

# **Bodies That Melt in the Air: De-Essentializing the Imperial Gaze in Peter Carey's Do You Love Me?**

Isabella Vieira de Bem

## **Resumo**

O conto *Do you love me?*, do escritor australiano Peter Carey, é analisado à luz da teoria crítica pós-colonial como expressão da posicionalidade enunciativa do sujeito pós-colonial, conforme proposta por Walter Mignolo. A memória da experiência colonial australiana é poeticamente inscrita no conto, que põe em questão a tática essencializante do projeto colonial, caracterizado por Elleke Boehemer como uma empresa militar, econômica e textual. Ao reler e reescrever a condição colonial a partir dessa consciência, Carey inscreve seu texto no esforço de cunhar o campo das «Novas Humanidades» invocado pela teoria pós-colonial como alternativa epistemológica às Humanidades, marcadas pelo essencialismo da filosofia ocidental.

**Palavras-chave:** Peter Carey, pós-colonialidade, anti-essencialismo.

## **Abstract**

*Do you love me?*, the short story by the Australian writer Peter Carey, is here analyzed under the light of postcolonial critical theory as an expressive instance of the enunciative positionality held by the post-colonial subject, according to Walter Mignolo. The memory of the Australian colonial experience is poetically inscribed in the short story, which calls into question the essentializing tactics of the colonial project, characterized by Elleke Boehemer as a military, economic, and textual enterprise. On re-reading and re-writing the colonial condition on the basis of such a realization in his text, Carey joins the effort of shaping the field of «The New Humanities», summoned by postcolonial theory as an epistemologic alternative to the heavily essentializing Humanities within Western philosophy.

**Key words:** Peter Carey, postcoloniality, anti-essentialism.

Our revels now are ended. These our actors, As I  
foretold you, were all spirits and  
Are melted into air, into thin air:  
And, like the baseless fabric of this vision,  
The cloud-capp'd towers, the gorgeous palaces, The  
solemn temples, the great globe itself,

Ye all which it inherit, shall dissolve  
And, like this insubstantial pageant faded,  
Leave not a rack behind. We are such stuff  
As dreams are made on, and our little life  
Is rounded with a sleep. (William Shakespeare)  
(Prospero to Fernando, Act 4, Scene 1 - *The Tempest*)

Isabella Vieira de Bem é Mestre em Literaturas de Língua Inglesa pela UFRGS. Professora dos Cursos de Letras e Secretariado Executivo da ULBRA

Textura	Canoas	n. 5	2º semestre de 2001	p. 77-84
---------	--------	------	---------------------	----------

Not unlike Gayatri Spivak, where I was first brought up I was taught that if I could live up to Rudyard Kipling's challenge and summoning stated in *If*, I would be (made) a Man. Having been told and made (hu)Man in this way, she could not help being charmed by Jacques Derrida's attack on the philosophical system that assigned humanness to some human beings more than to others.

Having made my enunciative *locus* explicit from the start, the article that follows is an exercise of relating (my situated reading of) the theoretical production of Leela Gandhi, Walter Dignolo and Elleke Boehmer on postcoloniality. It is also meant to offer a critical account of Peter Carey's short story, *Do you love me?* after the contribution of the theoreticians mentioned above.

The philosophical tradition of the West, interestingly, rests on the assumption that there is a given human nature underlying the diversity of human experience. This nature is revealed in a language that mirrors the symbiotic and reciprocal articulation with rationality. In this way, not only the humanities (disciplines) are what defines what it means to be human, but also reasoning stands as the only way of acquiring knowledge.

While assuming the diversity of experience, the equation between human nature and rational language rather prescribes human existence as homogeneous. Heterogeneity in human existence, thus, is assigned the label of quasi-human, and so is liable to be submitted to a humanizing pedagogic and e(-)man(-)cipatory project.

The imperialist project can be understood as such a humanizing mission and investment to endow the quasi-human portion of the world's population with humanity. As a consequence, colonialism was made justifiable on the grounds of an ethical commitment to homogenize the human race, to lead the whole humanity to the heights of European rationality.

Among the highlights of the development of European rationality stands the Cartesian philosophy founded on the elaboration of man as the all-knowing subject of consciousness. According to this, the world of external objects is controlled inasmuch as they become intelligible contents of man's mind, and are reduced to objects of (rational)knowledge. The

power of knowledge over things heterogeneous - the mysterious and incalculable nature (human nature included)- is the power to reduce the material alterity of the world to the implicit unity of knowledge. Therefore, whatever falls short of being reduced in this way, whatever does not conform to the Same always already pre-inscribed in the unified structure of knowledge, is violently negated, and ascribed the status of Other.

In so being, otherness is integrated into the structure of knowledge as essence, as the common feature shared by those (contender) «contents» that resisted objectification on the grounds of their material contingency. Otherness, in such a move, is attributed to those «resistant» objects once deprived of their contingent properties, of their threatening materiality, in a word. To clothe the huge variety of contingent differences with an abstract «common» rationally constructed trait is to homogenize it, to essentialize it.

The poststructuralist critique brings to the fore this violent relationship of Cartesian philosophy with its (threatening and omitted) Other and draws a parallel with the procedures of the colonial civilizing mission. Whereas mastery, containment and domination are the distinctive motivations of Western humanism and Cartesian rationality for knowing the world (for asserting humanness), entertaining difference (alterity) without the will to reduce it to sameness is what marks the radical distinctiveness of both the postmodern and poststructuralist interventions in Western philosophy from within. The motivation that feeds these projects is rather the hope to explore the suppressed and potentially transgressive possibilities of rationality than the repression of the anxiety produced by the other in the rationally empowered subject.

The intellectual basis of postcolonialist thought lies on the challenge it poses to the universal validity of Western rationality in terms of culture and epistemology. Still necessary to reaffirm is its deconstructive bias against the traditional humanities. Its oppositional posture lies on the epistemology of new fields of knowledge that have endeavored to both bring to the fore and to recover the set of 'subjugated' (Foucault) or



'minor' (Deleuze and Guattari) knowledges that, by having been excluded or silenced, account for the authority of canonical systems of knowledge and of the humanist curriculum.

Among the humanities under sheer attack in the postcolonial field is History. Hegel's formulation of History as the last stage of mankind's progression from darkness (nature) to light (civilization) encompasses various hierarchical dimensions. The journey is also that leading mankind from incompleteness to totality, from individual alienation to community belonging, and from undifferentiation to identity - not synonymous to singularity - achieved through a rational process. The consequent articulation of the narratives of 'Reason', 'Modernity' and 'History' consolidates Hegel's defense of the nation-State as bearing teleological significance.

The issue of nationalism in the postcolonial debate is, thus, an extremely disputable one. This very (Hegelian) understanding of 'nation' may prove inadequate to address other self-sufficient (alternative) cultural elaborations of what a 'nation' means. Consider any other non-Western epistemological system that accounts for a sense of community (capable of supporting political praxis) to which the notion of the modern state offers little basis - the aboriginal struggle to achieve political self-determination in Australia, for example.

The issue of colonialism is still a more problematic one. As a category, colonialism manages to accommodate the diverse cultural encounters within the immediate past into a single body of experience concerning their relationship with the history of Europe. Nevertheless, postcolonialism is recurrently deemed as a critique of History. This contradiction has fueled much of the debate on representation, on the validity of the discourse produced in the academic centers (mostly based in the West) about the postcolonial subject.

The vector described by this intellectual production is referred to as «epistemic violence» by Spivak and as «authoritative knowing» by Michel Foucault, in both cases on the grounds of the rearticulation of the complicity between modernity and the violence of reason. The modern reason is dubbed responsible for the suppression of certain

qualities of knowledge and for the assigning of whole knowledge fields to the outskirts of the intellectual task and academic research.

As a consequence, the postcolonial intellectual has to reckon with the issue of positionality so that the legitimacy and the actual contribution of its (theoretical) production can be properly assimilated. Walter D. Mignolo forwards this discussion in his essay *La Razón Pos-colonial* in terms of the several enunciative *loci* engendered by the multiplicity of postcolonial situations based on their different and singular colonial heritage. Though partaking of the common experience of having undergone the process of western expansion, each situation bears some particularities as to the shape the settlements assumed as an outcome of the impact of the colonial encounter.

Mignolo defines positionality as the complex arrangement between the aspects in common to the experience of colonization and the specificities developed in/by each colony in the long run. On one hand, such configuration makes the term «postcoloniality» a problematic one; on the other, it endows the theoretical and intellectual production under these circumstances with the power to produce a radical epistemological shift.

The critical reasoning arising from this differential point of view, which encompasses many levels of counterpoint stances within the corpus in question, fosters a new site of struggle. Such an oppositional site is capable of questioning the dichotomic world ordering established by the imperial project and eventually exposes it as founded on a process of naturalization of difference through an essentialist tactics.

Still according to Mignolo, postcolonial theory should be understood rather as a manifestation of the consequences of certain specific colonial situations and discourses than as one kind of either situation or discourse. Once aware of these expressive forms, these theoretical elaborations, colonial and postcolonial experiences can be put apart and properly categorized.

Thus, though Mignolo alligns postcolonialism with postmodernism regarding their countermodern feature, he succeeds in



putting one apart from the other in terms of their positionality. Taking into account his definition of modernity as multidimensional, both the consolidation of European colonial empires and the domination of those peoples and cultures as well as their struggle for liberation, postmodernity corresponds to the countermodern discourse produced in the «*colonias de asentamiento*» (1996: 11) whereas postcoloniality is produced in the colonies where colonial power was maintained through particularly brutal means (*colonias de profundo asentamiento*).

In so being, the displacement operated by the postcolonial reason(ing)- and its radical rupture-bearing potential - is brought about as a consequence of a geocultural decentering of the site of production of theory *par excellence*, the humanities. While the cognitive practice under the umbrella of the humanities are rooted in the legacy of Renaissance and Enlightenment (the modern reason, essentialism, in a word), the postcolonial reason stems from another substrata.

Unlike the (rational) subject of the humanities, the individuals with which the theoretical production of postcoloniality is associated are not subjected to a process of essentialization, of reduction of their contingent and material concreteness, as a *sine qua non* condition for their validation as theoretical (transhistorical) agents. Much the contrary, it is precisely their singular condition as people who have in common the colonial heritage what entitles them.

Nevertheless, as it has already been mentioned above, positionality is a complex arrangement, and the diversity of colonial situations and configurations cannot be overlooked lest we fall into the trap of essentialist tactics. Based on this, Mignolo states that the explicit geocultural place held by the individual committed to the task of postcolonial intellectual production is what informs its options and possibilities.

Concerning this, he suggests that the cognitive practice in postcolonial reason lies precisely on three different explicit *loci*: the one engendered by the logic possibilities within the discipline (academic field), the one bearing the historical circumstances of the colonial heritage

considered, and that embodying the personal sensibility of the colonial heritage. In so being, the substantial feature of postcolonial theory is an image of the third world that stands as an inversion of that (other image) which has been sustained by the vast tradition ever since the colonial heritage.

Owing to the acknowledged differential place(position) held by the subject in the process of knowledge, postcolonial theory performs an effective epistemological move. By reassuring the contingent (non-essentialized) dimension of the subject in these terms as a determining aspect of knowledge, postcolonial theory reconfigures the constraints that have set the very knowledge, the object (the things man knows - the humanities), and the subject of the cognitive process as isolated entities. One implication of such a reconfiguration in that the task of the humanities should first undergo a redefinition if they are equal to performing social and cultural transformations as well.

Leelha Gandhi refers to the New Humanities as holding an oppositional stance to the traditional ones and characterizes the task of redefinition above mentioned as two-fold: to expose the humanist pretense of neutrality (political disinterestedness) and to make the geocultural specificity of the knowledge claims of modern (imperialist) Europe explicit. The two moves can be paralleled to cartographic operations like de- and re-territorialization, and referred to with the language of cartographers too, such as provincialization (Chakrabarty *apud* Gandhi: 45).

The coincidence of the language of cartography is not accidental. The recurrence can be attributed not only because the main contribution of postcolonial theory has been stated by Mignolo regarding the subject «positionality», but also after Boehmer's definition of colonialism as a metaphoric and cartographic undertaking (from the European point of view) (1995: 16-17).

In this sense, Paul Carter argues that even the so-called empirical history has privileged the factual and static dimensions of experience, in accord with the naturalizing cause-and-effect rules and conventions of narrating facts. It has consistently shunned the «spatiality» of historical experience, the

«dynamic, material but invisible» (Carter: 376) dimension of life. He forwards the thesis that spatiality is a form of non-linear writing, another form of history, though, with its own literature: «(...) - the letters home, the explorer's journals, the unfinished maps - are written traces which, but for their spatial occasion, would not have come into being.» (idem)

Spatial history, thus, stands as a token of the new humanities inasmuch as it begins and ends in language, here understood not as a mirroring surface reciprocally bonded with rationality but rather as the play of possibilities of reasoning in its exploratory task of acquiring (contextual) knowledge. To reinforce the imagery of language as a mirror, as a visual perceptive apparatus or support, it is worth quoting Carter again:

Such spatial history - history that discovers and explores the lacuna left by imperial history - (...) if it does *imitate* the world of the traveller it is in a different sense. For, like the traveller whose gaze is oriented and limited, it makes no claim to authoritative completeness. It is, must be like a journey, exploratory... (Carter: 376-377)

Once again we can read the same concern with the fundamental importance of the positionality, of the place held by the subject of cognition as the most important contribution of postcoloniality to both epistemology and hermeneutics. This concern has been manifested by Gandhi, Mignolo and Boehmer alike.

Australian born Peter Carey, in his short story *Do you love me?*, artfully gathers the major literary elements that have prevented him from being listed as a canonical writer while displaying the distinctive features proper to postcolonial literature. An «irregular» narrative style, disconcerting notions about History, and non-philosophical ideas about philosophy grant his non-canonic category, whereas the identity disjunction of the self in relation to the location (place) and the permanent tension he holds with the notion of the center (the imperial power) account for his differential constitutive perspective.

«Perhaps», the opening word of his short story, sets the tone of the writing/reading to follow as an exploratory, non-conclusive,

tentative intervention, as it should. «*Perhaps a few words about the role of the Cartographers in our present society are warranted*». This is the opening statement of section 1, The Role of the Cartographers, of a short story to be closed with the question «*Do you love me?*» - which is also the title of the story. A story that «begins and ends in language»...

«The Role of the Cartographers», itself a parodical inscription of the theme and structure of the story to follow, starts with the characterization of the yearly census, the task of the Cartographers, as central to national life. It is so central that the publication of the results of the census shared the occasion with the Festival of the Corn, an ancient festival of the wealth of the earth.

In this section, the Australian people are continually referred to as having «*a passion for lists*», as people who «*crave, more than anything else, to know the extent of the nation, to know exactly, the shape of the coastline, to hear what land may have been lost to the sea, to know what has been reclaimed and what is still in doubt.*» The Australian passion mentioned in this quotation reenacts what Carter defined as the imperial gaze, as the legitimizing enterprise of imperial history and its preference for fixed and detachable facts rather than for the material uncertainties of lived time and space.

Following to this, there is the information that the Cartographer's report has an immediate impact on the atmosphere of the Festival. In so being, to a negative report follows some kind of nervousness, apprehension and despair, despite the festivities.

Among the memories of the narrator's childhood, as the son of a cartographer, he selects a frightening one: the history of certain regions which had gradually become less and less real. Such regions had earned the Cartographers' awe, regions that were uninhabited, not exploited economically and «*that had begun to slowly disappear like the image on an improperly fixed photograph.*» In order to reckon with those «*nebulous areas*» an instrument capable of detecting the presence of any object «*no matter how dematerialized or insubstantial*» was developed to integrate the Cartographers' equipment.

This account can be read as a fictional



textualization of colonialism as a cartographic enterprise, according to Boehmer's characterization. It also constitutes a poetic elaboration of the resistant and oppositional stance held by the postcolonial subject against the powerful, authoritarian, violent, reducing and suppressive cognitive operation of the traditional humanities towards Europe's other - in this case, Australia. The section ends with the narrator's speculative hint at the fact that the Cartographers, under political pressure, decided to use old maps to «fake-in» the sections that not even the powerful Fischerscope succeeded in spotting. The nebulous areas are at one with the numerous minority groups, or with the «ungovernable and uncivilised subjects of empire.» (Gandhi: 51).

In «The Most Famous Festival» (section 3) the narrator justifies the suggestion with which he ended section 1: despite an excellent census report, the Festival turned into a violent scene of robberies and thefts, of shouting and screaming, and of the complete disappearance of a large house in Howie Street. To this dematerialization followed that of a whole building, witnessed by thousands of people who were immediately ravaged by uncontrollable rage fits. While under this effect, they destroyed the next building in a hysterical splurge. Five days later the building would also undergo the process of dematerialization. Next to the buildings, the people began to dematerialize.

The continuous aspect of the dematerialization phenomenon suggests the cause-effect rule typical of the discourse of History, but in this case the evolution is not the ideal(ist) progression from chaos to order.

As a sequel to the Cartographers' move, the media omitted (suppressed) the fact of the dematerialization of living people for several weeks, but few families were spared by the chain of events triggered by then. The people undergoing dematerialization displayed an unbelievable rage to the point of attacking and harming those around them.

«Some Theories that Arose at the Time», section 7, consists of a list of three interpretative attempts of providing a rational account of the state of affairs. They invariably conform to the traditional if-then, when-because, cause-consequence rule, despite the motivations and interested with which they are invested. In a few words, they stand as:

1. a warped existentialist brand - the world is God's dream: when he wakes up, everything will vanish and we will be happy forever;

2. a twisted brand of environmentalism and new age combined - the world has become sensitive to light as our bodies become sensitive to uncontrolled extended use of antibiotics;

3. a Nuremberg-like oath of allegiance to bureaucratic efficiency: the sloppy job of Cartographers and censors has caused dematerialization; the items neglected in their reports were eligible to dematerialization, objects and people alike.

Each of the theories above manage to reveal both the strong hold of the traditional encoding and containment of the colonial heritage and the inverted image of this same containment. The theories both stress the legitimizing power of the European and Western ordering of the world and expose their claims of universality as a shield against «materialization» (de-essentialization).

None of the them make explicit reference to the fact that Australia before the European colonization has no animals suitable for herding, and therefore the Aborigines lived by hunting and gathering food in a semi-nomadic, dynamic lifestyle. New territories and new waters were discovered in a process continual to the swelling of the tribes and or dwindling of water and supplies. Notwithstanding it is made evident that the cultural story of the places where the tribes settled defies the European ordering of the world.

«My Father's Theory», section 8, consists of the Cartographer's prophetic interpretation of their plight. The father compares the world to the human body, with its safety mechanisms and all, and explains that,

Humanity is god. Humanity is the only god I know.  
If humanity doesn't need something it will disappear. People who are not loved will disappear. Everything that is not loved will disappear from the face of the earth. We only exist through the love of others and that's what it's all about.

Therefore, when the first Cartographers begin to disappear the narrator is woken by his father in the middle of the night to be told why the world needs Cartographers. When his father is finally confronted with his own

dematerialization, the narrator manages to address him with the lying and dishonest but pitiful statement «*I love you.*»

Surprisingly, instead of the uncontrollable rage fit typical of the awareness of one's own dematerialization process, the transparent father bursts into a wild laughter in his ordinary cynical tone until he vanishes completely. The mother lets out a cry and looking at the son nervously asks him, «*Do you love me?*»

Perhaps a few more words about postcoloniality in our present society are warranted, after the eloquent example provided by Peter Carey's short story. Many myths and rituals in the Aboriginal culture were connected both to the tribe's ancestors and the creators of the world. None of these people ever died but merged with the natural world and thus remained a part of the present. These knowledges - marginalized or suppressed by the colonial rule - reflected a belief in the continuity of existence and harmony with the world. Taking this into account, the dematerialization phenomenon in *Do you love me?* poetically re-inscribes these elements of spatial history as a prehistory of places. It textualizes the recognition that «*the spatiality of historical experience evaporates before the imperial gaze...*» (Carter: 377)

An analogous reference to such a dissolving power as that of the imperial gaze can be found in Prospero's realization that

These our actors,  
As I foretold you, were all spirits and  
Are melted into air, into thin air:  
And, like the baseless fabric of this vision,  
The cloud-capp'd towers, the gorgeous palaces,  
The solemn temples, the great globe itself,  
Ye all which it inherit, shall dissolve  
And, like this insubstantial pageant faded,  
Leave not a rack behind. (Shakespeare: 988)

In an article concerned with the issue of materiality in social science, John Law (2001), reminds us that such a realization has been reassessed and reinterpreted in a number of different ways: «*as capitalist accumulation and world-domination; as a process of industrialisation; and, more recently, as a story about the networks of globalisation.*» - Marx and Marshal Berman being the most often quoted instances. Law states that a concern with materiality, with the «*stuff of the*

*world*», can be described as three-fold: a concern with objects, a concern about bodies, about «*how bodies display themselves in clothes and cosmetics as objects of the gaze,*» but also a concern about information and media in material form,

Texts such as this, newspapers, **the pictures on the television at night**, books in libraries, CD roms, maps, films, **statistical tables**, spreadsheets, musical scores, architect's drawings, engineering designs(...) (Law 2001. My bold types)

In Peter Carey's story dematerialization stands as an allegory of the way in which different materials - objects, technologies, texts **and bodies** are produced by and simultaneously produce social and cultural relations - not to mention economic ones. The final scene, in which his father «melts in the air» while watching TV, can be read as a comment on the immateriality of the cartographer's family life, as the son cannot but fake a statement of loving attachment to his father. Notwithstanding, the son's tentative maneuver of faking love interestingly re-enacts the «*sloppy cartographers*» procedure of «*faking in*» lost territory in maps - leading the whole nation to a deceptive outcome. Likewise, the mother's desperate attempt to reassure herself of her *mater-r(ea)*ility by ex(tr)acting some assertion of love on the part (out) of her son reinstates the colonial experience in Australia.

Australia is categorized by Mignolo as one of the «*colonias de asentamiento*» whose indigenous population has, nevertheless, suffered the devastating effect of the colonial process. There is a pervading sense of great colonial guilt in much of the art emerging from Australia in postcoloniality and there are very few examples of artistic Aboriginal responses to the colonizer. The meaning construction process of the Aborigines' feelings towards the people who dispossessed them is made evident mainly through the works by the descendants of those people. These authors and artists are rightfully reluctant to appropriate the voice of the colonized and thus bear the positionality engendered by their personal sensibilities.

Peter Carey, in his turn, an Australian writing in the imperial language, holds another positional category - that engendered by the historical circumstances of the colonial heritage.



The birth of Australia as a nation is a result or an aftermath of a new colonial experiment (Transportation), an unprecedented penal colony at Botany Bay in 1788 - which has not been repeated ever since. Even present day Australians are ashamed of their country's origins and shy away from a detailed examination of transportation. This sense of guilt underlies the son's reluctant utterance affirmation of love to his dematerializing father and it is also projected in the Cartographer's theory about dematerialization.

As we have mentioned previously, the inescapable task of the postcolonial intellectual encompasses the re-reading and re-writing of the historical and fictional Eurocentric recordings. This can be achieved through the adoption of a differential positionality in the discursive practice that sets out to oppose the universalist essentialism of imperial or colonial literatures. In this counter-discursive practice, the issue of place is more than the category of space as assigned by the structuralist narratology. It is rather the place of production and consume associated to the production of meaning.

Therefore, postcolonial authors not only write back, or counter-write the canonic recordings of the colonial heritage, they also and mainly intervene in the discursive field in which texts have continually operated within the postcolonial worlds. (Ashcroft, Griffiths and Tiffin 1989). Postcolonial texts reaffirm the radical alterity of the colonized subject, an alterity that has not been announced, that has not been forecasted and therefore did not fit one singular compartment belonging to the pre-catalogued European world. These texts expose the essentialist tactics to which their alterity have been submitted in order to afford the European ordering of the world its closure (economy).

If the Empire is thus produced as the place of de-humanization - and imperial literature bears the taints and blessings of this process - it is only from the privileged point of view of the postcolonial subject(individual) that the positions You and I are reconfigured. These positions can then stand as the agents of the permanent struggle against de-humanization, in the effort to de-brutalize and de-essentialize our human-ness.

Sensitive to the appeal of thinking otherwise, of going beyond the constraining and suppressive hold of the traditional

humanities, the postcolonial intellectual is faced with the challenge of constructing not only a differential other-ness as well as making this a wise and operational intervention. Being other and still escaping the protective essentialist shield available in the disciplinary field, on one hand; being wise enough to meet the ethical demands of the qualms of writing/reading in the languages of the vastest imperialist nation-states of (modern) Europe, on the other. In short, being other-wise.

Not unlike Spivak, in some ways, most unlike her in many others, I have attempted to live up to the inescapable task by producing a critical reading of authoritative texts in the field of postcolonial theory as well as by offering an interpretation of a piece of postcolonial literature.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- ASHCROFT, Bill, GRIFFITHS, Gareth and TIFFIN, Helen. *The Empire Writes Back. Theory and Practice in Post-Colonial Literatures*. London: Routledge, 1989.
- BOEHMER, Elleke. *Colonial and Postcolonial Literature*. Oxford: OUP, 1995.
- CAREY, Peter. «Do You Love Me?» in *The Fat Man in History: and other stories*. New York: Vintage Books, 1993.
- CARTER, Paul. «Spatial History» in TIFFIN, Helen *The PostColonial Studies Reader*. London: Routledge, 1995.
- GANDHI, Leela. *Postcolonial Theory. A Critical Introduction*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1998.
- LAW, John and HETHERINGTON, Kevin, «Materialities, Spatialities, Globalities», Department of Sociology, Lancaster University, June 2001. Available at <http://www.comp.lancs.ac.uk/sociology/soc029jl.html>. Accessed on Dec1<sup>st</sup>, 2001.
- MIGNOLO, Walter. «La Razón Postcolonial. Herencias Coloniales y Teorías Postcoloniales» in *Gragoatá* 1:7-29, 2 sem 1996.
- SHAKESPEARE, William. «The Tempest» in CLARK, W. G. and WRIGHT W. Aldis, ed. *The Complete Works of William Shakespeare. All the Plays. All the Poems*. New York:

