

The colonizer who refuses

If every colonial immediately assumes the role of colonizer, every colonizer does not necessarily become a colonialist. However, the facts of colonial life are not simply ideas, but the general effect of actual conditions. To refuse means either withdrawing physically from those conditions or remaining to fight and change them.

It sometimes happens that a new arrival—astonished by the large number of beggars, the children wandering about half-naked, trachoma, etc., ill at ease before such obvious organization of injustice, revolted by the cynicism of his own fellow citizens (“Pay no attention to poverty! You’ll see: you soon get used to it!”), immediately thinks of going home. Being compelled to wait until the end of his contract, he is liable to get used to the poverty and the rest. But it may happen that this man, whose only wish was to be a colonial, finds himself unfit for this role, and soon leaves.

It can also happen that he does not leave. Having discovered the economic, political and moral scandal of colonization, he can no longer agree to become what his fellow citizens have become; he decides to remain, vowing not to accept colonization.

Oh, this vow is not necessarily a rigid one! Such

indignation is not always accompanied by desire for a policy of action. It is rather a position of principle. He may openly protest, or sign a petition, or join a group which is not automatically hostile toward the colonized. This already suffices for him to recognize that he has simply changed difficulties and discomfort. It is not easy to escape mentally from a concrete situation, to refuse its ideology while continuing to live with its actual relationships. From now on, he lives his life under the sign of a contradiction which looms at every step, depriving him of all coherence and all tranquillity.

What he is actually renouncing is part of himself, and what he slowly becomes as soon as he accepts a life in a colony. He participates in and benefits from those privileges which he half-heartedly denounces. Does he receive less favorable treatment than his fellow citizens? Doesn't he enjoy the same facilities for travel? How could he help figuring, unconsciously, that he can afford a car, a refrigerator, perhaps a house? How can he go about freeing himself of this halo of prestige which crowns him and at which he would like to take offense?

Should he happen to rationalize this contradiction so as to come to terms with this discomfort, his fellow citizens would take it upon themselves to awaken him. First with ironical indulgence; they have known, they understand this somewhat naïve

uneasiness of the new arrival; it will leave him as a result of the tests of colonial life, under a multitude of small and pleasant compromises.

It *must* leave him, they insist, for humanitarian romanticism is looked upon in the colonies as a serious illness, the worst of all dangers. It is no more or less than going over to the side of the enemy.

If he persists, he will learn that he is launching into an undeclared conflict with his own people which will always remain alive, unless he returns to the colonialist fold or is defeated. Wonder has been expressed at the vehemence of colonizers against any among them who put colonization in jeopardy. It is clear that such a colonizer is nothing but a traitor. He challenges their very existence and endangers the very homeland which they represent in the colony. However, historical relationships are on their side. What would logically result from the attitude of a colonizer who rejects colonization? Why shouldn't they vigorously defend themselves against an attitude which would end in their immolation, perhaps on the altar of justice, but, nevertheless, in their sacrifice? If they only fully recognized the injustice of their position! But it is they themselves who accepted it and who made the most of it. If this newly arrived colonizer cannot rise above this intolerable moralism which prevents him from living, if he believes in it so fervently, then let him begin by going away. He will

give proof of the earnestness of his feelings and will solve his problems—and stop creating them for his fellow citizens. Otherwise, he must not expect to continue to harass them undisturbed. They will take the offensive and return blow for blow. His friends will become surly; his superiors will threaten him; even his wife will join in and cry—a woman is less concerned about humanity in an abstract sense, the colonized mean nothing to her and she only feels at home among Europeans.

Is there then no way out except submission to the heart of the colonial community or departure? Yes, still one. Since his rebellion has closed the doors of colonization to him and isolated him in the middle of the colonial desert, why not knock at the door of the colonized whom he defends and who would surely open their arms to him in gratitude? He has discovered that one of the camps is that of injustice; the other, then, is that of righteousness. Let him take one more step, let him complete his revolt to the full. The colony is not made up only of Europeans! Refusing the colonizers, damned by them: let him adopt the colonized people and be adopted by them; let him become a turncoat.

There are so few of those colonizers, even of extreme good will, who seriously consider following this path, that the actual problem is rather theoretical; but it is a problem of significance in terms of an accurate view of colonial life. To refuse coloniza-

tion is one thing; to adopt the colonized and be adopted by them seems to be another; and the two are far from being connected.

To succeed in this second conversion, our man would have to be a moral hero. We said he should have broken economically and administratively with the oppressors' camp. That would be the only way to silence them. What a decisive demonstration, to abandon a fourth of his income or disregard the favors of the administration! But let us drop this; it is certainly admitted today that one can be, while awaiting the revolution, both a revolutionary and an exploiter. He discovers that if the colonized have justice on their side, if he can go so far as to give them his approval and even his assistance, his solidarity stops here; he is not one of them and has no desire to be one. He vaguely foresees the day of their liberation and the reconquest of their rights, but does not seriously plan to share their existence, even if they are freed.

A trace of racism? Perhaps, without being too well aware of it. Who can completely rid himself of bigotry in a country where everyone is tainted by it, including its victims? Is it so natural to assume, even mentally, the burden of a fate on which weighs such heavy scorn? How would he, in any case, go about attracting himself to this scorn which sticks to the person of the colonized? And how could he visualize sharing in any future liberation, being himself al-

ready free? All this is really nothing but mental exercise.

Well no, it is not necessarily racism. He has simply had the time to realize that a colony is not an extension of the home country and that he is not, on his home grounds. That is not inconsistent with his positions of principle. Since he has discovered the colonized and their existential character, since the colonized have suddenly become living and suffering humanity, the colonizer refuses to participate in their suppression and decides to come to their assistance. At the same time, he has understood that he has only changed his province; he has another civilization before him, customs differing from his own, men whose reactions often surprise him, with whom he does not feel deep affinity.

He will certainly have to admit this—even if he refuses to acknowledge it to the colonialists. He cannot help judging those people and that civilization. How can one deny that they are under-developed, that their customs are oddly changeable and their culture outdated? Oh, he hastens to reply, those defects are not attributable to the colonized but to decades of colonization which galvanized their history. Some colonialist arguments disturb him at times. For example, before colonization, weren't the colonized already backward? If they let themselves be colonized, it is precisely because they did not have the

capacity to fight, either militarily or technically. Understanding that, their past shortcomings mean nothing as far as their future is concerned. No one doubts that they would make up for that, if they had their freedom back. He has complete faith in the genius of people, all peoples. The fact remains, however, that he admits to a fundamental difference between the colonized and himself. Colonial actuality is a specific historical fact; the situation and state of the colonized, as they presently are, of course, are none the less special.

The little strains of daily life will support him in his decisive discovery more than great intellectual convulsions will. Having first eaten *couscous* with curiosity, he now tastes it from time to time out of politeness and finds that "it's filling, it's degrading and it's not nourishing." It is "torture by suffocation," he says humorously. Or if he does like *couscous*, he cannot stand that "fairground music" which seizes and deafens him each time he passes a café. "Why so loud? How can they hear each other?" He is tortured by that odor of old mutton fat which stinks up many of the houses. Many traits of the colonized shock or irritate him. He is unable to conceal the revulsions he feels and which manifest themselves in remarks which strangely recall those of a colonialist. It was really a long time ago that he was certain, *a priori*, of the identity of human nature in

every dimension. True, he still believes in it, but rather like an abstract universality or an ideal to be found in history of the future.

You are going too far, someone will remark; your benevolent colonizer is no longer so benevolent. He has evolved slowly and is he not already a colonialist? Not at all! One simply cannot live, especially for a lifetime, in what remains something picturesque and to an extent removed from one's natural sphere. As a tourist one can become enamored and perhaps interested in it for a time, but one ends up tiring of it and shielding himself from the original attraction. To live without anguish, one must live in detachment from oneself and the world—one must reconstruct the odors and sounds of one's childhood. It is not difficult to do this as it only requires spontaneous actions and mental attitudes. It would be as absurd to demand that the colonizer be attuned to the life of the colonized, as it would be to ask left-wing intellectuals to ape laborers. These intellectuals, having insisted on dressing sloppily, wearing shirts for days on end, and walking in hobnailed shoes, soon realized the stupidity of their pose, and in this case the language, cuisine and basic customs were the same. Unlike the intellectual, however, the colonizer can only reject being identified in any way with the colonized.

“Why not wear a tarboosh in Arab countries and

dye your face black in Negro countries?" an irritated teacher once asked me.

It is not immaterial to add that that teacher was a communist.

That much said, I am quite willing to admit that excessive romanticizing of the difference must be avoided. It may be thought that the benevolent colonizer's difficulties in adapting are not very important. The essential factor is firmness of ideological attitude and condemnation of colonization. (On the condition, obviously, that those difficulties do not end up in obstructing the rectitude of ethical judgment.) To be a rightist or leftist is not merely a way of thinking but also—perhaps especially—a way of feeling and of living. Let us just note that there are very few colonizers who do not allow themselves to be overcome by those revulsions and those doubts, and furthermore, these nuances must be taken into consideration in order to understand their relationship with the colonized and colonial life.

Suppose then that our benevolent colonizer has succeeded in laying aside both the problem of his own privileges and that of his emotional difficulties. Only his ideological and political attitudes remain to be considered.

A communist or socialist or just a democrat, he remained so in the colony. He intended, no matter what changes might occur in his own individual or

national feeling, to continue to be one; or better still, to act like a communist, socialist or democrat. In other words, he would work toward economic equality and social liberty, expressed in the colony by a struggle for liberation of the colonized and equality between colonizers and colonized.

Here we deal with one of the most curious chapters of the history of the contemporary left (if one had dared write it) and which might be entitled "Nationalism and the Left."

In the face of nationalism, an undeniable uneasiness exists in the European left. Socialism has already tried for so long to have an internationalist bent that this tradition has seemed to be tied to its doctrine and to form part of its fundamental principles. With leftists of my generation, the word "nationalist" still evokes a reaction of suspicion, if not hostility. When the U.S.S.R., the "international fatherland" of socialism, established itself as a nation, the reasons for doing so did not appear convincing to many of its most devoted admirers. We remember that recently, the governments of the peoples threatened by Nazism resorted to somewhat forgotten national responses. This time, the workers' parties, awakened by the Russian example, discovered that national pride remained powerful among their troops and responded to that call. The French Communist Party even took it up for its own use and laid claim to being a "national party," reinstating the Tricolor and

the *Marseillaise*. And it was again that tactic—or that revival—which prevailed after the war against the investment in those old nations by young America. Rather than fight as socialists against a capitalist danger, the communist parties (and a large part of the left) preferred to put one national entity in opposition to another; in the process, confusing Americans with capitalists. The result was a decided constraint in the socialist attitude toward nationalism (an irresolution in the ideology of the workers' parties). The caution employed by left-wing journalists and essayists who commented on this problem is extremely revealing. They deal with as little as possible; they don't dare to condemn or approve; they don't know how to, or whether they want to integrate it, to include it in their understanding of the historical future. In a word, the left today feels ill at ease before nationalism.

For a number of historical, sociological and psychological reasons, the struggle for liberation by colonized peoples has taken on a marked national and nationalistic look. While the European left cannot but approve, encourage, and support that struggle, it suffers from very intense doubts and real uneasiness in the face of the nationalistic form of those attempts at liberation. In addition, the nationalistic renaissance of the workers' parties is above all a form for the same socialist content. Everything happens as though social liberation, which remains the ultimate

goal, were embodied in more or less permanent national form; the Internationals had simply buried nations too soon. But the leftist does not always clearly understand the immediate social content of the struggle of nationalistic colonized peoples. In short, the leftist finds in the struggle of the colonized, which he supports *a priori*, neither the traditional means nor the final aims of that left wing to which he belongs. And it follows that this uneasiness is distinctly aggravated in a left-wing colonizer, i.e., a leftist living in a colony and living his daily life within that nationalism.

Take terrorism, one example among the methods used in that struggle. We know that leftist tradition condemns terrorism and political assassination. When the colonized uses them, the leftist colonizer becomes unbearably embarrassed. He makes an effort to separate them from the colonized's voluntary action; to make an epiphenomenon out of his struggle. They are spontaneous outbursts of masses too long oppressed, or better yet, acts by unstable, untrustworthy elements which the leader of the movement has difficulty in controlling. Even in Europe, very few people admitted that the oppression of the colonized was so great, the disproportion of forces so overwhelming, that they had reached the point, whether morally correct or not, of using violent means voluntarily. The leftist colonizer tried in vain to explain actions which seemed incomprehensible,

shocking and politically absurd. For example, the death of children and persons outside of the struggle, or even of colonized persons who, without being basically opposed, disapproved of some small aspect of the undertaking. At first he was so disconcerted that the best he could do was to deny such actions; for they would fit nowhere in his view of the problem. That it could be the cruelty of oppression which explained the blind fury of the reaction hardly seemed to be an argument to him; he can't approve acts of the colonized which he condemns in the colonizers because these are exactly why he condemns colonization.

Then, after having suspected the information to be false, he says, as a last resort, that such deeds are errors, that is, that they should not belong to the essence of the movement. He bravely asserts that the leaders certainly disapprove of them. A newspaperman who always supported the cause of the colonized, weary of waiting for censure which was not forthcoming, finally called on certain leaders to take a public stand against the outrages. Of course, he received no reply; he did not have the additional naïveté to insist.

Confronted with this silence, what was there to do? He tried to interpret the phenomenon for himself and for the sake of his uneasiness to explain it to others, but never, it must be said, to justify it. The leaders cannot and will not speak though they are

aware of this terrorism. He would have accepted with relief, with joy, the slightest indication of understanding. And since these indications cannot come, he finds himself in an unenviable dilemma: either likening the colonial situation to any other and therefore applying to it the same analytical methods, judging it and the colonized in accordance with traditional values; or he must consider the colonial juncture as being original and abandon his values and usual habits of political thought which induced him to take sides. In other words, either he no longer recognizes the colonized, or he no longer recognizes himself. However, being unable to bring himself to select one of these paths, he stays at the crossroads and loses contact with reality. He applies to one and to the other those ulterior motives which he deems convenient and portrays a colonized according to his reconstruction. In short, he begins to construct myths.

He is also worried about the future of the liberation of the colonized, at least about its near future. Often the liberated nation asserts itself beyond the limits of the struggle, and aspires, for example, to be religious, or shows no concern for individual freedom. Again there is no way out except to assume a hidden, bolder, and nobler motive. In their hearts, all the lucid and responsible fighters are anything but theocrats; they really love and venerate freedom. It is the immediate crisis which causes them to disguise their true feelings; faith still being strong

among the colonized masses, they must take it into account. As for their apparent disregard for democracy, it can be explained by the fact that since they need the support of all groups, they are afraid to alienate the powerful bourgeois and land-owning classes.

But terrorism does not coincide with the leftist colonizer's stride toward liberation and his uneasiness remains deep-rooted, often reappearing. The leaders of the colonized cannot criticize the religious feelings of their troops—that the left-wing colonizer will admit—but to exploit them is another thing! Those proclamations in the name of God, the Holy War concept, for instance, throws the leftist off balance and frightens him. Is it purely strategic? How can he fail to notice that when freed, the most newly liberated nations hasten to include religion in their constitutions, or that their laws conform to the premises of liberty and democracy which the leftist colonizer expected?

Then, fearing that he might be wrong once again, he will retreat; he will speculate on a more distant future. Later, assuredly, leaders will arise from the midst of those peoples who will express their honest needs, who will defend their true interests, in harmony with the moral (and socialist) imperatives of history. It was inevitable that only the bourgeoisie and landowners, who had some education, would establish the framework and place their imprint on

the movement. Later on, the colonized will rid themselves of xenophobia and racist temptation, which the leftist colonizer perceives, not without concern. An inevitable reaction to racism and the colonizer's xenophobia is that it becomes necessary to wait for the disappearance of colonization and the wounds which it has left in the flesh of the colonized. "Later they will shake off religious obscurantism. . . .

But in the meantime, the leftist colonizer cannot help remaining confused about the meaning of the immediate battle. For him, being on the left means not only accepting and assisting the national liberation of the peoples, but also includes political democracy and freedom, economic democracy and justice, rejection of racist xenophobia and universality, material and spiritual progress. Because such aspirations mean all those things, every true leftist must support the national aspirations of people. If the leftist colonizer rejects colonization refusing his role as colonizer, it is in the name of this ideal. But now he discovers that there is no connection between the liberation of the colonized and the application of a left-wing program. And that, in fact, he is perhaps aiding the birth of a social order in which there is no room for a leftist as such, at least in the near future.

It can even happen that for various reasons—to gain the friendship of reactionary powers, to carry out a national union or out of conviction—the liberation movements banish forthwith leftist ideology and

refuse systematically its assistance, thus placing it in intolerable embarrassment, condemning it to sterility. Then, as a militant left-winger, the colonizer even finds himself almost out of the movement of colonial liberation.

These very difficulties, moreover, this hesitation which curiously resembles remorse, excludes him all the more. They leave him suspect not only in the eyes of the colonized, but also in those of the left wing at home; it is from this that he suffers most. He voluntarily cut himself off from the Europeans of the colony; he disregards their insults and is even proud of them. But the leftists are truly his own people, the judges whom he appoints, before whom he desires to justify his life in the colony. Now his peers and his judges hardly understand him; the least of his timid reservations draw only distrust and indignation. What! they tell him, a people is waiting, suffering from hunger, illness and contempt, one child in four dies before he is one year old, and he wants assurances on means and ends! What conditions he sets for his co-operation! After all, this matter is one of ethics and ideology. The only task at the moment is that of freeing the people. As for the future, there will be plenty of time to deal with it when it becomes the present. Yet, he insists, the shape of post-liberation is already apparent. They will silence him with a decisive argument—in that it is simply a refusal to look that future in the face—by telling him

that the destiny of the colonized does not concern him and that what the colonized will do with their freedom concerns them only.

If he wants to help the colonized, it is exactly because their destiny does concern him, because his destiny and theirs are intertwined and matter to one another, because he hopes to go on living in the colony. He cannot help thinking bitterly that the attitude of the leftists back home is really an abstract one. Granted, at the time of the resistance against the Nazis, the only task which was imperative and which united all the fighters was liberation. But all of them fought for a certain political future as well. If the left-wing groups, for example, had been assured that the future regime would be theocratic and authoritarian, or the rightist groups that it would be communist, if they had realized that for imperative sociological reasons they would be crushed after the battle, would they both have gone on fighting? Perhaps. But would their hesitations or their fears have seemed so offensive? Believing that socialism was exportable and Marxism universal, the leftist colonizer wonders whether he has not failed through excessive pride. In this matter, he believed he had the right to fight for his conception of the world in accordance with the one in which he hoped to build his life.

The left at home, as well as the colonized themselves, agree that he should withdraw (and on top

of this, curiously, the colonialist, which confirms the heterogeneity of mentalities). He will support the colonized's unconditional liberation, by whatever means they use, and the future which they seem to have chosen for themselves. A journalist of the best French left-wing weekly ended up admitting that man's fate could mean achieving the Koran and supporting the Arab League. The Koran, all right; but the Arab League! Must the just cause of a people include its deceptions and errors? The leftist colonizer will accept all the ideological themes of the struggling colonized; he will temporarily forget that he is a leftist.

To succeed in becoming a turncoat, as he has finally resolved to do, it is not enough to accept the position of the colonized, it is necessary to be loved by them.

The first point was not reached without difficulties or serious contradictions because he had to abandon his basic political values. The intellectual or the progressive bourgeois might want the barriers between himself and the colonized to fade; those are class characteristics which he would gladly renounce. But no one seriously aspires toward changing language, customs, religious affiliation, etc., even to ease his conscience, nor even for his material security.

The second point is no easier. In order truly to become a part of the colonial struggle, even all his good will is not sufficient; there must still be the pos-

sibility of adoption by the colonized. However, he suspects that he will have no place in the future nation. This will be the last discovery, the most staggering one for the left-wing colonizer, the one which he often makes on the eve of the liberation, though it was really predictable from the very beginning.

To understand this point, it is necessary to keep in mind an essential feature of the nature of colonial life; the colonial situation is based on the relationship between one group of people and another. The leftist colonizer is part of the oppressing group and will be forced to share its destiny, as he shared its good fortune. If his own kind, the colonizers, should one day be chased out of the colony, the colonized would probably not make any exception for him. If he could continue to live in the midst of the colonized, as a tolerated foreigner, he would tolerate together with the former colonizers the rancor of a people once bullied by them. If the home country's power should, on the other hand, endure in the colony, he would continue to harvest his share of hatred despite his manifestations of good will. To tell the truth, the style of a colonization does not depend upon one or a few generous or clear-thinking individuals. Colonial relations do not stem from individual good will or actions; they exist before his arrival or his birth, and whether he accepts or rejects them matters little. It is they, on the contrary which, like any institution, determine *a priori* his place and

that of the colonized and, in the final analysis, their true relationship. No matter how he may reassure himself, "I have always been this way or that with the colonized," he suspects, even if he is in no way guilty as an individual, that he shares a collective responsibility by the fact of membership in a national oppressor group. Being oppressed as a group, the colonized must necessarily adopt a national and ethnic form of liberation from which he cannot but be excluded.

How could he help thinking, once again, that this fight is not his own? Why should he struggle for a social order in which he understands that there would be no place for him?

Hard-pressed, the role of the left-wing colonizer collapses. There are, I believe, impossible historical situations and this is one of them. The present life of the leftist colonizer in the colony is ultimately unacceptable by virtue of his ideology, and if that ideology should triumph it would question his very existence. The strict consequence of this realization would be the abandonment of that role.

He can, of course, attempt to come to terms with the situation, and his life will be a long series of adjustments. The colonized in the midst of whom he lives are not his people and never will be. After careful consideration, he cannot be identified with them and they cannot accept him. "I feel more at home with colonialist Europeans," confessed a left-wing

colonizer, "than with any of the colonized." He does not foresee, if he ever did, such an assimilation; in any event, he lacks the necessary imagination for a revolution of that kind. While he happens to dream of a tomorrow, a brand-new social state in which the colonized cease to be colonized, he certainly does not conceive, on the other hand, of a deep transformation of his own situation and of his own personality. In that new, more harmonious state, he will go on being what he is, with his language intact and his cultural traditions dominating. Through a *de facto* contradiction which he either does not see in himself or refuses to see, he hopes to continue being a European by divine right in a country which would no longer be Europe's chattel; but this time by the divine right of love and renewed confidence. He would no longer be protected and ruled by his army but by the fraternity of peoples. Juridically, there would be very few minor administrative changes, the practical nature and consequences of which he cannot guess. Without having a clear legal picture, he vaguely hopes to be a part of the future young nation, but he firmly reserves the right to remain a citizen of his native country. Finally he realizes that everything may change. He invokes the end of colonization, but refuses to conceive that this revolution can result in the overthrow of his situation and himself. For it is too much to ask one's imagination to visualize one's own end, even if it be in order to be reborn another;

especially if, like the colonizer, one can hardly evaluate such a rebirth.

One now understands a dangerously deceptive trait of the leftist colonizer, his political ineffectiveness. It results from the nature of his position in the colony. His demands, compared to those of the colonized, or even those of a right-wing colonizer, are not solid. Besides, has one ever seen a serious political demand—one which is not a delusion or fantasy—which does not rest upon concrete solid supports, whether it be the masses or power, money or force? The right-wing colonizer is consistent when he demands a colonial status quo, or even when he cynically asks for more privileges and more rights. He defends his interests and his way of life, and can utilize enormous forces to support his demands. The hopes and desires of the colonized are just as clear. They are founded on latent forces which poorly realize their own power, but are capable of astonishing developments. The left-wing colonizer refuses to become a part of his group of fellow citizens. At the same time it is impossible for him to identify his future with that of the colonized. Politically, who is he? Is he not an expression of himself, of a negligible force in the varied conflicts within colonialism?

His political desires will suffer from a flaw inherent in his own anomalous position. If he attempts to begin a political group, he will interest only those who are already leftist colonizers, or other misplaced

heretics. He will never succeed in attracting large numbers of the colonized or the colonizers because he threatens their interests. In a situation like this, a party of great popular expression should be derived from or directed toward them, and the leftist faction is not. He cannot try to start a strike. He would immediately discover that he is an outsider and, therefore, totally impotent. Should he agree to offer his unconditional help, that would not assure him of having any voice in events; not only that, but this air of gratuity only serves better to emphasize his political powerlessness.

The distance between his commitment and that of the colonized will have unforeseen and insurmountable consequences. Despite his attempts to take part in the politics of the colony, he will be constantly out of step in his language and in his actions. He might hesitate or reject a demand of the colonized, the significance of which he will not immediately grasp. This lack of perception will seem to confirm his indifference. Wanting to vie with the less realistic nationalists, he might indulge in an extreme type of demagoguery which will increase the distrust of the colonized. When explaining the acts of the colonizer, he will offer obscure or Machiavellian rationalizations where the simple mechanics of colonization are self-explanatory. Or, to the irritated astonishment of the colonized, he will loudly excuse what the latter condemn in himself. Thus, while refusing the sinis-

ter, the benevolent colonizer can never attain the good, for his only choice is not between good and evil, but between evil and uneasiness.

In the end, the leftist colonizer cannot fail to question the success of his efforts. His fits of verbal furor merely arouse the hatred of his fellow citizens and leave the colonized indifferent. His statements and promises have no influence on the life of the colonized because he is not in power. Nor can he converse with the colonized, asking questions or asking for assurances. He is a member of the oppressors and the moment he makes a dubious gesture or forgets to show the slightest diplomatic reserve (and he believes he can permit himself the frankness authorized by benevolence), he draws suspicion. He also admits that he must not embarrass the struggling colonized by doubts and public interrogations. In short, everything confirms his solitude, bewilderment and ineffectiveness. He will slowly realize that the only thing for him to do is to remain silent. Is it necessary to say that this silence is probably not such a terrible anguish to him? That he was rather forcing himself to fight in the name of theoretical justice for interests which are not his own; often even incompatible with his own?

If he cannot stand this silence and make his life a perpetual compromise, he can end up by leaving the colony and its privileges. And if his political ethics will not permit him to "run out," he will make

a fuss. He will criticize the authorities until he is "delivered to the disposal of the *metropole*," as the chaste administrative jargon goes. By ceasing to be a colonizer, he will put an end to his contradiction and uneasiness.