Rethinking a Problematic Constellation: Postcolonialism and its Germanic Contexts (Pramoedya Ananta Toer/ Multatuli)

CARL NIEKERK

It often has been remarked that the field of postcolonial studies has been dominated by scholars whose home base is in English literary history,[1] and that this situation is undesirable. A focus on other, non-British colonialisms, so the argument goes, is needed. But why? Such a focus could be productive for an understanding of the history and contemporary socio-political dynamics of parts of the postcolonial world outside of the Commonwealth and, to some extent, also of the former colonial powers that once dominated them. From a global perspective, for example, relatively little is known about the history and culture of Indonesia, particularly if one compares it with, for instance, its "bigger brother" India. This has no doubt something to do with the fact that English never played a very prominent role in Indonesia or the Dutch Indies. The desire to rectify such an imbalance should in itself legitimate a call for a broader focus for postcolonial studies. But there are other good reasons for introducing a comparative component. In the colonial era, a critical attitude toward a competing power often helped legitimate a national colonial policy. There may be something disingenuous about this "critique" of colonialism; it may not always be very informed, it may be dominated by nationalistic or racist concerns, but at times it may also refer to existing abusive practices. If this is the case, such a critique is useful for those interested in a critique of the historical practices of colonialism in all its shapes. But the phenomenon of competing colonial powers allows for yet another form of criticism. A colonial power may censor its own citizens in their criticism of colonial practice, but it also may allow the circulation of writings criticizing the colonial policies of another, competing power. In fact, this may have been the reason for the international popularity of one of the texts that I will discuss, the novel *Max Havelaar* by the nineteenth-century Dutch realist Multatuli.

In addition to its focus on the Commonwealth, there is another problematic aspect of postcolonial studies that is also widely acknowledged by its practitioners, but at the same time has remained to a large extent unresolved. It has been said that postcoloniality is the construction of "a relatively small, Western-style, Western-trained group of writers and thinkers, who mediate the trade in cultural commodities of world capitalism at the periphery."[2] Is that really so, or do we, as Western intellectuals, simply privilege the literature of those who, at least to some extent, are familiar with metropolitan societies themselves, because we think that any other type of literature is too sentimental, too primitive in its ideological alliances, or, in other words, not good literature? And if there exists another postcolonial literature, not written in English or primarily oriented toward Western standards, how can such a literature contribute to a more complex understanding of the postcolonial condition or even to a rethinking of some of postcolonial theory's basic assumptions?

The following essay attempts to deal in a productive way with the challenges posed by the two self-critiques mentioned above, both of which are articulated within contemporary postcolonial studies, and seeks to develop alternative strategies. I will make the argument that there are indeed good reasons to look at the Germanic contexts of colonial and postcolonial literature. There certainly seems to be a need for such research. In postcolonial studies, there has been a call for the "provincialization" of Europe.[3] In the first place, such a call refers to the attempt to break with the explicit or implicit Eurocentric focus of postcolonial research. But that is not necessarily its only programmatic consequence. It can be argued that a provincializing of Europe is only possible if we are aware of the homogenizing function of a Eurocentric perspective and pay more attention to differences existing within Europe. Understood in either sense, however, the concomitant agenda is not entirely unproblematic. A call for more awareness of the local and temporal particularities of colonial thinking should not be used, for instance, to exempt some European nations from Europe's colonial past, as has been done in the recent past in the case of

Germany's colonial heritage.[4] It is no doubt a consequence of the more global consciousness introduced to literary studies by postcolonial theory that an interest in "marginality" has become much more prominent. However, it is important to distinguish among different marginalities. If in the following my aim is to show that there exists a body of local knowledge that can contribute to a better understanding of the history of the postcolonial world, I do not mean to equate the different claims of marginality that could result from such a program. Claiming that there is a specifically Germanic colonial literary and non-literary discourse does not mean that there is an inherent value to the reconstruction of that discourse. Moreover, the question of why it might be important to reconstruct such a discourse itself also needs to be raised.

In a thematic issue of the *New York Times Magazine* from 18 April 1999, dedicated to the stories of the closing millennium, the contemporary Indonesian author Pramoedya Ananta Toer published a contribution on Multatuli's *Max Havelaar*. That Toer (born 1925) picked a largely forgotten novel, first published in 1860 by the Dutch colonial official and author Multatuli (1820-1887), as his text of the millennium is highly interesting. Pramoedya Ananta Toer is a prolific postcolonial author whose first language is not English and whose intellectual and artistic development have taken place largely independently of the West—not necessarily by his own choice. Toer first was imprisoned in 1947 by the Dutch during the fight for Indonesia's independence; later in 1965, he was arrested and exiled to Buru island until 1979 by the Indonesian authorities. Until very recently he lived under house arrest in Jakarta. The book Toer discusses in his essay, *Max Havelaar* (1860), was written by the erstwhile Dutch colonial official Eduard Douwes Dekker, who chose as his pen name "Multatuli" (Latin for "I have suffered much"). Toer's essay is interesting because it approaches postcolonialism and colonialism simultaneously as global phenomena and from a highly localized perspective. In his essay, and also in the cycle of novels entitled *Buru Quartet*, Toer traces the processes of transculturation[5] that occurred as Indonesian nationalism began under Dutch rule. As such, Toer offers something that comes close to an outside perspective on the West—not by making general assumptions, but by looking very concretely at the exchanges of cultural materials and practices in a specific (Germanic) colonial context. Toer explores the role of the progressive intellectual in this process of transculturation, and the questions he asks and the answers he gives are unorthodox.

Toer's article has the provocative title "The Book That Killed Colonialism: As the West Clamored for Spices, the Novelist 'Multatuli' Cried for Justice."[6] In a nutshell, Toer offers a history of European colonialism in Southeast Asia. He points out that Europe's interest in the Indonesian territories was initially based on a desire for spices. Religious conflict is for Toer a secondary phenomenon, only resulting from the West's attempt to establish business interests in the East. By the nineteenth century the Dutch try to establish a system of forced cultivation of sugar, coffee, tea, and indigo in order to guarantee its economic interests in the East, while turning all of Java "into an agricultural sweatshop".[7] The importance of Multatuli's *Max Havelaar* consists in two facts: first, for the first time a Dutch colonial official, who was supposed to implement the new policy, protests the new developments blaming both Dutch colonial policies and the indigenous power structures they capitalize on. Second, Multatuli writes a book about Dutch colonial abuse that potentially can be read by a broad, international audience. At the beginning of the main narrative line of Multatuli's novel, the principal character Max Havelaar moves with his wife and child to Lebak, a remote and poor district of the Dutch Indies, in order to assume a position as assistant resident of that district. Many of the problems Havelaar encounters have to do with the specifics of his official position. As assistant resident, Havelaar is the highest local Dutch official in a subdistrict, and he works in conjunction with the local regent, a Native who is a member of local nobility. In contrast to the colonial strategies of other powers, the Dutch chose to use the existing pre-colonial hierarchies rather than to impose their own organization in the East Indies. This had little to do with respect for the relatively advanced organization of the indigenous society, and much to do with the fact that the Dutch lacked the manpower necessary to develop their own administrative structures. Due to his attempts to protect the lives and rights of the abused local population, soon after his arrival Havelaar gets into trouble with both the native regent and his Dutch superiors. In essence, the novel is a report of the events leading to Havelaar's suspension and subsequent departure from the Dutch Indies. *Max Havelaar* was, as Toer points out, of great importance in Indonesia's fight for its own independence; the book was a "weapon to shame the Dutch Government in Indonesia"[8] into introducing reform, and it set into motion a development which would eventually end the Dutch colonial regime over Indonesia.

At first sight, Toer's essay seems to be an embarrassment for postcolonial studies. If anything, postcolonial theory has taught us to mistrust the tradition of colonial literature of which Multatuli is a representative, in particular when this type of literature claims to be critical.[9] Most colonial literature was written by intellectuals who saw themselves as critical, even though their writings in practice ended up legitimating colonial practice. Mary

Louise Pratt writes about "anti-conquest," meaning "strategies of representation whereby European bourgeois subjects seek to secure their innocence at the same time as they assert European hegemony."[10] Indeed, Eduard Douwes Dekker personifies the ambiguities of critical colonial literature in an almost exemplary way. He disapproves of the Dutch colonial regime, especially because it tolerated practices of unpaid labor, theft, and murder from the side of the Native chiefs. But Dekker's motives for standing up for the Javanese natives are dubious at best. E. M. Beekman, in his pathbreaking work on Dutch colonial literature from the East Indies, mentions "personal and psychological" reasons that may have motivated Dekker's behavior,[11] a statement that doubtless represents a consensus in contemporary Multatuli scholarship.[12] Dekker was a colonial administrator accused of financial mismanagement before he requested an honorable discharge in 1856 (these events are described more or less accurately in *Max Havelaar*). Dekker was a highly ambitious man, but not psychologically stable. He fought for the rights of Natives and women, but his high moral stances did not keep him from gambling and womanizing. Dekker liked to play the masochist; he saw himself as someone who had to suffer for the common good. Above all, in spite of his harsh criticism, Dekker never really questioned the principle of colonialism: "Dekker was an imperialist all his life, notwithstanding his very real concern for the downtrodden Asians."[13] Even when Multatuli, at the end of *Max Havelaar*, threatens to "hurl *klewang*-whetting war songs into the hearts of the poor martyrs to whom I have promised help, I, Multatuli,"[14] he means primarily to persuade the Dutch to improve the conditions for the native population of the Indies within the colonial structure, and not to call for independence, even though some of the contemporaries of Multatuli may have read these words this way.[15]

However, one can wonder whether questioning Multatuli's motives for writing *Max Havelaar* is the most productive way of dealing with his life and work from a postcolonial perspective. Whatever the man's motives were, once his text was published, its own existence began. Dutch colonial literature starts with *Max Havelaar,*[16] and it is interesting that this beginning is simultaneously a highly critical account of Dutch colonialism. Many later colonial writers (Couperus, Daum, Du Perron), some of them quite prominent, have attempted to copy Multatuli's critical impulse (and inadvertently may also have copied its ambiguities). This basic critical attitude led to a mode of writing virtually unknown in other national traditions of colonial literature. But the international as well as the national reception of *Max Havelaar* made it clear that the book was loved for its critical attitude toward colonial politics and the discourses that legitimated them. *Max Havelaar* has often been compared to *Uncle Tom's Cabin* for this reason. This should make us suspicious. *Uncle Tom's Cabin* is a powerful text criticizing racial discrimination, but outside the United States it was mostly read as critical of the U.S., and not necessarily as a text that in any way had anything to do with racial relations in Europe. Indeed, maybe Multatuli's *Max Havelaar* was at one point part of world literature[17] not only because it was critical of colonial excesses, but also because his criticism could be interpreted as a specific response to the colonial abuse of one specific nation, and not to colonialism in general. Localizing Multatuli's criticism can cause it to lose at least part of its critical impetus.

But Toer's strategy of approaching colonialism from a local perspective is different from the one sketched above. By reading Multatuli in the context of Indonesia's battle for independence, Toer suggests that there is, in contrast, a genuine critical and political impetus behind *Max Havelaar.*[18] Toer's interest in Multatuli is apparent in writings beyond his essay for the *New York Times*. *Max Havelaar* and historical knowledge about the life of its author in the Dutch East Indies and his reputation play a role in Toer's cycle of novels, *Buru Quartet.*[19] As I will show in the following, a far more differentiated image of Multatuli's relevance for the Indonesian movement of independence emerges in this cycle of novels. Toer's *Buru Quartet* is a fictional account of the life of the high school and medical school student, journalist, and political prisoner Minke, and it covers the period from 1898 to approximately 1920. The story of Minke is based on the life of the early Indonesian nationalist and journalist Tirto Adi Suryo (1880-1918).[20] Toer first narrated and then wrote the cycle of novels while interned on Buru Island (1969-1979).

The influence of Multatuli is ubiquitous in *Buru Quartet*. In the first volume we learn that Minke, when he publishes his first writings, chooses the pen name Max Tollenaar (1:109). This name is a clear reference to the protagonist of Multatuli's novel, and this is later pointed out to him; people will assume, Minke's European friend the journalist Ter Haar says, that "you are the spiritual child of Multatuli" (2:259). Minke does not object to such a characterization. He has learned about Multatuli in school from his teacher Magda Peters—something his Dutch friends initially refuse to believe, but then explain with the assumption that his teacher must be a member of a radical, anti-colonial movement (1:139ff.). Later Minke reconstructs one of Magda Peters's lectures about Multatuli for his class:

> Miss Magda once told us the story of Multatuli and his friend, the poet-journalist Roorda van Eysinga: They lived in tension because of their beliefs and their struggles to improve the fate of the people of the Indies, against both all-European and all-Native oppression. For the sake of the people of the Indies,

> who knew nothing of the world, those two ended up in exile, without comrades who visited them, without a single hand stretched out in aid, Minke. (1:189)

It is interesting that Magda Peters, Minke's teacher, uses the term "exile" to characterize Dekker's situation after he leaves the Indies. Eduard Douwes Dekker was not born in the Dutch Indies; he came there to seek employment with the colonial bureaucracy at the age of eighteen. Still Minke's teacher seems to assume that the tie between Dekker and the Indies is strong enough to make his repatriation to the Netherlands a case of "exile." There is a second intriguing piece of information in Peters's characterization of Multatuli. She portrays him as fighting against European and Native abuse of power alike. Such a statement can be debated. Multatuli criticizes the colonial regime's tolerance of abuses of power by the Natives. One could therefore argue that the roots of the problem, according to Multatuli, lie in hierarchical structures inherent to Native culture and not in the colonists' attitudes. The fact that Multatuli fights all forms of abuse, independent of the perpetrators, is of course very much part of the image Multatuli tries to create for himself; but is this not a simplification of his own role?

Toer's *Buru Quartet* is not always entirely positive about Multatuli. At times it becomes clear that Minke's admiration for the author stands in the way of his own development as a writer. He is, for instance, reproached that his "outlook on life is so heavy, so serious, just like Multatuli" and that he has no humor (2:179). Multatuli's megalomaniac tendencies are also recognized in *Buru Quartet* when Minke remembers "how Multatuli had been accused by the colonial newspapers of wanting to be a white emperor ruling over the peoples of the Indies, independent of the Netherlands" (3: 303). Minke clearly disapproves of such a characterization of Dekker's ambitions, but there is a historical basis for this story. Dekker's niece and erotic interest Sietske Abrahamsz notes in her memoirs that Dekker confessed to her that he wanted to become "Emperor" of the Indies, and that he would make her his "crown princess".[21]

Toer's texts document connections between contemporary postcolonial literature and the colonial literary history of at least one Germanic country. Before I elaborate further on the exact nature of these connections and the literary traditions behind them, I want to interrupt my argument to look briefly at theoretical or meta-theoretical attempts to trace and reflect on the specific Germanic contexts of postcolonialism. What legitimates a specific "Germanic" perspective on postcolonialism? At first sight, German and Dutch colonialism are very different. Dutch colonialism can be traced back to 1595, when the first expedition, four ships, left Amsterdam for the East Indies. Not much later, in 1601, the Dutch set up their first trading post in Sumatra.[22] Indonesia gained official independence in 1949; the other major Dutch colony, Surinam, became independent in 1975. In contrast to the Dutch, the Germans have a very brief colonial history. Germany possessed a number of territories, mainly in the southern half of Africa, from 1884 through 1919 when it lost its colonial territories in the wake of the end of the First World War.[23] Dutch colonial history is long; German colonialism is but a passing phase. But are the differences so extreme? For a long time (until the beginning of the nineteenth century), Dutch colonialism consisted mainly in the attempt to maintain trading posts; there was no actual occupation of territories. Until it went bankrupt in 1799, Dutch colonial policies were in fact determined by the V.O.C. (United East Indies Company) and were not primarily a matter of the Dutch government. The conquest of what is now Indonesia started in the early nineteenth century and lasted until the second decade of the twentieth century. The Dutch struggled with the "problem" that they did not have the manpower to occupy large territories like the East Indies, even if they were employing representatives of other nationalities in their colonies. Like the Germans, the Dutch saw themselves as the underdogs of international colonialism, outsmarted by the major European colonial powers. Both emphasized that their mission was to bring civilization to the uncivilized.

What I propose in the following is an experiment. I will approach Dutch colonial literature with the help of German theory. This presumes certain intellectual and historical continuities. Some of the earliest writings on the Dutch Indies were by Germans who worked for the Dutch government (Rumphius, Junghuhn).[24] In the case of Multatuli's *Max Havelaar*, the impact of German on Dutch culture is clearly visible; for instance, in the exemplary function the work of Heine has for Multatuli[25] or in the fact that Multatuli makes a German, Fritz Stern, into one of the narrators of *Max Havelaar* (a rather unlikely construction, since Stern seems early in the novel to have little knowledge of Dutch).[26] Nevertheless, it is clearly important to Multatuli to use a representative of the German cultural tradition as a mediator for the story of Max Havelaar; as a representative of a country without colonial past or present, one can expect Stern to be an objective, but informed outsider.[27] Dekker himself, later in life, chose to leave the Netherlands and to live in Germany. This may have had something to do with financial or legal troubles that he was facing in the Netherlands,[28] but it may also point to his affinity for the German writing of his time which, in comparison to Dutch literature, was politically more explicit.

Postcolonial theory has never been very popular in Germany and other Germanic countries. In the case of Germany[29]—and the same goes for the Scandinavian

countries—this doubtless has something to do with the fact that the country had only a brief colonial history. In the case of the Netherlands, this theoretical skepticism can be explained by its reluctance to deal with its colonial past,[30] and especially, just after the German occupation of the Netherlands, with Indonesia's battle for independence in the late 1940s, an event that has left scars in the Dutch national historical memory. A further complication is that theoretical debates, especially in the German-speaking countries, were dominated by trends that led away from issues in which postcolonial critics tend to be interested. Without a doubt, German intellectuals reacted in general with profound skepticism to poststructuralism and to the diverse waves of postmodern thought at the roots of much of postcolonial thought. In fact, attempts to develop something like a German identity in the theoretical debates dominating literary and cultural discourses of the past two decades were dominated by an anti-poststructuralist and anti-postmodern attitude. The heir of the Frankfurt School, Jürgen Habermas, emphasized the legacy of the Enlightenment and its legitimative resources in his attempt to secure the legacy of modernity against its postmodern and poststructuralist critics.[31]

This emphasis on the Enlightenment is also apparent in the few theoretical attempts in German cultural studies to deal with Germany's colonial past. In his book *Enlightenment or Empire*, Russell Berman asks whether it is fair to equate the Enlightenment with imperialism, or whether there is a critical side to the Enlightenment's program that evades such an equation and rejects imperialism. Berman thinks he has located this more critical side of the Enlightenment by distinguishing between "alternative rationalities, the object of one being the control and domination of nature—the fully mapped-out globe—the object of the other maintaining an interest in alternative regions of human experience,"[32] The second form of rationality is, for Berman, closely tied to the emancipatory potential of the Enlightenment (40 and 64), the recognition of alterity leads the European subject to relativize its own value judgments and world view. For Berman, this dualism within the Enlightenment is personified by the differences between the responses of the Englishman Cook and the German Forster to their encounter with the Natives of the South Island of New Zealand during Cook's second major exploratory voyage (1772-1775). Cook's sole interest is in producing a map of the visited territories which is to be as precise as possible; he pursues a form of instrumental rationality that, in the end, is interested in expanding the British empire. Forster, in contrast, represents the emancipatory potential of the Enlightenment, its humanistic side. He is interested in knowledge not as a tool for eventually conquering unexplored territories, but as a goal in itself. According to Berman's argumentation, this second strain in the Enlightenment's program exonerates German colonialism, at least partially.[33] He sees a connection between Germany's own "liminal situation" and its interest in alterity as an "object of heterophile desire".[34]

These are highly problematic assertions. The claim that one form of marginality—Germany's liminal position in eighteenth- and early nineteenth-century Europe—more or less automatically leads to a sympathetic identification with those representing other marginalities (for instance, those falling victim to European colonial expansion) is especially difficult to defend. In colonial history, there is little factual evidence to back up such a claim. The marginal role of Germany in the West's colonial past was tied to a desire to catch up with other colonial powers, which without a doubt led to a discarding of humanitarian principles in countries like Namibia.[35] But there are other problems with Berman's argument. One wonders whether the critical attitude toward colonial abuse is so typical for the German Enlightenment alone, since the Enlightenment was a European, and not just a German occurrence. Furthermore, as Susanne Zantop has shown in detail, it has always been part of the rhetoric of German colonialism to claim that Germans would be better colonists than others.[36] In spite of all its critical ambitions, Berman's study follows this pattern of argumentation exactly. Berman's main problem in his attempt to resolve the issue of the Enlightenment's engagement versus colonial abuse is that he tries to resolve it on a discursive level alone, and has little interest in everyday colonial practice.[37]

In spite of the problematic aspects of Berman's text from the perspective of postcolonial theory, there is a very compelling question at the core of his book. What was the practical meaning of the emancipatory, progressive side of the Enlightenment's program in the colonial context? Much attention has been paid to the dialectical structures underlying the Enlightenment in the West, to the tendency of emancipatory reason to ally itself with instrumental reason, and to the potential for rationality to become its own totalitarian mythology. But what about the impact of the Enlightenment's program on the relationship between Europeans and non-Europeans in the colonies?

When Toer addresses the progressive and emancipatory side of the heritage of the West, he indeed means the intellectual, cultural and political heritage associated with Europe's Enlightenment. There is no doubt that the clearest historical manifestation of this legacy is the French Revolution with its ideals of liberty, equality, and fraternity; Minke learns about them in school from Magda Peters (1:128). It is the journalist Ter Haar who points out that, taken literally, the ideals of the French revolution are valid everywhere—even if France itself

has not proven this, by keeping colonies of its own, as Minke points out (2:267). Minke declares himself an unambiguous believer in the "spirit and ideals of the French Revolution," even though he is aware of the fact that he is, at least partially, cheating himself in his idealism, since he has not succeeded in giving up all the "comforts and pleasures" he owes to his family background (2:186ff.). Multatuli is also here; he can be seen as one of the defenders of this political heritage of the radical Enlightenment. He has great admiration for Napoleon, Voltaire, and Rousseau.[38] In terms of literary history, in particular the similarities to Rousseau and also Heine are striking; all of these men were highly indebted to the Enlightenment, but pushed the Enlightenment's program with a certain Romantic fervor.

Most examples of Minke's appropriation of Multatuli thus far have been from volumes 1 and 2 of *Buru Quartet*. Volume 3, entitled *Footsteps*, is where we encounter the first attempts to come to an independence movement. Multatuli also plays a significant, although much more ambiguous role in this volume. He is discussed in connection with Minke's encounters and visits with Johannes Benedictus Van Heutsz (1851-1924). As a general in the colonial army, Van Heutsz conquered Aceh (the northern part of the island Sumatra) and thereby finished one of the longest lasting military conflicts of Dutch colonial history (1873-1904).[39] It is estimated that the campaign in Aceh cost approximately 70,000 lives among the Native population.[40] After Van Heutsz was appointed Governor-General of the Dutch Indies in 1904—with support of the liberal party, as Toer reminds us—he incorporated the last remaining independent territories to form the territory of what was once the Dutch Indies and is now Indonesia. For this he won much praise in the Netherlands; even today there still exists a Van Heutsz monument in Amsterdam, although the bust of the former colonial hero has been removed.[41]

Van Heutsz is the ultimate personification of militant imperialism in Indonesia's history; his name is associated with some of the worst atrocities against the Native population during the colonial period. Yet in *Buru Quartet*, we are acquainted with another side of Van Heutsz. As Governor-General of the Indies, Van Heutsz wants to surround himself with Native intellectuals like Minke, and he even turns out to be an admirer of Multatuli. We learn that Van Heutsz gives Minke books by Multatuli (3:139), and he claims to want to know Minke's opinion about them: "What do you think of Multatuli's writings? outstanding, don't you think?" (3:225) The context of Van Heutsz's question is important. He discusses Multatuli right after making a statement criticizing the "conservativism of the priyayi"—the class of high Native officials targeted by Multatuli in *Max Havelaar*. Even though this may mean over-interpreting Van Heutsz's words, one could conclude that the general has a one-sided view of Multatuli's colonial criticism. Minke responds with a non-committal remark on Multatuli's style, after which Van Heutsz goes into more detail about his interest in Multatuli:

> I don't think anyone can truly understand the Indies without having read Multatuli. And if you don't understand the Indies, then you don't know what it is you have to do for the Indies. In the past many people criticized and ridiculed his works. They were backward colonials. He understood the Indies and the Netherlands of his time. He understood the spirit of his times. But, Mr. Minke, the Indies has changed since the time of Multatuli. As has the Netherlands itself (3:226).

What does Van Heutsz mean when he says he is interested in "understanding" the Indies? Such an "understanding" has immediate practical consequences. Only when one understands the Indies does one know what one has "to do." Such a statement should be understood in terms of colonial policy; "understanding" the Indies and its population means having the ability to run the colony more efficiently and to produce larger profits. Knowledge is power. Multatuli's name as well as his writings are co-opted by those in power. The regime seeks to create the illusion that it has worked on the problems identified by Multatuli. *Footsteps* often emphasizes that the message those in power want to send is: "The dark ages of Multatuli are past." (3:390) By mentioning the name "Multatuli," those in power can portray themselves as humanitarian, as open for Native concerns, and as modern. Van Heutsz does not count himself among the "backward colonials"; he sees himself as a forward-looking colonial.

One of the points Toer is making here is that in the colonial context all forms of knowledge can be abused, even those types of knowledge gained with good intentions. It is impossible to distinguish emancipatory from instrumental forms of Enlightenment as Berman would like to do; in colonialism a progressive agenda can easily become a tool of subjugation. But that is not all; there are indications that for Toer the Western idea of literature as a whole is problematic. When Van Heutsz, shortly before stepping down as governor-general and leaving for the Netherlands, reproaches Minke that he has not written any short stories for a long time, and that such stories "are a much more valuable and long-lasting contribution to writing in the Indies than [Minke's] piece on boycott, for example, will ever be" (3: 318), he defends a concept of culture which the text in the meanwhile has declared obsolete. Minke has made a conscious choice in favor of journalism and against fiction. A connection with Multatuli's writing is made when, in the same conversation, Van Heutsz asks Minke whether he will abandon his pen name forever. The dis-

cussion of Multatuli in the context of Minke's intellectual encounters with Van Heutsz illustrates a point made earlier by Nyai Ontosoroh, Minke's first mother-in-law, whom he calls "Mama." In *Child of all Nations,* Nyai Ontosoroh had warned Minke that colonialism is not something that can be understood unless one has lived it: "[The word 'colonial' is] something that must be not only explained but also experienced. You will never understand by reading alone. I've tried to find it in dictionaries, Child, three dictionaries. All in vain." (2:82). It is not just the idea of culture that is questioned in *Buru Quartet*, it is the idea of discursivity itself. Through language, by thinking through all possible explanations of what colonialism is, we will never get to the core of what colonialism means. The gap between the constructions meant to grasp what colonialism is and colonialism as a lived reality will always be there. On the level of thinking alone, we will never be able to fully penetrate what it really is.

Although it seems important to Toer to point out that Dekker suffered personally for his political stances (see 1:189), he also openly breaks with Multatuli. This is most clear when one compares the narrative organization of *Max Havelaar* with *Buru Quartet*. Toer's *Buru Quartet* reverses the narrative structure of Multatuli's *Max Havelaar* on a formal level. Edward Said has written of a "far from coincidental convergence between the patterns of narrative authority constitutive of the novel on the one hand, and, on the other, a complex ideological configuration underlying the tendency to imperialism."[42] Not just the colonial novel, but Western literature of the nineteenth and early twentieth century in general aims for a narrative authority that is "normative and sovereign" and above all "self-validating in the course of the narrative."[43] The narrative structure of Multatuli's *Max Havelaar* is highly complex; there are several narrators—all with their own agendas and not all of them reliable—and it is not always clear who is speaking when.[44] One could say that Multatuli attempts to break through the normative patterns of the novel to which Said refers. However, at the end of *Max Havelaar* the real narrator, Multatuli, "stands up" and, by revealing himself to be Max Havelaar, authenticates the story.[45] This confirms the "self-validating" narrative strategy to which Said refers. Toer makes clear that the narrative form of the *Buru Quartet* is influenced by *Max Havelaar*. For instance, Multatuli's inclusion of the story of "Saïjah and Adinda"[46] in *Max Havelaar* prompts Minke to write about colonial abuse in his own time (2:120). Toer, in turn, then breaks open the linear narrative in order to integrate one of Minke's writings into his text, the story of Surati (2:131-57). In the end, though, the *Buru Quartet* reverses the narrative structure of *Max Havelaar*. In the beginning, Multatuli's novel is narrated by the most inauthentic voice—the first narrator is the "coffee broker" Batavus Droogstoppel, "No. 37 Lauriersgracht, Amsterdam,"[47] who has no direct knowledge of the narrated event and has no interest in any truth that might be an obstacle to the coffee trade—and it ends with the "authentic" voice of Multatuli. In the first three volumes of *Buru Quartet* Minke functions as narrator. The last volume, *House of Glass*, takes up the events after Minke has been exiled, and is narrated by Pangemanann, the Native police commissioner charged with Minke's case. Multatuli's self-identification as Max Havelaar at the end of the novel of the same name bespeaks the Enlightenment's confidence that truth will eventually reveal itself if we, narrator and reader, work hard enough to find it. Toer's *Buru Quartet* achieves the opposite effect; at the end there is no narrator who tells us that he personally guarantees the truth of his story. Instead we witness how the truth is systematically distorted, how history is consciously rewritten. Truth is a fiction; any attempt to read a teleology into historical developments is futile. Toer fundamentally questions the Enlightenment's program and its ambitions.

But if it is not the legacy of the Enlightenment, what is the exact nature of the utopian model presented in *Buru Quartet*?

Toer's *Buru Quartet* should be read as part of current debates about postcolonial theory, because Toer offers unconventional perspectives on post-colonialism or, more specifically, on what seem to be established positions within contemporary post-colonial studies. Toer's text, as I will show in the following, allows for an innovative reading of some of the key concepts of contemporary postcolonial theory. Postcolonial scholars, for instance, have argued that there is a direct link between globalization and the "economic, cultural and political legacy of Western imperialism."[48] Toer acknowledges this connection by stressing the ubiquitous influence of the sugar industry on colonial politics and on the functioning of the press, or by describing how Nyai Ontosoroh loses her business to the inexperienced relatives of Mellema, her former boss, lover, and business partner. The story of the Japanese prostitute Maiko (1:169-177) shows that the international trade in women is a side effect of globalization.

However, there is another, more positive side to globalization that Toer takes very seriously. The titles of the first two volumes of *Buru Quartet*—*This Earth of Mankind* and *Child of all Nations*—have a programmatic function within the cycle; Minke describes himself once as "a child of all nations, of all ages, past and present" (2:169). Globalization may be a side effect of global capitalism; it also at least potentially allows for an exchange of information all over the globe. And this aspect attracts Minke. "Learn from ideas that aren't European!" he admonishes himself (2:77). He is particularly

interested in countries with independence movements:

> It was not only from Europe that so much could be learned! This modern age had provided so many breasts to suckle me—from among the natives themselves, from Japan, China, America, India, Arabia, from all the peoples on the face of this earth. (2:169)

Globalization cannot be understood exclusively as something that concerns the colonizer and the colonized—the Netherlands and the Indies—alone. By definition "globalization" has something indeterminate and uncontrollable in it, in particular when it concerns the flow of information. This flow of information can potentially also reach the furthest villages, if there are people who are willing to function as mediators. The journalist Kommer reminds Minke that his idol Multatuli promised to have his work translated into Native languages, if the Dutch would not read it (2:113),[49] and that he, Minke, should follow this example.

As the above quote from the second volume of *Buru Quartet* makes clear, Toer's re-evaluation of "globalization" also has consequences for his understanding of "modernity"; it is the "modern age" that has made globalization possible. The Dutch journalist Ter Haar directly links that modernization and the dominant role of capitalism—"What people call the modern age, Mr. Tollenaar, is really the age of the triumph of capital" (2:259) —and he warns Minke against embracing modernity. Undeniably, however, the term "modern" also has positive connotations for Minke. This is clear in the introduction to the second chapter of volume one, in which Minke as narrator at a later age reflects on developments in his youth, and addresses the popularity of the word "modern":

> Modern! How quickly that word had surged forward and multiplied itself like bacteria throughout the world. (At least, that is what people were saying.) So allow me to use this word, though I still don't fully understand its meaning. (1:18)

The above quotation follows a section in which Minke writes enthusiastically about trains, cars, and above all about innovations in the printing process that allows for the easier reproduction of photographs. "Modern," in other words, is understood here in the sense of modernization; it is significant that Minke emphasizes those aspects of the modern world that concern increased mobility and the exchange of information. In volume three of the *Buru Quartet*, *Footsteps*, he will not only buy his first bicycle with a similar enthusiasm, but also profit from the innovations in printing techniques by starting a number of publications for Natives. Increased mobility of the Native population and the fact that Minke's publications are reaching it make the foundation of new, "modern" organizations possible (3: 260).

For Minke, the issue of modernization has not only a societal, but also a philosophical dimension which also is addressed in *Buru Quartet*. Minke argues consistently for the freedom and autonomy of the individual, and tries to further his own intellectual development by any means available. He fights for education and freedom of information for all. Throughout the *Buru Quartet*, Minke battles existing hierarchies in colonial society—and he seems relatively indifferent to the issue of whether these hierarchies are the products of European domination or Native tradition. Furthermore, he is adamant about abolishing existing inequalities between men and women. Underlying his ideas is a firm belief in rationality; in the introduction to the second chapter of volume one, which I have quoted before, he states unequivocally: "I put my trust in scientific understanding and in reason" (1:19). Such a statement reads like an unambiguous endorsement of the Enlightenment's program, but it is not. For one thing, the ideal articulated by Minke here is meant to be utopian, and is not bound to a specific time or place. Although certain ideas are rooted in a particular culture, that does not mean they cannot be appropriated and radicalized by other cultures. But if Minke does not refer here to a Western style of rationality, what does the text intend to articulate?

Toer's position is not entirely isolated within contemporary postcolonial theory, . One of the defining controversies in recent anthropology concerns Captain Cook—the same figure to whom Berman refers in order to understand English versus German colonial discourse. At the core of the debate about Cook are the exact circumstances of his death. The prominent cultural anthropologist Marshall Sahlins has claimed that the Hawaiians considered Cook to be their white god Lono, and that when he did not fulfill their expectations, they turned against him.[50] Sahlins's colleague Gananath Obeyesekere questions this conclusion. According to Obeyesekere, Sahlins has a reductive view of non-European peoples and cultures; non-Europeans supposedly naively believe in their myths and rituals, while Europeans act rationally, according to Obeyesekere's view of Sahlins's line of argumentation.[51] Obeyesekere claims in contrast that the Hawaiians acted rationally; according to their own form of practical reason, they assumed the white men arriving again were up to no good. It is incorrect, according to Obeyesekere, to see "rationality" as a purely Western, culture-bound given—as a product of the Enlightenment, in other words. Instead, his notion of practical rationality rests on the idea that humans everywhere, on the basis of their biology, have "perceptual and cognitive mechanisms" in common.[52] Obeyesekere is aware of the radical stance such "universalist" assumptions imply, but he considers them a fair alternative to the Eurocentric views of Sahlins.[53]

There are interesting parallels between Obeyesekere's argumentation and the claims that Toer makes in *Buru*

Quartet. Toer essentially argues that rationality and a concomitant model of modernity are not necessarily Western privileges. For Toer, the Western European cultural legacy can never be normative, because it has failed to speak for all of humanity and is intertwined with abusive colonial practices that contradict its humanistic agenda. This does not mean, however, that concepts such as modernity and rationality are completely useless for Toer. On a programmatic level, Toer's novels propose an appropriation of key concepts like globalization, modernity, and rationality in order to refunctionalize these ideas in the interest of the subaltern subjects in the colonial and postcolonial worlds. Like Obeyesekere, Toer embraces a kind of universalism—together with a fair dose of skepticism—in order to offer a political and societal agenda for those relegated to the margins of postcolonial globalism.

I began this paper with the argument that the contemporary practice of postcolonial studies could benefit from approaches putting more emphasis on the importance of local perspectives. A provincialization of Europe, for which postcolonial studies has called, is only possible if we, first, take into account the differences within Europe and, secondly, if we seriously attempt to find an outside perspective on Europe at the same time. I hope that my deliberations above have shown that the current interest in European colonial literary history can be productive if we relate these colonial narratives to the lives of those living in postcolonial societies today. I have chosen to work with Indonesian and Dutch examples to illustrate this principle, but it could be done with examples involving Germany's colonial heritage too, even though the available material is much more limited. I hope to have made clear that a scholarly interest in colonial literary traditions can be legitimate if we focus on those cultural materials in which postcolonial and colonial literatures intersect. It is crucial, in other words, to make a connection between colonial literature on the one hand and the history and present of those who live in the former colonies on the other. Making the intellectual traditions that inform the West part of the debate seems to me unavoidable. The existence of processes of transculturation between Europe and its others is a fact; there is no reason to deny it. *Buru Quartet* also argues, however, that in the end, Minke—and the tradition of non-Western intellectuals he represents—does not need Europe; we should take this conclusion seriously.

While an emphasis on local transformations of colonial discourse is constitutive for *Buru Quartet*, Toer's argument is finally about globalization. Minke consistently searches for a negotiation of the local with the global. He is aware of the fact that his ideas are at least partially determined by the place where he grew up and by the time in which he lives, but when he describes himself as "a child of all nations, of all ages, past and present" (2:169) he makes clear that he wants to use his local knowledge to contribute to knowledge about a more general, global condition—one could say about the postcolonial condition. It is possible to apply Minke's insight to the state of postcolonial studies today; in fact, here too Toer formulates an interesting polemical point. If all knowledge is local and global knowledge can only be the product of an ongoing process of negotiation, this has consequences for the way postcolonial critics position themselves. Neither Western postcolonial critics nor their non-Western counterparts—the author-intellectual living in the postcolonial world—are necessarily in possession of *the* truth. One could read this as an argument for the recognition of the hybrid nature of all knowledge about the postcolonial condition, but Toer understands the term in quite a different way from most of contemporary postcolonial theory. While postcolonial theory emphasizes the aspect of difference in hybridity, Toer emphasizes increased mobility, globalism, and the chances this offers. His notion of globalization goes hand in hand with the idea that humanity, one way or another, needs to negotiate its internal differences.

It is possible to read "The Book That Killed Colonialism" as an example of the processes of negotiation meant by Toer. Toer starts his essay with an anecdote about Agus Salim, Indonesia's first ambassador to England, who at a reception for diplomats in London in the late 1940s is asked about the strong smelling clove-cigarette he smokes. Salim answers that the clove once was once "one of the world's most sought-after spices" and the reason why the West colonized the world.[54] It is Agus Salim's statement that, for Toer, turns into an impetus to rethink global history from a perspective that comes from those formerly colonized. Such a rethinking of global history also appropriates neglected parts of Western intellectual history; *Max Havelaar* is "now an almost unknown literary work," (112) but can be relevant, if interpreted in the context of Indonesia's colonial past. It takes a certain attitude of irreverence toward the Western intellectual tradition to re-think it in such a way. Toer's essay also reaffirms the importance the author attributes to the processes of globalization set into motion by colonialism. Through contacts between peoples and cultures previously unaware of one another, the new globalism enables new educational opportunities and the chance for former colonies to determine their own fate.[55] Thus, according to Toer, in spite of all the misery colonialism has produced, globalism facilitates a learning process that involves the West, but *by no means* limits itself to the West, and eventually turns itself against the hierarchies of colonialism. Interpreted in this way, globalism does not just react against colonial or neo-colonial practices; it also is critical toward "separa-

tist nationalism," advocating instead what Said describes as a "more integrative view of human community and human liberation."[56] Such an ideal profits from the insight that "the history of all cultures is the history of cultural borrowings. Cultures are not impermeable …"[57]

Minke's statement about his identity as a global citizen in *Buru Quartet* does not merely indicate a need to negotiate geographical, spatial differences, but also the need to bridge temporal gaps. What does this mean for *Buru Quartet* as a whole? Is it maybe too reductive to read *Buru Quartet* as a report on Indonesia's colonial history alone? The critical potential of Toer's novel lies not exclusively in the fact that it analyzes Indonesia's colonial past in detail, but the Indonesian present as well. Suharto's government understood this clearly. Not only did it place Toer under house arrest after he was released from Buru Island, but in 1981, shortly after their publication the year before, the first two volumes of *Buru Quartet* were banned by the Indonesian government.[58] Globalization did not stop with the end of the colonial era, and its ties with global capitalism were never severed. What was true in the colonial era may still be true today.

NOTES

[1]"[W]hat is circulated as 'postcolonial theory' has largely emerged from within English literary studies. The meaning of 'discourse' shrinks to 'text', and from there to 'literary text' and from there to texts written in English because that is the corpus most familiar to the critics." Ania Loomba, *Colonialism/Postcolonialism* (New York: Routledge, 1998), 96).

[2]Kwame Anthony Appiah, "The Postcolonial and the Postmodern", in *The Postcolonial Studies Reader*, eds. Bill Ashcroft, Gareth Griffiths, and Helen Tiffin (New York: Routledge, 1995), 119; see also Loomba, *Colonialism/ Postcolonialism*, 246.

[3]Loomba, *Colonialism/Postcolonialism*, 255ff.

[4]See my discussion of Russell Berman's *Enlightenment or Empire?* below.

[5]Marie Louise Pratt develops the concept of "transculturation" to describe the interaction, in the so-called "contact-zone," of dominant and subjugated culture, of the metropolis and the periphery, of empire and its subordinated subjects. Mary Louise Pratt, *Imperial Eyes: Travel Writing and Transculturation* (New York: Routledge, 1992), 6.

[6]Pramoedya Ananta Toer, "The Book That Killed Colonialism: As the West Clamored for Spices, the Novelist 'Multatuli' Cried for Justice," *New York Times Magazine* (18 April 1999): 112-114. Toer is not the only one who embraces Multatuli from a postcolonial perspective; see for instance the following passage in Edward Said's *Culture and Imperialism*: "During the nineteenth century, if we exclude rare exceptions like the Dutch writer Multatuli, debate over colonies usually turned over their profitability, their management and mismanagement, and on theoretical questions such as whether and how colonialism might be squared with *laissez-faire* or tariff-politics; an *imperialist* and Euro-centric framework is implicitly accepted." Edward W. Said, *Culture and Imperialism* (New York: Vintage, 1994), 240). Unfortunately, Said does not elaborate on his statement.

[7]"The Book That Killed Colonialism," 114.

[8]"The Book That Killed Colonialism," 114. In contrast, other Indonesian intellectuals have relativized the impact of *Max Havelaar* on Dutch colonial policies; the book did, for instance, not stop further Dutch conquests (Aceh, Bali, Lombok); see Subagio Sastrowardoyo, "Max Havelaar di tengah masyarakat Indonesia" [Max Havelaar in de Indonesische samenleving], in *Studi Belanda di Indonesia/Nederlandse studiën in Indonesië*, e. Kees Groeneboer (Jakarta: Djambatan, 1989), 23, 24, 32.

[9]In contrast to Toer's very positive evaluation of Multatuli's work, the reception of the first Indonesian translation of *Max Havelaar*, published in 1972, was not very enthusiastic. One of the reviewers called the work important for Dutch literary history, but of little importance for Indonesian readers. See "Petisi Sjaalman-Dekker," in *Tempo* (5 August 1972): 49; see Gerard Termorshuizen and Kees Snoek, *Adinda! Duizend vuurvliegjes tooien je loshangende haar. Multatuli in Indonesië* (Leiden: Dimensie, 1991), 21. In 1987—100 years after his death—Multatuli was again the object of debate in Indonesia when a film from 1975 based on *Max Havelaar* was released by the Indonesian authorities for public performance, a symposium on his work was organized at the Universitas Indonesia, and a Dutch book on Multatuli by Willem Frederik Hermans appeared in translation. A representative sampling of the responses by the press to these events (Termorshuizen and Snoek, *Adinda!* 69-113) shows how conflicted Indonesians feel about Multatuli. His work was seen as pervaded by colonial prejudices and self-centered; but it also is acknowledged that he was important for the first generation of Indonesian nationalists, who lived during colonization and read *Max Havelaar* in school. Also, the critical potential of his writings for postcolonial Indonesia was recognized. This is clear in Umar Nur Zain's "Max Havelaar" (Termorshuizen and Snoek, *Adinda!,* 85-89), a fictional dialogue of a narrator, Cemplon, who is visited by Havelaar in 1987. Havelaar is astonished over the enormous economic progress made by Indonesia, which leads him to believe that the country has left behind the abusive practices of the past, while in reality the narrator has to admit things look a lot more like the colonial days of Multatuli than at first seems to be the case

[10]Pratt, *Imperial Eyes*, 7.

[11]E. M. Beekman, *Troubled Pleasures: Dutch Colonial Literature from the East Indies 1600-1950* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996), 222.

[12]See the summary of secondary literature on Multatuli by Hermans, Nieuwenhuys, and van 't Veer in the recent biography of Multatuli by Dik van der Meulen, *Multatuli: Leven en werk van Eduard Douwes Dekker* (Nijmegen: Sun, 2002), 321-28.

[13]Beekman, *Troubled Pleasures*, 225.

[14]Multatuli, *Max Havelaar or the Coffee Auctions of the Dutch Trading Company* (London: Penguin, 1987), 320. A "klewang" is a Malay sword.

[15]See van der Meulen, *Multatuli*, 415.

[16]To be more precise, *Max Havelaar* is the first Dutch novel about colonial life attracting a major readership. Texts about the Indies had been published earlier (see Beekman, *Troubles*

Pleasures, 80-201), but none of them made an impact on the public sphere that in any way was comparable to the response to Multatuli's novel.

[17]This period seems to have lasted until approximately 1940. In my own experience, those outside the Netherlands who received at least some higher education before 1940 are in general familiar with the author, title, and content of the book.

[18]Before Indonesia's independence, Multatuli's name was associated with those of prominent nationalists. See Pramoedya Ananta Toer, "Multatuli, Sebuah Kenangan" ('Multatuli, a Memoir'), <http://www.geocities.com/Broadway/Orchestra/9632/ mulatuli.html>. In this autobiographical text written in 1986—I assume to celebrate the hundredth anniversary of Multatuli's death in the following year—Toer retraces the origins of his interest in Multatuli. Even though Toer's parents read Dutch and owned Dutch books they did not speak of Multatuli. When Toer first encounters the name, in school during extracurricular activities, he responds rather negatively. He cannot imagine that anything good can come from a (former) official of the Dutch government. After the beginning of the Japanese occupation, Toer moves to Jakarta and starts to read Multatuli, including his lesser known works, while visiting a friend who lives in a secondhand bookstore full of Western books from Europeans sent to the camps. On the advice of his teacher, he then also starts to read old papers and magazines, and from those he learns that virtually every nationalist leader had been interested in Multatuli. It is important to Toer that Multatuli was concerned with the plight of the common man. However, after independence, Multatuli's reputation is seen as more problematic; when Toer in 1959 proposes to celebrate Dekker's hundred and fortieth birthday (1960) with a statue and a lecture, his initiative is not appreciated and is put on hold. In 1964, Toer is one of the founders of the Multatuli Literature Academy—an institution that ceases to exist one year later when Sukarno's regime is overthrown. While in exile on Buru Island, Toer learns from one of the few newspapers to which he has access that the Indonesian-Dutch co-production, the film *Max Havelaar*, had been banned in Indonesia.

[19]In the following, all references to *Buru Quartet* list the volume number first, and then the page number. 1 = *This Earth of Mankind*, *The Buru Quartet, vol 1*, trans. and aftrw. Max Lane (London: Penguin, 1996); 2 = *Child of all Nations. The Buru Quartet, vol 2*, trans. and intr. Max Lane (London: Penguin, 1996); 3 = *Footsteps*. *The Buru Quartet, vol 3*, trans. and intr. Max Lane (London: Penguin, 1996); 4 = *House of Glass. The Buru Quartet, vol 4*, trans. and intr. Max Lane (New York: Morrow, 1996).

[20]See Max Lane, "Introduction" (3:9), and Chris GoGwilt, "Pramoedya's Fiction and History: An Interview With Indonesian Novelist Pramoedya Ananta Toer," *The Yale Journal of Criticism* 9:1 (1996), 147-164, here p. 151.

[21]Beekman, *Troubled Pleasures*, 214.

[22]Beekman, *Troubled Pleasures*, 49.

[23]A complete overview of German colonial history can be found at <http://www.dhm.de/lemo/html/kaiserreich/aus sen politik/kolonien2/>. The Germans also possessed colonies in Papua-New Guinea, the Marshall Islands, West Samoa, Micronesia, and China (Kiautschou).

[24]Beekman, *Troubled Pleasures*, 80-116 and 147-201.

[25]See the integration of a poem by Heine in *Max Havelaar*, 145-47.

[26]Multatuli, *Max Havelaar*, 43.

[27]Susanne Zantop, *Colonial Fantasies: Conquest, Family, and Nation in Precolonial Germany, 1770-1870* (Durham: Duke University Press, 1997), 38-40, who points out that Germans often conceived of themselves as "intellectual arbiter[s]", as "objective" and "moral" outsiders in relation to other European nations' colonial adventures, who had a right to speak for indigenous populations.

[28]See van der Meulen, *Multatuli*, 511.

[29]See for instance Zantop, *Colonial Fantasies*, 6-8.

[30]It is interesting to note that the major study on Dutch colonial literature was published first in English and by a scholar working in the United States: E. M. Beekman, *Troubled Pleasures: Dutch Colonial Literature from the East Indies 1600-1950* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996).

[31]Jürgen Habermas develops the most detailed account of this argument in his book *The Philosophical Discourse of Modernity* (Cambridge ,Mass.: MIT, 1990).

[32]Russell A. Berman, *Enlightenment or Empire: Colonial Discourse in German Culture* (Lincoln: Nebraska University Press, 1998), 48; see also 40.

[33]See for instance the following statement toward the end of Berman's study: "If there is a feature that characterizes the discourse of colonialism in Germany, it is, not exhaustively to be sure but frequent enough, the capacity to recognize and appreciate—appreciate even at the moment of colonial appropriation—the other culture" (*Enlightenment or Empire*, 235).

[34]Berman, *Enlightenment or Empire*, 135. For Berman's argument of the moral superiority of German colonialism it also seems important that, instead of "succumbing to violent decolonization, it was dismantled by the treaty of Versailles, which transferred the colonies to the victors of the First World War." (*Enlightenment or Empire*, 125)

[35]See for instance Helmut Walser Smith, "The Talk of Genocide, the Rhetoric of Miscegenation: Notes on Debates in the German Reichstag Concerning Southwest Africa, 1904-14," in *The Imperialist Imagination: German Colonialism and Its Legacy*, eds. Sara Friedrichsmeyer, Sara Lennox, and Susanne Zantop (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1998), 107-123. Smith points out that the term "Konzentrationslager" was used in the colonial context to refer to prison camps for the native population (111). By 1907 the Germans had killed more than 60 percent of the original population of southern and central Namibia ("Introduction," *The Imperialist Imagination*, 14).

[36]Zantop, Colonial Fantasies, 6-8.

[37]Berman's claim that "the Enlightenment, at least in Forster's version, generates a decidedly anticolonialist politics" (*Enlightenment or Empire*, 56) remains entirely unsubstantiated.

[38]See also Beekman, *Troubled Pleasures*, 211, 216, 222- 224. The fact that Multatuli was an "arch-rebel" makes it hard to pin him down politically, as Beekman shows (225).

[39]Beekman speaks of a "long and brutal war" (204). Details of this war are discussed in volume one of the *Buru Quartet*,

when Minke talks to his friend Jean Marais who served the Dutch colonial army in the Aceh war (1:55-63).

[40]See <http://www.absofacts2.com/cultuurarchief/data/0111vanheuts zmonument.htm>. In total it is estimated that the conflict in Aceh took about 100,000 Indonesian and 30,000 European lives (see <http://www.groene.nl/2000/0026/ jb_heutsz.html>.

[41]For a history of the Van Heutsz monument see: <http://www.antenna.nl/wvi/nl/ic/vp/atjeh/heutsz/vn1.htl>, <http://www.antenna.nl/wvi/nl/ic/vp/atjeh/heutsz/groen1.html> and <http://www.absofacts2.com/cultuurarchief/data/0111 van-heutszmonu ment.htm>.

[42]Edward W. Said, *Culture and Imperialism* (New York: Vintage, 1994), 70.

[43]Edward W. Said, *Orientalism*, 77.

[44]A detailed analysis of the complex narrative structure of *Max Havelaar* can be found in Beekman, *Troubled Pleasures*, 234-240.

[45]Multatuli, *Max Havelaar,* 317.

[46]Multatuli, *Max Havelaar,* 255-277.

[47]Multatuli, *Max Havelaar,* 19.

[48]See also Bill Ashcroft, *Post-colonial Transformation* (New York: Routledge, 2001), 208.

[49]See *Max Havelaar*, 319.

[50]Marshall Sahlins summarizes his theory in *How "Natives" think: About Captain Cook, for Example* (Chicago: Uinversity of Chicago Press, 1996), 1-15. A summary of the controversy can be found in Adam Kuper, *Culture: the Anthropologists' Account* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1999), 177-200.

[51]See Gananath Obeyesekere, *The Apotheosis of Captain Cook: European Mythmaking in the Pacific* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1997), 220.

[52]Obeyesekere, *The Apotheosis of Captain Cook*, 21.

[53]"There is virtually no one, from Franz Boas onward, who really believes that natives are biologically different from Europeans. But this universalist assumption cannot be brought directly into our writing nowadays because it essentializes human beings, and 'essentialism' is a dirty word. Instead, we have moved in the reverse direction and have celebrated *difference*; thus each culture is different, and we have proclaimed a doctrine of cultural relativism to rationalize that difference" (Obeyesekere, "Afterword: On De-Sahlinization" in *The Apotheosis of Captain Cook*, 232). Kuper discusses the Sahlins-Obeyesekere controversy in the context of contemporary anthropological theory (*Culture*, 190-200).

[54]Toer, "The Book that Killed Colonialism," 112.

[55]"I include [the story of Agus Salim] here because it touches on what I would argue are the two most important 'processes' of this millennium: the search for spices by Western countries, which brought alien nations and cultures into contact with one another for the first time; and the expansion of educational opportunities, which returned to the colonized peoples of the world a right they had been forced to forfeit under Western colonization—the right to determine their own futures" (112).

[56]Said, *Culture and Imperialism*, 216.

[57] Said, *Culture and Imperialism*, 217.

[58]See GoGwilt, "Pramoedya's Fiction and History," 148 and 150.