlier debates about

the conditions of postcolonial states. Ahmad overstates the amnesia – for many in literary theory are all to well aware of those prior (and continuing) discussions. However, at times the two sets of uses of the term do appear to follow separate tracks. This essay insists on linking (or at least juxtaposing) them and, in recognizing that, in Shohat and Stam's (1994: 41) words:

> It is not that one conceptual frame is 'wrong' and the other 'right', but rather that each frame only partly illuminates the issues. We can use them as part of a more mobile set of grids, a more flexible set of disciplinary and cross-cultural lenses adequate to the complex politics of contemporary location, while maintaining openings for agency and resistance.

Given the breadth (and evident complexity) of such an agenda, section II can do no more than serve as a selective review, and as set of suggestions and pointers. I am acutely aware that a whole series of issues (for example, that of diasporic geographies) remain either underspecified or are barely touched upon here (see Cohen, 1995, for suggestions). Nor are gendered differences in the experiences of and literature about postcolonialism given systematic consideration here (for which Yuval-Davis, 1997, is suggestive). However, as already noted there can be no simple or singular format for the kind of exercises this article conducts. Therefore the resulting contrasts between different treatments of the 'postcolonial', both within this article and between its presentations and those of other texts, should be seen as a potential source of analytical departures, debates and reconceptualizations.

II Postcolonial geographies: mapping postcolonialisms

> There is always a certain amount of reduction in any attempt to simplify, schematise or summarise complex debates and histories, and the study of colonialism is especially vulnerable to such problems on account of colonialism's heterogeneous practices and impact over the past four centuries (Loomba, 1998: xiii).

> . . . colonialism's culture should not be seen as a singular enduring discourse, but rather as a series of projects that incorporate representations, narratives and practical efforts. Although competing colonizing visions at particular times often shared a good deal, as the racist discourses of one epoch superficially resembled those of others, these projects are best understood as strategic reformulations and revaluations of prior discourses, determined by their historical, political and cultural contexts . . . (Thomas, 1994: 171).

1 Multiple postcolonial conditions

a Colonialisms, quasi-colonialisms, neocolonialisms: In an abundantly suggestive essay, first published in 1992, Anne McClintock insisted on the need to be careful *not* to use the term postcolonial as though it described a single condition, a plea echoed in Loomba's (1998) more recent text cited above. Loomba (1998: 6) goes on to describe how:

> . . . imperialism, colonialism and the differences between them are defined differently depending on their historical mutations. One useful way of distinguishing between them might be to not separate them in temporal but in spatial terms and to think of imperialism or neo-imperialism as the phenomenon that originates in the metropolis, the process which leads to domination or control. Its result, or what happens in the colonies as a consequence of imperial domination is colonialism or neocolonialism.

I will draw upon some of the arguments of her book and McClintock's essay as basic departure points, taking up a number of the issues they raise about the multiplicity of

postcolonial conditions. In this respect McClintock (1992: 87) describes postcolonialism as 'unevenly developed' globally. In her terms: 'Argentina, formally independent of imperial Spain for over a century and a half, is not "postcolonial" in the same way as Hong Kong (destined to be independent of Britain only in 1997). Nor is Brazil "post-colonial" in the same way as Zimbabwe.'

Furthermore she draws attention to complications presented by those societies which were subject to imperial power, but not *formal* colonies. This is true for much of China (though to add to the complexity it was divided into quasi-colonial spheres of influence and fell into the domain of the Japanese empire[2]). Certainly places such as Anatolia and Persia, Ethiopia, the interior of Arabia, Afghanistan, Thailand and Tibet disrupt any conception of the south as essentially postcolonial. It should be added that the colonial epoch is not by any means *the* defining feature of other societies with longer historical trajectories. India and China spring first to mind, but the point is valid much more widely. In this respect, writing about the treatment of South American histories, Harris (1995: 20) points out that one of consequences of the increased recognition in the social sciences and humanities of the importance of colonialism has been 'to reinforce the self-importance of Europeans'. What she means by this is that other histories which do not see the coming of the Europeans as an historical axis on which 'pre' and 'post' colonial periods can be constructed are further marginalized. This paradox (which has been recognized by others, including McClintock, 1992) leads Harris (1995: 20) to conclude that:

> My argument is not that we should dismiss the coming of the whites in historical analysis, but recognise that usually this moment is treated not as a historical fact with consequences that must be investigated inductively, but as a transcendental event upon whose axis history is created, a rupture from which fundamental categories of periodisation and identity are derived.

The status of the post-Soviet and post-Yugoslav republics and, for that matter, European states which have succeeded empire in the twentieth century (such as Albania or Ireland) raises some further complex problematics. I should also mention here, in passing, that much of Europe has, at one time or another, been subject to imperial rule (Hapsburg, Ottoman, English, French and, briefly, Italian Fascism and German Nazism). More widely, Robert Bartlett's (1994: 3) account of conquest, colonization and cultural change in medieval Europe contains an analysis of 'English colonialism in the Celtic world, the movement of Germans into Eastern Europe, the Spanish Reconquest and the activities of crusaders and colonists in the eastern Mediterranean'.

Bartlett (1994: 313–14) claims to demonstrate:

> Conquest, colonization, Christianization: the techniques of settling in a new land, the ability to maintain cultural identity through legal forms and nurtured attitudes, the institutions and outlook required to confront the strange or abhorrent, to repress it and live with it, the law and religion as well as the guns and ships. The European Christians who sailed to the coasts of the Americas, Asia and Africa in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries came from a society that was already a colonizing society. Europe, the initiator of one of the world's major processes of conquest, colonization and cultural transformation, was also the product of one.

Such legacies reverberate throughout the textures (and theme) of 'Europe' (see Halperin, 1997). Yet, Gibraltar and Northern Ireland aside, imperialism and colonialism in Europe have recently been most obvious or evident in the contemporary 'Balkan wars'. Writing of former Yugoslavia, Neil Smith (1994: 492) therefore notes how:

> Yugoslavia presents an interesting entrée in any discussion of geography and empire. First it resides in Europe, generally accepted to be the font of imperial ambition in recent centuries, yet it finds itself a casualty of empire. Secondly it lies on the edge of European and Asian imperia, its original nationhood resulting as much from the defeat of the Ottoman as from the Hapsburg empire. More recently, the genocidal implosion of Yugoslavia was precipitated by the collapse of the Soviet empire. And further, the ethnic cleansing of Sarajevo and Gorazade is in large part about the nostalgic reassertion of a nineteenth-century Serbian empire.

An influential strain of debate and analysis has stressed the way that the political and ecclesiastical fractures from the days of the Roman imperia coincide with significant lines of fragmentation in the contemporary Balkans. So it is with some reluctance (but a certain relief) that, given the limited problematic of this essay, I must leave aside more direct consideration of premodern empires. However some connecting threads do inevitably crop up, to the extent they also figure in our times – in all kinds of spectres, 'revivals' and invented 'traditions' which make quasi-mythical uses of 'the past'.

Returning however to the comparative themes raised by Russian–Soviet 'imperial' strategy, it can be argued that the Soviet successor states are symptomatic of postcolonial states more widely. Of course it is notable that it has long been amongst the *raison d'êtres* of western 'Sovietology' to demonstrate that the USSR was merely the latest form of great-Russian imperialism. Two 'classic' examples by British commentators are Seton-Watson (1961) and Conquest (1962). Both these impassioned polemics against Soviet/Russian imperialism register (or attempt) a certain *displacement* of a north–south geopolitics of decolonization on to an east–west cold-war axis. The script is roughly as follows: Britain and other west Europeans are now good decolonizers, Russia cynically backs third-world liberation whilst continuing to exercise its own imperialism. Russian colonialism is therefore the real imperial force in the 1960s: not at all the west. Such claims are made just a few years after the British–French–Israeli intervention at Suez (and whilst Britain was still an imperial force to be reckoned with in the 'Middle East') and at a moment when the US intervention in Vietnam was gearing up. A variation of this script was also produced by commentators in other European powers in the 1960s and 1970s, notably in France during the Algerian war and in fascist-colonial Portugal (see Sidaway, 1999). Yet, like many cold war clichés, these charges of 'Soviet imperialism' reflected (albeit in a distorted and one-dimensional manner) something of the experiences of Soviet governance. In more recent times, Roman Szporluk (1994) is one of a number of observers to consider the imperial, postimperial or postcolonial elements of the Soviet successor states. He prudently argues that the new postcolonial or postimperial status does not define politics in the former USSR, for the much debated 'transition' from state socialism combined with (formal) 'democratization' are registered as more significant elements of the current conjuncture. However, for Szporluk (1994: 27), the peoples of the former USSR are 'facing the dual task of coming to terms with the legacy of the communist "counterparadigm of modernity" and their imperial legacy. [And that:] These issues are not easily separated, although the difference is clear enough'.

There is no scope here for much further consideration of the relevant historical trajectories and literature concerning them.[3] However, a feature that is particularly evident in the non-Russian territories of the former USSR, but which is also paradigmatic (though to enormously variable degrees) for other postcolonial states, deserves further comment. This concerns the way that the (imperial) processes of the USSR were *constitutive* of nationalities – and of those broader apparatuses of governance which were

destined to become the post-Soviet states. In the USSR this took a particular format, through the 'Leninist' nationalities policy and Stalin's highly arbitrary application of it. Therefore, the Soviet Union was not simply a project of imperial Russification (even though this was always significant) nor simply an alternative (noncapitalist) modernity. The USSR certainly embodied these things. But, critically, it was also a system for managing multiple ethnicities and the inheritance of a dynastic realm. This procedure included the granting of titular nationality to its non-Russians and a formal federal structure. Once Soviet power weakened these provided the units which became the new states.

It is true many of these units date back, in very loose terms, to before the establishment of the Russian empire. But their particular *configuration* was overdetermined by the imperial and Soviet experiences (and reactions to them). 'Postcolonial' Tajikistan or Armenia, and other Soviet successor states, thereby share a key feature with those longer-established 'postcolonial' states of south and southeast Asia, Africa and Latin America. This concerns the extent to which basic 'structures' (including formal boundaries) and a good deal in their political configuration have emerged out of the colonial experiences, whilst not being simply reducible to outcomes of colonialism.

Having said this, proper recognition of the enormously complex relations (which, as is in the nature of such things, operate simultaneously on several different levels) between resistances to and complicities with the colonial is also essential. In this context, Said (1993) insists that colonial discourses frequently overlook resistances and rebellions that accompany colonialism. Yet it is these that allow for postcolonialism in most instances. In a series of articles on this theme, Homi Bhabha (brought together in Bhabha, 1990) has shown the coupling or co-presence of 'colonial' and 'anti-colonial' discourses. Bhabha's work is notoriously dense – and it does not make for an easy read. However, though he writes at a sometimes frustrating level of abstraction, Bhabha confronts the combined 'ambivalence, mimicry and hybridity' of 'anti-colonial' subjectivities (and movements). Therefore, even if as Robert Young (1990: 156) has remarked, 'as he enacts what he describes, at times Bhabha's discourse becomes as incalculable and difficult to place as the colonial subject itself', Bhabha's works do serve to move us beyond some of the earlier *oversimplifications* that tended to characterize a previous generation of critical psychoanalytical and political studies of colonial situations and anti-colonial movements.

b Internal colonialisms: Adding to such messy complexities is the necessity for any critical 'mapping' of postcolonialisms to take into account a variety of contemporary internal colonialisms and colonial occupations. In McClintock's (1992: 88) polemical words:

> Currently, China keeps its colonial grip on Tibet's throat, as does Indonesia on East Timor, Israel on the Occupied Territories and the West Bank, and Britain on Northern Ireland. Since 1915, South Africa has kept its colonial boot on Namibia's soil . . . Israel remains in partial occupation of Lebanon and Syria, as does Turkey of Cyprus. [Therefore] None of these countries can, with justice, be called 'post-colonial'.

Indeed, 'internal colonialisms' are virtually a characteristic of state formation and as such have generated a substantial (and quite influential) literature beyond Latin America where commentators first drew systematic attention to the appearance of this form of colonial relation (see Kay, 1989). Therefore, in addition to the deployment of the

concept to refer to the structural position of African-Americans (Carmichael and Hamilton, 1967) and Native Americans (Garrity, 1980; Churchill and LaDuke, 1992), works such as Michael Hechter's (1975) study of *Internal colonialism: the Celtic fringe in British national development, 1536–1966* have developed and reapplied the analytical category of the 'internal colony'. Hechter's book did not pass unnoticed by geographers (Williams, 1977; Rogerson, 1980; Drakakis-Smith and Williams, 1983, for example) and it has also influenced later critical political studies of the UK (even if as a position to contest) such as Tom Nairn's (1977) brilliant study of the morphology of the British state. Thinking about internal colonialisms also requires consideration of the ways that colonial categories and discourses are reimported into the wider politics of the metropolitan powers, where they then crop up in racist discourses and practices as well as disseminating into other images of, for example, the unruly classes (or the nonwhite 'inner city') as some kind of 'uncivilized', 'dark' forces beyond some imagined 'urban frontier'.

More specifically, however, the words of the Kurdish writer Ismet Sheriff Vanly (1993: 189) poignantly express the (multiple) tragedies of many 'internal colonialisms':

> Within the artificial frontiers inherited from imperialism, many Third World states practise a 'poor people's colonialism'. It is directed against often sizeable minorities, and is both more ferocious and more harmful than the classical type. The effects of economic exploitation are aggravated by an almost total absence of local development and by a level of national oppression fuelled by chauvinism and unrestrained by the democratic traditions which in the past usually limited the more extreme forms of injustice under the old colonialism.

We might reasonably question Vanly's notion that these internal colonialisms are really 'more ferocious' or 'unrestrained' than, for example, French counterinsurgency in Algeria or German settler-colonialism in Namibia. Nor are such internal colonialisms unrelated to the 'machinations' of, for example, US strategy which has aided some such occupations as part of its wider system of alliances (for example, in the cases of Indonesia in East Timor; Israel in Gaza, the West Bank and southern Lebanon; and Turkey in northern Cyprus). More will be said below of this US role.

At this point, I will simply reiterate the striking way that grisly processes of internal colonialism have evolved in a number of avowedly 'postcolonial' states. In the more severe cases, 'postcolonial' states have, almost at their 'founding moments' (a moment that cannot be contained, nor separated from that which precedes it and which is always being re-enacted by independence days, constitutional amendments and the like as well as the presence of so many signs and signatures of independence, flags, seals, anthems and so on), felt it necessary to deny the existence of minorities or to expel or murder large numbers of them, and subject their lands, culture and society to the enduring mode of internal colonialism of the kind that Vanly denounces.

The Turkish case deserves special comment, if only for reasons of its historical primacy. Turkey was never formally colonized by outside powers, but as the Ottoman empire terminally weakened, Anatolia was about to be dismembered by the European powers. At this moment and under the *Ittihat ve Teraki Cemiyeti* (Committee of Union and Progress) the decaying empire sought to convert itself into a simulacra of a modern state, committing perhaps the first large-scale twentieth-century genocide (in 1915–16) against its Armenian minority and expounding *Türkçülük* (pan-Turkism) (see Landau, 1995). After 1923, under the 'bonapartist' Mustafa Kemal Atatürk some of the area cleared of Armenians thenceforth became a de facto internal colony of the new Turkish

'national-state' with a subject Kurdish population. Lest this paragraph be misinterpreted as some kind of singling out of Turkey, I will add that this early example of 'ethnic cleansing' has since become one of the first examples of what turns out to be a much more universal phenomenon, a model not only for the Holocaust, but also (on a smaller and less total scale of course) especially pronounced in other 'national-states' that succeeded the multinational Ottoman empire.

c Break-away settler colonialisms: However, many contemporary internal colonialisms are associated with the settler colonization which prevails in break-away settler colonies. These are distinguished by their formal independence from the founding metropolitan country, thus *displacing* 'colonial' control from the metropolis to the colony itself. For McClintock (1992: 89): 'The United States, South Africa, Australia, Canada and New Zealand remain . . . break away settler colonies that have not undergone decolonization, nor with the exception of South Africa, are they likely to in the near future.'

The historical achievement of the Zionist movement is also a special case of this. Israel therefore shares some key features of other colonial-settler states, notably a frontier/pioneer mentality and dispossession of an indigenous population, whilst not being simply reducible to such a category (see Rodinson, 1973). As Edward Said (1979: 68–69) notes:

> In many instances . . . there is an unmistakable coincidence between the experiences of Arab Palestinians at the hands of Zionism and the experiences of those black, yellow, and brown people who were described as inferior and subhuman by nineteenth-century imperialists. For although it coincided with an era of the most virulent Western anti-Semitism, Zionism also coincided with the period of unparalleled European territorial acquisition in Africa and Asia, and it was as part of this general movement of acquisition and occupation that Zionism was launched initially by Theodor Herzl.

In Zionist discourse, the Palestinian Arab therefore occupies an analogous place to the 'native' in other colonial discourses:

> The Arabs were seen as synonymous with everything degraded, fearsome, irrational, and brutal. Institutions whose humanistic and social (even socialist) inspiration were manifest for Jews – the Kibbutz, the Law of Return, various facilities for the acculturation of immigrants – were precisely, determinedly inhuman for the Arabs. In his [*sic*] body and being, and in the putative emotions and psychology assigned to him, the Arab expressed whatever by definition stood *outside*, *beyond* Zionism (Said, 1979: 88).

However, it is the USA that is probably the most striking example of a break-away colonial settler society, given its rise to the position of a hegemonic power in the twentieth century, long after the original break-away colonies had themselves annexed a continent, parts of the Caribbean and Central America and a swathe of the Pacific. As was noted in the introduction, the status of the USA and its relationship to postcolonialism is much debated. For some it is the USA as a postcolonial society that is most evident (rather than its persistent internal colonies or contemporary imperial power). This view is perhaps most explicit in Ashcroft *et al*.'s (1989) *The empire writes back: theory and practice in post-colonial literatures* – a book which has done much to promote a claim for the analytic utility of the term postcolonial in literary and cultural studies. In their vision:

> Perhaps because of its current position of power, and the neocolonizing role it has played, its postcolonial nature has not been generally recognized. But its relationship with the metropolitan centre as it evolved over the last two centuries has been paradigmatic for postcolonial literatures everywhere. What each of these literatures have

> in common beyond their special and distinctive regional characteristics is that they emerged in their present form out of the experience of colonization and asserted themselves by foregrounding the tension with the imperial power, and by emphasizing their differences from the assumptions of the imperial centre. It is this which makes them distinctively post-colonial (Ashcroft *et al.*, 1989: 2).

This may be so. However, for an alternative reading, see Kaplan and Pease's (1993) collection on *Cultures of United States imperialism*. The latter collection indicates how things become rather complex, given that the USA itself becomes an imperial centre on a scale the world has never before seen.

More will be said concerning this later, where I concentrate on the analysis of imperialisms. However at this point it is vital to note that, beyond the USA and Canada,[4] the other states of the Americas also represent evolutions[5] of settler colonies, not least in terms of the political hegemony exercised in a number of Latin American states by predominantly white elites. There is an enormous variation between the southern cone countries (Argentina, Chile, Uruguay) that may be characterized as (largely white) break-away settler colonies, where the indigenous population has been largely exterminated, and those countries where the majority indigenous populations (Peru,[6] Bolivia, Paraguay and Guatemala, for example) are governed by white-dominated and highly militarized states. Moreover, a closer look at the class and racial hierarchies within different Latin American societies indicates a very considerable variation in extent and formats of exclusion, domination, hegemony, 'mixing' [*mestizae*] and specificity, which defies simple generalization.

Perhaps the sharpest case of such domination, and therefore a good one to focus on, is the recent trajectory of 'postcolonial' Guatemala, where over 150 000 people have died in political violence (mostly victims of state and quasi-state powers) in the past 40 years. The violent format of Guatemala's recent history is understandable only through reference to the interactions of local reaction and wider neocolonial relations that exist between Guatemala and the USA. The result of this sinister mix is (as elsewhere in Meso-America) captured well in the words of Victor Perera (1992), who refers to an *Unfinished conquest*. Perera's argument is that the conquest of the Maya peoples of Meso-America is not a singular event that happened 500 years ago. Rather than being a distant (if not forgotten) historical event, 'conquest' is an ongoing process (cf. Noam Chomsky's text of the following year, entitled *Year 501: the conquest continues*). Perera's account might be seen as exaggerated by some who are not familiar with modern Guatemalan politics. But this thesis bears reading against some passages which lie buried in the middle of James Dunkerley's weighty *Political history of modern Central America*. Dunkerley (1988: 430–31) has noted that:

> From the autumn of 1966, when the campaign was first fully implemented the people of Guatemala were subjected to a policy of systematic state violence. This has certainly evidenced fluctuations, acquiring particular ferocity in 1966–68, 1970–73 and 1978–84, but it has been far more prolonged than in either El Salvador or Nicaragua and cannot simply be treated as the reaction of a regime in extremis. It is estimated that since 1954 no less than 100,000 people have died as a result of political violence, and whilst perhaps half of this number have been killed since 1978, the political culture of assassination and massacre was established much earlier . . . the great majority of those killed were not caucasian, middle-class and European in culture; they were 'Indian', indigenous Americans who if they speak Spanish at all do so only as a second or third language, adhere resolutely to their autochonous culture and appear both physically and in their tangible 'otherness' to be oriental.

All this flowed logically from the US-supported counterinsurgency regimes since the (US-directed) overthrow of the leftist-nationalist Arbenez government in 1954. The co-

ordinator of a vast (3400 page) UN-directed investigation, which was commissioned following 1997 Guatemalan peace accords and formation of a 'Government of National Unity', commented that:

> In no other Latin American country have there been registered as many cases of violations of human rights as here [the report documents 150 000 deaths, 45 000 disappeared and over one million displaced, with over 90% of the killing perpetrated by the armed forces]. According to the statistics, Guatemala is ahead of all (cited in Rico, 1999: 3, my translation).

That the Guatemalan counter-revolution provided 'a model for US destabilization and intervention in the region, being followed by other instances – the Bay of Pigs (1961); invasion of the Dominican Republic (1965); Chile (1973); Grenada (1983); and the campaign against Sandinista Nicaragua – which made it part of a larger and wider pattern' (Dunkerley, 1988: 429), also gives Guatemala a singular place in the history of contemporary US imperial power in the Americas. Thus, as Walter Mignolo (1996: 685, my translation) has noted, the Latin American experience of 'postcolonialism' has been 'characterized by the tension between the loosening of a decadent colonialism [originating in Iberia] and the emergence of a new type of imperial colonialism emerging from the first independence movement in the Americas [i.e., the USA]'.

The case of US power in the rest of the Americas, or for that matter the roles of Australia in the Pacific or of South Africa in Namibia, also serves to indicate how break-away settler colonies (in one sense 'postcolonial') themselves may become various imperial or 'subimperial' powers (see Marini, 1972; Simon, 1991; Zirken, 1994).

It is above all the various forms of such contemporary neocolonialisms, imperialisms and subimperialisms that allow McClintock (1992: 89) to stress that:

> Since the 1940's, the United State's imperialism-without-colonies has taken a number of distinct forms (military, political, economic and cultural), some concealed, some half-concealed . . . It is precisely the greater subtlety, innovation and variety of these forms of imperialism that makes the historical rupture implied by the term 'postcolonial' especially unwarranted.

Others have made similar criticisms. Miyoshi (1993: 750), for example, argues that 'Ours . . . is not an age of *post*colonialism but of intensified colonialism, even though it is under an unfamiliar guise'.

Yet such lamentations of the limits to postcolonialism tend to leave the theorization of (contemporary) imperialism relatively underdeveloped, usually invoking it simply as a limiting factor that renders incredible and untenable the straightforward assertion that today's is a postcolonial world. The complex social relations and ideologies of contemporary imperialism therefore deserve further critical reflection.

2 Theorizing contemporary imperialisms

a A renewed culture of imperialism?: Something of contemporary western imperialism is evident in some of the international events of the 1980s and 1990s, most notably the Gulf war and the US interventions in Grenada, Panama, Somalia and Haiti. Whatever the manifold complexities (let alone the rights and wrongs) of these engagements, from one vantage point, that is in terms of the asymmetry of the technological level of forces pitted against each other, these new western interventions bear considerable resemblance to classic nineteenth-century colonial wars[7].

Reflecting on this, some observers (e.g., Callinicos *et al*., 1994; Furedi, 1994) speak of a 'revived', or 'new' *ideology of imperialism*. Furedi (1994: 99) sees 'the emergence of a new more overt Western imperial rhetoric' in the 1990s as:

> the product of three separate but mutually reinforcing causes . . . the failure of what has been called Third Worldism [specifically the crisis of a number of postcolonial states, itself a complex affair very much tied to imperial legacies and cold-war weapons flows] . . . the emergence of a conservative intellectual climate, which is the product of the decline of other social experiments . . . [and] . . . the end of the Cold War, which has removed one of the major restraints on Western intervention.

Furedi's argument is focused on what he sees as the renewal and reinvigoration of cultures of imperialism amongst the European powers. However it also echoes many of the themes in Chomsky's (1991) earlier account of post-cold-war US foreign policy. Even allowing for a degree of polemic in such arguments, there is an undeniable sense in which the combination of such facts as the end of the peculiar 'stability' of the cold war, the weakening of some third-worldist nationalisms and the violent trajectory of some 'postcolonial' societies (perhaps epitomized by Lebanon in the 1980s and by Angola, Afghanistan, Liberia, Sierra Leone, Somalia and Rwanda in the 1990s) provided the frame for a certain rehabilitation of what may be labelled 'imperial temperament'. Traces of this temperament can also be found in many social science representations of the 'third world', particularly of Africa, be they political science and international relations texts (see Doty, 1996) or basic geography textbooks (see Mitchell and Smith, 1991). In such representations, 'third world' states are frequently seen to lack the putative presence and self-identity of western statehood. In a schema that has deep colonial lineages, the south is read through a western lens and seen as suffering from *lack* of the vigour and conduct which originates in and finds its full development only in the West. Doty (1996: 162) comments on the perpetuation of this discourse as:

> . . . a sort of cultural unconscious that always comes back to the presumption, generally unstated, especially in more recent texts, of different kinds of human beings with different capacities and perhaps different worth and value. 'We' of the West are not inefficient, corrupt, or dependent on a benevolent international society for our existence. 'We' are the unquestioned upholders of human rights. 'We' attained positions of privilege and authority as a result of our capacities. 'We' of the West are different from 'them.' 'Their' fate could not befall 'us.' 'They' can succeed only if 'they' become more like 'us.' These intertexts begin with the presupposition of a clear and unambiguous boundary between 'us' and 'them,' between the North and the South, between 'real states' and quasi states.' They thus disallow the possibility that rather than being independent and autonomous entities, these oppositions are mutually constitutive of each other.

In other words, that the apparent violence or 'failure' or 'weakness' of select 'third world' states is inseparable from the historical and contemporary role and reproduction of the west is thereby obscured.

Yet it should be added that recognition of the ongoing presence of imperial motives/motifs or practices is not in itself the end of the analytical problems, as any serious engagement with the literature and debates about imperialism will reveal. There is, of course, a long history of polemics about the causes, forms and consequences of imperialism (see Brewe, 1980, and, for a geographical reading, Blaut, 1975). Within the Marxist tradition alone, the disagreement is such that Arrighi (1978: 17) could claim that the Marxian theory of imperialism had become 'a tower of babel'. However such debates are by no means of antiquarian interest and deserve some reconsideration in contemporary circumstances.

b Beyond ultraimperialism?: Within radical theorizations of imperialism, the main lines of difference have long been between what became known as 'Leninist' arguments that interimperialist conflict was an inevitable part of the logic of twentieth-century capitalism, and those of Kautsky (1970, originally published in 1914), who saw the prospects for an ultra-imperialism which involved 'cartelization of foreign policy' whereby leading powers jointly and co-operatively govern the periphery. The interimperialist conflicts of 1914–18 and 1939–45, and the elevation of Lenin's polemics to the status of quasi-sacred gospel in the USSR and the international communist movement, meant that Kautsky's ideas were marginalized. At least, that is, until the growth of multinational capital in the 1960s and 1970s led a number of Marxists to return to Kautsky (for example, Sklar, 1976). Whilst, at the same time, others claimed to detect a new phase of interimperialist rivalry in the rise of Japan, the EEC and the eclipse of US hegemony (Mandel, 1975; Rowthorn, 1975; Kaldor, 1978). More recently, a valuable survey which considers these issues in the new context of a post-cold-war world is made in articles and debates contained in a special issue of *Radical History Review* (1993, Volume 23) under the title of 'Imperialism: a useful category of analysis?' In these articles a variety of commentators (the broadest scope is provided by Haynes, 1993) again revisit the concepts of ultra-imperialism first formulated by Kautsky. As has been noted, the notion of ultra-imperialism holds that co-ordination between states and multinational capital will produce a global ultra-imperial system which will displace interimperialist contest and by the 1970s, some had argued that since 1945, the role of multinational companies combined with the balance of power produced via the International Monetary Fund (IMF) and World Bank made for just such an ultra-imperialism.

However, whilst Haynes and others writing in *Radical History Review* wish to rehabilitate and rework Kautsky's ideas, as they indicate, the evolution of the global polity during the past 30 years has extended a system of governance and international financial regulation which can neither be captured by versions of the classical Leninist theory of imperialism,[8] nor by theories of ultra-imperialism, even if they may point the way. As Lipietz (1987: 48) has reminded us, both these sets of theorizations were 'developed in a context of a specific historical reality: predominantly extensive accumulation and competitive regulation in the first countries undertaking capitalist industrial revolution'.

He suggests a way forward through the critical study of transnational (capitalist) regulation. It is notable that Aglietta (1979) in his original formulation of regulation theory was not systematically able to consider the significance of imperialism. 'An ambiguous notion not studied in this work' (1979: 29) is how he referred to it. And ever since (and despite Lipietz's, 1987, efforts) the variety of imperial and colonial relations have tended to remain as relative blind spots within the otherwise vibrant literatures on capitalist regulation. Yet work influenced by regulation theories has indicated how the contemporary system of transnational power might be thought of as manifesting itself as a kind of *phantom state* (Thrift and Leyshon, 1994) of global governance constituted out of the nexus between powers of multinational companies and international finance and the core formal regulatory structures, notably the IMF and the World Bank. There is another echo here of Kautsky.

The IMF and World Bank have become the subject of an already prodigious critical literature on the framework for and impact of so called 'structural adjustment' (see

Mosley, *et al*., 1991; George and Sabelli, 1994, for an indication of the relevant literatures). However, they are just one aspect (though perhaps a particularly important one) of what Graham Smith (1994: 63) termed 'the specific non-national character [of today's imperialisms], associated in particular with the growth of transnational and supranational institutions'.

Not only is this irreducible to a single story (see Gibson-Graham, 1998; Kayatekin and Ruccio, 1998), but the geographies of such transnational powers (by the very nature of their highly dynamic and multiform natures) are perhaps rather more difficult to specify than that of classical imperial systems. Referring to a 'new hegemony of transnational liberalism', Agnew and Corbridge (1995: 205) describe a system that is 'both polycentric and expansionist, and possibly unstable (in some respects)'.

In fact the instability is not just possible, but very evident. To take just one example, something of what this instability amounts to and how it may be related to (or read as) a kind of ultra-imperialism may be detected in the course of the unfolding 'Asian crisis'. The roots of the dramatic collapse in 1997–98 of certain southeast Asian economies (most notably those of Thailand, South Korea and Indonesia) cannot be separated from the operation of western-led 'transnational liberalism', specifically the financial system. Although the causes are complex, no precise analysis can ignore the roles of western and Japanese financial capital. Scripting these (and other) countries as 'emerging markets', western and Japanese investors sought high returns through new overseas lending and equity investment. In turn local banks in the southeast Asian countries translated such hard-currency capital into domestic lending to local companies, as well as speculative land and property investments. Like the boom in Japan itself, these speculative movements proved impossible to sustain.

Whilst the western-led IMF and World Bank tend to present the resulting crisis as a result of 'regulatory failure' or 'lack of transparency', this obscures the closely combined roles of international capital flow and local agency. At the same time, the IMF and the related nexus of finance gains increased power to shape the trajectory of these societies via the crisis and the conditions associated with its bail-outs. Although the process has not been straightforward or uncontested, IMF conditions place the greater part of the burden of coping on the most deeply affected societies. Adjustment formulas involve cuts in government spending (including public education, health and social programmes) and sharply upward moves in interest rates. Such adjustment aims to 'stabilize' the economies and currencies, so as to facilitate debt service (which is denominated in hard currency). The responsibility and obligation to make adjustments are placed wholly on the borrowers. Indeed the ways that adjustment lifts remaining capital controls, opens financial markets and requires increased western surveillance further entrenches 'transnational liberalism' or variants of it. The point is not that accusations of corruption and waste, evident in the designation of the southeast Asian economies as marked by 'crony capitalism', are wrong, but that such conditions are inseparably part of a theme in which the west, through earlier and contemporary presences, is profoundly implicated. Indeed the whole discourse of 'emerging markets' which had been promoted by western-led financial institutions (in tandem with the World Bank, financial media and elites in certain of the states receiving inflows of speculative investment) can be read as a contemporary reformulation of colonial idioms or at least as representing another embodiment of the latter in an avowedly 'postcolonial' world (see Sidaway and Pryke, 2000).

III Postcolonial geographies: not on any map

> Or again, instead of trying to define the other ('What is he?'), I turn to myself: 'What do I want, wanting to know you? What would happen if I decided to define you as a force and not as a person? And if I were to situate myself as another force confronting yours?' This would happen: my other would be defined solely by the suffering or the pleasure he affords me (Roland Barthes, 1990: 135).

Postcolonial theories have been described as 'an attempt to transcend in rhetoric what has not been transcended in substance' (Ryan, 1994: 82). But despite the kinds of substantial limits specified above, such rejection concedes too much. For a start, 'rhetoric' and 'substance' are too closely mixed up, as has been shown in a wide range of poststructuralist literatures, to which in turn, most versions of postcolonial theory subscribe. Amongst the insights of these, and of postcolonial theory in particular, is to see knowledge and understanding of say, (post)colonialism or imperialism, as limited and partial, and thereby to point out the requirement of such 'knowledge' to be sensitive to its limits, its absences and to the possibility of its displacement. With this sprit in mind it seems appropriate here to cite the words of Carole Boyce Davis (1994: 81), a writer who also rejects the term 'postcolonial' as altogether spurious:

> . . . post-coloniality represents a misnaming of current realities, it is too premature a formulation, it is too totalizing, it erroneously contains decolonizing discourses, it re-males and recenters resistant discourses by women and attempts to submerge a host of uprising textualities, it has to be historicized and placed in the context of a variety of historical resistances to colonialism, it reveals the malaise of some Western intellectuals caught behind the posts and unable to move to new and/or more promising re-/articulations.

In this she joins many commentators, including those cited above (such as McClintock, Miyoshi and Ryan) and others, such as Goss (1996), Parry (1987), Jeyifo (1990), Mukherjee (1990) and who are in some way uneasy with or somewhat wary of the term 'postcolonial'. Yet for Boyce Davis (1994: 5):

> Each [use of a term] must be used provisionally, each must be subject to new analyses, new questions and new understandings if we are to unlock some of the narrow terms of the discourses in which we are inscribed. In other words, at each arrival at a definition, we begin a new analysis, a new departure, a new interrogation of meaning, new contradictions.

And her demands for provisional use of terms and concepts, for caution and for a kind of reflexivity are relevant to the challenge of deconstructing western (imperialist) forms of knowledge (within which, as has been noted, geography has been prominent). There is in this an indication too that seeking the 'whole truth' or a straightforward project or formula for a 'postcolonial geography' reproduces something of the epistemological drive of the colonial project itself. Indeed creating and completing rational, universal knowledge about the world (earth-writing) was amongst the quests of colonialism. One cannot simply reject all this and declare victory, any more than we can we simply erase exploration from what is geography. It is not so easy to get outside something that has arisen as a certain kind of 'world-picturing' (for further reflections and resolutions, see Mitchell, 1998; Costantinou, 1996; Gregory, 1994; 1998).

The term 'world-picture' (*Weltbild*) (attributed to Martin Heidegger) stresses what is common to a good deal of western representations, which condense, essentialize, summarize and presume themselves as offering *the* essential 'truth' about their object of scrutiny. Yet, at their best and most radical, postcolonial geographies will not only be alert to the continued fact of imperialism, but also thoroughly uncontainable in terms

of disturbing and disrupting established assumptions, frames and methods. Between the encouragement to rethink, rework and recontextualize (or, as some might prefer, to 'deconstruct') 'our' geographies and the recognition of the impossibility of such reworked geographies entirely or simply escaping their ('western') genealogies and delivering us to some postcolonial promised land, are the spaces for forms and directions that will at the very least *relocate* (and perhaps sometimes radically dislocate) familiar and often taken-for-granted geographical narratives. This applies to all levels and many topics, from the kinds of research '*frontiers*' (!) described in journals like *Progress in Human Geography* to basic-level student atlases and texts (see Myers, 2000). In the latter case, Lewis and Wigen (1997: xiii) argue that, in the USA, 'World regional geography textbooks are, at their worst, repositories of the discipline's past mistakes, constructing 1950-style catalogs of regional traits over unacknowledged substrata of 1920s-style environmental determinism'.

And whilst one starting point for postcolonial critiques is an interrogation of western geography as sovereign-universal-global truth, it is important to restate here that post-colonial critiques do not offer a simple or straightforward way out of complex theoretical and practical issues and questions. Instead they open layers of questions about what underpins and is taken for granted in western geographical narratives and how they have been inextricably entangled with the world they seek to analyse and mistaken for self-contained, universal and eternal truths.

More poetically, the multiple paradoxes of geographical 'encounters' with and 'explorations' of the postcolonial (in all its guises) can help us, in the words of Lucy Stone McNeece (1995: 47), writing in her case about postcolonial approaches to the works of the greatest of contemporary Maghrebi authors, Tahah Ben Jelloun: 'to become aware of what it means to confront difference, to look again at what we think we know.'

Acknowledgements

Although I began drafting this essay several years ago and with the intention of clarifying my doubts and confusions about the expanding horizons of postcolonialism, this has been a difficult article to (re)write and so I am particularly grateful to Alexander Murphy and the referees for support and guidance. Felix Driver and Derek Gregory provided initial encouragement and stimulus. Critical support and comments on various drafts have since come from Clive Barnett, Lawrence Berg, Louise Jackson, Cheryl McEwan, Mark McGuinness, Robina Mohammad, Marcus Power and Michael Samers. A much earlier version was presented in seminars at the Universities of Strathclyde and Sussex where I received helpful critical feedback. I remain responsible for all errors or misinterpretations.

Notes

1. Usefully compared with Ahmad (1981), Ayoob (1991) and Mbembe (1992). The intellectual impacts of Alavi's essay are reappraised in Graff (1995). The bibliographic guide in Anderson (1986) is also a useful appraisal of debates that figured in and evolved around Alavi's essay. In turn the kinds of debates that Alavi's work set off have come to figure in more recent writings from south Asia (e.g., Guha, 1989), which have been grouped under the label of *Subaltern studies*.

2. On Japanese imperialism, see the collection of contributions in Myers and Peattie (1984).

3. Accessible examples are Burawoy (1992), Bremmer and Taras (1993), Karpat (1993), Neumann (1993), Hutchinson (1994), King (1994), Kusha (1994), Levin (1994), Zubov (1994), Lieven (1995), Kandiyoti (1996) and Roy (1998). For an original study of 'cities of the Stalinist empire' as forms of colonial artifact, see Castillo (1992).

4. Bart Moore-Gilbert (1997: 10) argues that: 'The example of Canada serves to suggest just how tangled and multi-faceted the term "postcolonial" has now become in terms of its temporal, spatial, political and socio-cultural meanings. Here there are at least five distinct but often overlapping contexts, to which the term might be applied.' According to Moore-Gilbert these are: 1) the legacy of the dependent relationship with Britain; 2) the relative (cultural, strategic and economic) US domination of North America; 3) the issue of Quebec; 4) the relationship of the indigenous inhabitants to the various white (Quebecois and Anglo) settler colonialisms; and 5) the arrival, role and status of migrants from Asia.

5. What is special about them is not only that they have been formally 'postcolonial' for over 160 years, but that, if Anderson (1983) is to be believed, it was in Latin America that modern nationalism first took concrete material form. This startling (at least to those reared on notions of the exclusively European origins of the ideology) fact seems to have been rather missed in the reception given to Anderson's text. Though see Chatterjee (1993) for a critique.

6. In an exemplary study of 'colonial and postcolonial Peruvian geography', Orlove (1993) suggests that the historical roots of 'othering' in Peru are related to a deep search for *order*. In this case, 'Order' can be read as sequence or arrangement, mandate or command – and hence power.

7. On the Gulf-war case, see Brown (1994) and Halliday (1994). A survey and theorization of intellectual complicity in the Gulf war is provided by Wilcken (1995). On geographical knowledges and the war, see Mitchell and Smith (1991), Ó Tuathail (1993) and Sidaway (1994; 1998).

8. For confirmation, see the forecasts for the present-time made in Abdel-Malek's (1977) 'Essay on the dialectics of imperialism'.

References

Abdel-Malek, A. 1977: Geopolitics and national movements: an essay on the dialectics of imperialism. *Antipode* 9, 28–36.

Aglietta, M. 1979: *A theory of capitalist regulation: the US experience*. London: New Left Books.

Agnew, J. and **Corbridge, S.** 1995: *Mastering space. Hegemony, territory and international political economy*. London and New York: Routledge.

Ahmad, A. 1995: The politics of literary postcoloniality. *Race and Class* 36, 1–20.

Ahmad, E. 1981: The neofascist state: notes on the pathology of power in the third world. *Arab Studies Quarterly* 3, 170–80.

Alavi, H. 1972: The state in postcolonial societies: Pakistan and Bangladesh. *New Left Review* 74, 59–82.

Anderson, B. 1983: *Imagined communities: reflections on the origin and spread of nationalism*. London: Verso.

Anderson, L. 1986: *The state and social transformation in Tunisia and Libya, 1830–1980*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Arrighi, G. 1978: *The geometry of imperialism*. London: New Left Books.

Ashcroft, B., Griffiths, G. and **Tiffin, H.** 1989: *The empire writes back: theory and practice in postcolonial literatures*. London and New York: Routledge.

—— (editors), 1995: *The post-colonial studies reader*. London and New York: Routledge.

Ayoob, M. 1991: The security problematic of the third world. *World Politics* 43, 257–83.

Barthes, R. 1990: *A lovers discourse: fragments*. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books.

Bartlett, R. 1994: *The making of Europe: conquest, colonization and cultural change, 950–1350*. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books.

Bhabha, H. 1990: *The location of culture*. London and New York: Routledge.

Blaut, J.M. 1975: Imperialism: the Marxist theory and its evolution. *Antipode* 7, 1–19.

Blunt, A. and **Rose, G.,** editors, 1994: *Writing women and space: colonial and postcolonial geographies*. New York: Guilford Press.

Boyce Davis, C. 1994: *Black women, writing and identity: migrations of the subject*. London and New York: Routledge.

Bremmer, I. and **Taras, R.,** editors, 1993: *Nations*

and politics in the Soviet successor states. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Brewe, A. 1980: *Marxist theories of imperialism*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
Brown, L.C. 1994: Review article: shield and storm in the desert. *The International History Review* 16, 92–113.
Burawoy, M. 1992: The end of Sovietology and the renaissance of modernization theory. *Contemporary Sociology* 21, 774–85.

Callinicos, A., Rees, J., Harman, C. and **Haynes, M.,** editors, 1994: *Marxism and the new imperialism*. London: Bookmarks.
Carmichael, S. and **Hamilton, C.** 1967: *Black power: the politics of liberation in America*. New York: Random House.
Castillo, G. 1992: Cities of the Stalinist empire. In AlSayyad, N., editor, *Forms of dominance: on the architecture and urbanism of the colonial enterprise*, Aldershot: Avebury, 261–87.
Chakrabarty, D. 1992: Postcoloniality and the artifice of history: who speaks for Indian pasts. *Representations* 37, 1–24
Chatterjee, P. 1993: *The nation and its fragments: colonial and postcolonial histories*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
Chomsky, N. 1991: *Deterring democracy*. London: Verso.
—— 1993: *Year 501: the conquest continues*. Boston, MA: South End Press.
Churchill, W. and **LaDuke, W.** 1992: Native North America: the political economy of radioactive colonialism. In Jaimes, M.A., editor, *The state of native America: genocide, colonization and resistance*, Boston, MA: South End Press, 241–66.
Cohen, R. 1995: Rethinking 'Babylon': iconoclastic conceptions of the diasporic experience. *New Community* 21, 5–18.
Conquest, R. 1962: *The last empire*. London: Ampersand.
Corbridge, S. 1993: Colonialism, postcolonialism and the political geography of the third world. In Taylor, P.J., editor, *Political geography of the twentieth century: a global analysis*. London: Belhaven, 173–205.
Costantinou, C. 1996: *On the way to diplomacy*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
Crush, J. 1994: Postcolonialism, de-colonization and geography. In Godlewska, A. and Smith, N., editors, *Geography and Empire*, Oxford: Blackwell, 333–50.

Dirlik, A. 1994: The postcolonial aura – third world criticism in the age of global capitalism. *Critical Inquiry* 20, 328–56.
Doty, L. 1996: *Imperial encounters: the politics of representation in north–south relations*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
Drakakis-Smith, D. and **Williams, S.W.,** editors, 1983: *Internal colonialism: essays around a theme*. London: Developing Areas Research Group of the Institute of British Geographers.
Dunkerley, J. 1988: *Power in the isthmus: a political history of modern Central America*. London: Verso.

Faiz Ahmed Faiz 1988: *The unicorn and the dancing girl: poetry of Faiz Ahmed Faiz with original text* (translated by Daud Kamal). Ahmedabad: Allied Publishers.
Fisk, R. 1994: Sound of murder on a British housing estate. *The Independent* 1 September, 7.
Foote, K.E. 1997: *Shadowed ground: America's landscapes of violence and tragedy*. Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.
Furedi, F. 1994: *The new ideology of imperialism: renewing the moral imperative*. London: Pluto Press.

Garrity, M. 1980: The US colonial empire is as close as the nearest reservation. In Sklar, H., editor, *Trilateralism: the trilateral commission and elite planning for world management*, Boston, MA: South End Press, 238–68.
George, S. and **Sabelli, F.** 1994: *The World Bank's secular empire*. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books.
Gibson-Graham, J.K. 1998: Queer(y)ing globalization. In Pile, S. and Nast, H., editors, *Places through the body*, London: Routledge, 23–41.
Glassman, J. and **Samatar, A.I.** 1997: Development geography and the third world state. *Progress in Human Geography* 21, 164–98.
Goss, J. 1996: Postcolonialism: subverting whose empire? *Third World Quarterly* 17, 239–50.
Graff, W. 1995: The state in the third world. In Panitch, L., editor, *Socialist register*. London: The Merlin Press, 140–62.
Gregory, D. 1994: *Geographical imaginations*. Oxford: Blackwell.
—— 1998: Power, knowledge and geography. *Geographische Zeitschrift* 86, 70–93.
Guha, R. 1989: Dominance without hegemony and its historiography. In Guha, R., editor, *Subaltern studies VI: writings on south Asian history and society*, Delhi and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 210–309.

Hall, S. 1996: When was the 'postcolonial'? Thinking at the limit? In Chambers, I. and Curti, L., editors, *The post-colonial question:*

common skies, divided horizons, London and New York: Routledge, 242–60.
Halliday, F. 1994: The Gulf war 1990–1991 and the study of international relations. *Review of International Studies* 20, 109–30.
Halperin, S. 1997: *In the mirror of the third world: capitalist development in modern Europe*. Ithaca, NY, and London: Cornell University Press.
Harris, O. 1995: 'The coming of the white people', reflections on the mythologisation of history in Latin America. *Bulletin of Latin American Research* 14, 9–24.
Haynes, K. 1993: Capitalism and the periodization of international relations: colonialism, imperialism, ultraimperialism and postimperialism. *Radical History Review* 57, 21–32.
Hechter, M. 1975: *Internal colonialism: the Celtic fringe in British national development, 1536–1966*. London: Edward Arnold.
Hutchinson, J. 1994: *Modern nationalism*. London: Fontana Press.

Jackson, P. 1994: Postcolonialism. In Johnston, R.J., Gregory, D. and Smith, D.M., editors, *The dictionary of human geography* (3rd edn), Oxford: Blackwell, 465–66.
Jacobs, J. 1995: *Edge of empire: postcolonialism and the city*. London and New York: Routledge.
Jaggi, M. 1996: Return to Zanzibar. *Guardian* 17 October, 11.
Jeyifo, B. 1990: The nature of things. Arrested decolonization and critical theory. *Research in African Literatures* 21, 33–47.

Kaldor, M. 1978: *The disintegrating west*. London: Allen Lane.
Kandiyoti, D. 1996: Modernization without the market? The case the 'Soviet east'. *Economy and Society* 25, 529–42.
Kaplan, A. and Pease, D.E., editors, 1993: *Cultures of United States imperialism*. Durham, NC, and London: Duke University Press.
Karpat, K. 1993: The old and new central Asia. *Central Asian Survey* 12, 415–25.
Kautsky, K. 1970: Presentation of Kautsky: ultra-imperialism. *New Left Review* 59, 41–46.
Kay, C. 1989: *Latin American theories of development and underdevelopment*. London and New York: Routledge.
Kayatekin, S.A. and **Ruccio, D.F.** 1998: Global fragments: subjectivity and class politics in discourses of globalization. *Economy and Society* 27, 74–96.
King, C. 1994: Review article: post-Sovietology: area studies or social science? *International Affairs* 70, 291–97.
Kusha, H.R. 1994: From central Asia to the Middle East: the societal background of the yasa order and sultanate institution in the Irano-Ottoman, historical bloc. *Central Asian Survey* 12, 427–46.

Landau, J.M. 1995: *Pan-Turkism: from irredentism to coooperation* (2nd edn). London: Hurst.
Levin, T. 1994: Reimagining central Asia. *New Formations* 22, 13–23.
Lewis, M.W. and **Wigen, K.E.** 1997: *The myth of continents: a critique of metageography*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
Lieven, D. 1995: The Russian empire and the Soviet Union as imperial polities. *Journal of Contemporary History* 30, 607–36.
Lipietz, A. 1987: *Mirages and miracles: the crises of global fordism*. London: Verso.
Loomba, A. 1998: *Colonialism/postcolonialism*. London and New York: Routledge.

Mandel, E. 1975: *Late capitalism*. London: New Left Books.
Marini, J.F. 1972: Brazilian sub-imperialism. *Monthly Review* 23, 14–24.
Mbembe, A. 1992: Provisional notes on the postcolony. *Africa* 62, 3–37.
McClintock, A. 1992: The angel of progress: pitfalls of the term 'post-colonialism'. *Social Text* 31/32, 1–15.
McEwan, C. 1998: Cutting power lines within the palace? Countering paternity and eurocentrism in the 'geographical tradition'. *Transactions, Institute of British Geographers* NS 23, 371–84.
McNeece, L.S. 1995: Tahar Ben Jelloun's postmodern folly? The writer through the looking glass. In Gurnah, A., editor, *Essays of African writing 2*, Oxford: Heinemann, 37–57.
Mignolo, W.D. 1996: Posoccidentalismo: las epistemologías fronterizas y el dilema de los estudios (Latinoamericas) de areas. *Revista Iberoamerica* 62, 679–96.
Mitchell, D. and **Smith, N.** 1991: Comment – the courtesy of political geography: introductory textbooks and the war against Iraq. *Political Geography Quarterly* 10, 338–94.
Mitchell, T. 1988: *Colonizing Egypt*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Miyoshi, M. 1993: A borderless world? From colonialism to transnationalism and the decline of the nation-state. *Critical Inquiry* 19, 726–51.
Moore-Gilbert, B. 1997: *Postcolonial theory: contexts, practices, politics*. London: Verso.
Mosley, P., Harrigan, J. and **Toye, J.** 1991: *Aid and power: the World Bank and policy-based lending, Volume 1 and Volume 2*. London and New York: Routledge.
Mukherjee, A. 1990: Whose postcolonialism and

whose postmodernism? *World Literature Written in English* 30, 1–9.
Myers, G. 2000: Tanzania's new political regionalism and introductory geography's portrayal of southern Africa. *South African Geographical Journal* 81, 64–74.
Myers, R. and **Peattie, M.,** editors, 1984: *The Japanese colonial empire*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Nairn, T. 1977: *The break up of Britain*. London: New Left Books.
Neumann, I.B. 1993: Russia as central Europe's constituting other. *East European Politics and Societies* 7, 349–69.

Orlove, B.S. 1993: Putting race in its place: order in colonial and postcolonial Peruvian geography. *Social Research* 60, 300–36.
Ó Tuathail, G. 1993: The effacement of place: US foreign policy and the spatiality of the Gulf crisis. *Antipode* 25, 4–31.

Parry, B. 1987: Problems in current theories of colonial discourse. *Oxford Literary Review* 9, 27–57.
Perera, V. 1992: *Unfinished conquest: the Guatemalan tragedy*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
Pieterse, J.N. and **Parekh, B.** 1995: Shifting imaginaries: decolonization, internal decolonization and postcoloniality. In Pieterse, J.N. and Parekh, B., editors, *The decolonization of imagination: culture, knowledge and power*, London and New York: Zed Books, 1–19.

Rattansi, A. 1997: Postcolonialism and its discontents. *Economy and Society* 26, 480–500.
Rico, M. 1999: Una investigación sobre la guerra de Guatemala culpa al Ejército de genocidio planificado. *El País* (Madrid) 26 February, 3.
Robinson, J. 1999: Postcoloniality/postcolonialism. In McDowell, L. and Sharp, J.P., editors, *A feminist glossary of human geography*. London: Arnold, 208–10.
Rodinson, M. 1973: *Israel, a colonial-settler state?* New York: Monad Press.
Rogers, A. 1992: The boundaries of reason: the world, the homeland and Edward Said. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 10, 511–26.
Rogerson, C. 1980: Internal colonialism, transnationalization and spatial inequality. *South African Geographical Journal* 62, 101–20.
Rowthorn, R. 1975: Imperialism in the 1970s – unity or rivalry. In Radice, H., editor, *International firms and modern imperialism*, Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 158–80.
Roy, O. 1998: *La nueva Asia central: o la fabricación de naciones*. Madrid: Ediciones Sequitir (first edition, 1997, *La nouvelle Asie centrale ou la fabrication des nationes*. Paris: Editions du Seuil).
Ryan, M. 1994: *War and peace in Ireland: Britain and the IRA in the new world order*. London: Pluto Press.

Said, E. 1979: *The question of Palestine*. New York: Times Books.
—— 1993: *Culture and imperialism*. London: Vintage.
Seton-Watson, H. 1961: *The new imperialism*. London: The Bodley Head.
Shohat, E. and **Stam, R.** 1994: *Unthinking Eurocentrism: multiculturalism and the new world order*. London and New York: Routledge.
Sidaway, J.D. 1994: Geopolitics, geography and 'terrorism' in the Middle East. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 12, 357–72.
—— 1997: The (re)making of the western 'geographical tradition': some missing links. *Area* 91, 72–80.
—— 1998: What is in a Gulf? From the 'arc of crisis' to the gulf war. In Dalby, S. and Ó Tuathail, G., editors, *Rethinking geopolitics*, London and New York: Routledge, 224–39.
—— 1999: American power and the Portuguese empire. In Slater, D., and Taylor, P.J., editors, *The American century: consent and coercion in the projection of American power*, Oxford: Blackwell, 195–209.
Sidaway, J.D. and **Pryke, M.D.** 2000: The strange geographies of emerging markets. *Transactions, Institute of British Geographers* NS 25, 187–201.
Simon, D. 1991: The ties that bind: decolonization and neocolonialism in southern Africa. In Dixon, C.J. and Heffernan, M., editors, *Colonialism and development in the contemporary world*, London: Mansell, 21–45.
—— 1998: Rethinking (post)modernism, postcolonialism and posttraditionalism: south–north perspectives. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 16, 219–45.
Sklar, R.L. 1976: Postimperialism: a class analysis of multinational corporate expansion. *Comparative Politics* 9, 75–92.
Sleman, S. 1991: Modernism's last post. In Adam, I. and Tiffin, H., editors, *Past the last post: theorizing post-colonialism and post-modernism*, Hemel Hempstead: Harvester Wheatsheaf, 1–11.
Smith, A.M. 1994: *New right discourses on race and sexuality: Britain, 1968–1990*. Cambridge:

Cambridge University Press.
Smith, G. 1994: Political theory and human geography. In Gregory, D., Martin, R. and Smith, G., editors, *Human geography, society, space and social science*, Basingstoke: Macmillan, 54–77.
Smith, N. 1994: Geography, empire and social theory. *Progress in Human Geography* 18, 491–500.
Szporluk, R. 1994: After empire: what? *Daedalus* 123, 21–39.

Thomas, N. 1994: *Colonialism's culture: anthropology, travel and government*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
Thrift, N. and **Leyshon, A.** 1994: A phantom state? The de-traditionalization of money, the international financial system and international financial centres. *Political Geography* 13, 299–327.

Vanly, I.S. 1993: Kurdistan in Iraq. In Chaliand, G., editor, *People without a country: the Kurds and Kurdistan*, London: Zed Books, 139–93.

Wilcken, P. 1995: The intellectuals, the media and the Gulf war. *Critique of Anthropology* 15, 37–69.
Williams, P. and **Chrisman, L.** 1993: Colonial discourse and post-colonial theory: an introduction. In *Colonial discourse and post-colonial theory: a reader*, Hemel Hempstead: Harvester Wheatsheaf, 1–20.
Williams, S.W. 1977: Internal colonialism, core–periphery contrasts and devolution: an integrative comment. *Area* 9, 272–78.

Young, R. 1990: *White mythologies: writing history and the west*. London and New York: Routledge.
Yuval-Davis, N. 1997: *Gender and nation*. London: Sage.

Zirken, D. 1994: Brazilian foreign policy and subimperialism during the political transition of the 1980s. A review and reapplication of Marini's theory. *Latin American Perspectives* 80, 21, 115–31.
Zubov, A.B. 1994: The Soviet Union: from an empire into nothing? *Russian Social Science Review* 35, 37–67.