

Deconstructing the Civilizing Process

Belachew Gebrewold

Introduction

Since the terrorist attacks against the US-Embassies in Kenya and Tanzania in August 1998 and especially 9/11 2001 the international security policy cooperation with the African states is focussing mainly on the consolidation and coordination of security policies. Integration of politics to fight terrorism has become the top agenda of global action besides AIDS and poverty especially in Africa. “Peace”, “development” and “fight against terror” are considered to be feasible only in the united world of the UN, US, EU, African Union etc. Unity and unification are accordingly the pillars of the contemporary civilizing process. State building, continental harmonization and regional integration have become priority areas of national, regional and global political decisions and actions. The African states created in 2002 the so-called African Union with the aim to consolidate their political cooperation and integrate their economic activities. The Constitutive Act of the African Union established in 2002 has specified its objectives that bolster its attempt to materialize this unification. According to Article 3, some of the objectives are such as to achieve greater unity and solidarity between the African countries and the peoples of Africa; defend the sovereignty, territorial integrity and independence of its Member States; accelerate the political and socio-economic integration of the continent; promote and defend African common positions on issues of interest to the continent and its peoples; promote peace, security, and stability on the continent; promote democratic principles and institutions, popular participation and good governance. In the same way the UN Charter Article 1 (1), the purposes of the UN are to maintain international peace and security, and to that end: to take effective *collective* measures for the prevention and removal of threats to the peace, and for the suppression of acts of aggression or other breaches of the peace, and to bring about by peaceful means, and in conformity with the principles of justice and international law, adjustment or settlement of international disputes or situations which might lead to a breach of the peace. Unity, unification and universalization become more and more the only way towards peace. Peace is possible only in unity, whereas unity cannot be materialized without security and its military aspect. Hence peace and security mean more or less the same thing.

Here arise some central questions regarding the issue of unity: what is unification about? Who is being unified? What are the causes and consequences of the unification? It is

important to discuss the cultural and psychological consequences of the colonial in the post-colonial era in the time of globalization and international and intercontinental cooperation. It is the aim of this paper to discuss the consequences of the cultural globalization and international and intercontinental cooperation, which can be described as the civilizing process. This civilizing process is preceded by three important phenomena: the inferiority complex, coequality and (paradoxically) the superiority complex that the colonized African intellectual experiences at the same time. The phenomenon this paper attempts to underline is that the conflict as well as dialogue between the West and Africa remains on the level of the African intellectual and political class only and the West, whereas the majority of the Africans are excluded from the whole process of political and cultural events, that have ultimately a radical impact on their lives. Deconstructing the civilizing process aims to draw our attention to the phenomenon of cultural violence against the marginalized African majority.

The exploitation that began during the colonial period and its euphemistic civilizing process which has been overtaken by the black intellectuals are the foundations of the current universalization and peripherization. Therefore, this paper puts special focus on the repercussions of the colonial intolerance of the colonized cultures. After discussing a *disintegrating integration* the paper deals with the *civilizing process as negation of the other in the colonial relations*. The colonizer considered the colonized as inferior beings. On the one hand he considered them inferior, therefore, justified to exploit and subdue; on the other hand, the colonizer maintained it was his ethical and Christian responsibility to civilize them. The colonizer negated their values as human beings.

A disintegrating integration

For the nations, states, regional, continental and global political organizations peace is an outcome of this political civilizing process. The civilizing process of the current political system is the creation of a collective identity by imagining it as a structure outside individuals or groups as an abstraction (Elias 1978). In the face of the geographical and numerical expansion the civilizing process and the abstraction demand professionalization of politics and culture. This means, politics is like any other job an office to be administered by politicians, a task of experts or representatives. Because of the geographical or numerical expansion the individual is represented by someone instead of actively and directly participating. In his task of representing the representative tries to present the universal to the particular (individual, group) or the particular to the universal. In Lyotard's words, the

representative attempts to present the *unpresentable* (Lyotard 1999). Through his pre-established rules the representative predetermines the particular and undermines its creativity and unpredictability. Similarly, Derrida has pointed out that the signified or represented concept is never present in and of itself, in a sufficient presence that would refer to itself (Derrida 1991:63). The attempt of the representative in the civilizing process to signify or present the unpresentable is a process of de-politicking the political individual as well as group and its culture.

This critical appraisal of universalism does not plead for ethnocentrism. Ethnocentrism is nothing but pre-establishing rules for certain political groups or cultures by political professionals or experts. The critical reflection on universalization and homogenization argues that by its teleological approach the civilizing process alienate the peoples from their cultural and political responsibilities. This alienation is the beginning of peripherization geographically as well as politically. In the face of the geographical and numerical expansion the administrative centres and the politicians pre-establish the political rules. Those citizens who are not in the political or geographical (big or capital cities) centres lose their political significance. Paradoxically, this peripherization happens only in the process of integration, state-building, homogenization, universalization, coordinated security policy, etc. Peripherization means neglecting and trivialization of the majority in the civilizing process. The outcome of the civilizing process and its peripherization is the cleft between the history made for the people and their culture. Whereas their history is moulded and imposed from outside in the civilizing process of state building, universalization and peripherization, they maintain their culture as their identity.

The African Union created in 2002 following the examples of the European Union attempts to achieve “development and peace” through continental unification. Its basic concept is the materialization of *civilization* of the Africans through integration whose ultimate aim is humanization of the Africans. The "white man's burden" re-humanizing and civilizing process of colonial period is now transformed into "black intellectual's burden". While offloading the burden (implementing the civilizing process) the colonized black intellectual has learnt to imitate his colonizer and to follow his footsteps. As his master has done, he exercises violence while civilizing the peripherized and de-politicked majority.

The negated and colonized intellectuals began to defend themselves against the negation of their values. They began to prove the colonizer that they can achieve what the colonizer has achieved, that they possess culture and philosophy. They began to show that they are not inferior to the colonizer. The colonization of mind, as Frantz Fanon says,

inculcated in the colonized that the colonized is restless unless he has proven the colonizer that he can achieve all that the colonizer has achieved materially and immaterially. Materially, the economic and industrial achievements of the colonizer were the ultimate goal of the colonized. Immaterially, the philosophy, culture and political system of the colonizer are the benchmark of the colonized to measure the level of his humanness. Hence, in order to materialize this ambitions the colonized has nothing else but to follow the civilizing process by which the colonizer oppressed him. He carries on the oppression of himself. He wants to testify that there is no alternative to the thinking of the colonizer. The local philosophies in the colonized territories will be replaced by a single continental African philosophy so that it is comparable to the western philosophy. There are different concepts of politics, peace, conflict resolution, conflict transformation depending on the cultural understanding of the human society and the nature around.

On the global level "just war" is considered nowadays as a civilizing process. Michael Walzer (2004), political philosopher, argues that "just war" is morally defensible and universalizable. In cases of genocide like Rwanda an intervention from outside is morally justifiable. At the first glance I think nobody would disagree with it, considering the brutality of the genocide. Curiously, however, Walzer does not mention even a word to reflect on the root causes of the genocide not only to halt it but also to prevent from the very beginning by addressing the issue of system failure in the societies that fight each other.

The civilizing process as the negation of the other in the colonial relationships

Colonisation is the manifestation of the attitude of the coloniser towards nature and human beings. The colonizer re-forms and redefines the nature of the human and non-human beings. This new definition of the nature of the environment and of the human beings by the coloniser is the beginning of the exploitation. To exploit means to alienate. The self-alienation of the coloniser from the rest of the human beings and the nature is not a pure negation of the non-Self (the colonizer) in itself. The coloniser is an ambivalent being, which distances itself from its object (the colonized) and at the same time dependent on it. The ambivalence lies in the fact that the colonial annihilation is on the one hand depreciation (destruction) of the Other as sub-human, and on the other hand from this depreciated object the colonizer attains his identity. Hence annihilation is negation and creation at the same time. Through the annihilated and colonized being the colonizer realizes its own being; by negating the counterpart the colonizer knows who he is, since his identity is based on the nothingness of the Other. To exploit the alien nature and the owners of this nature is not only an historical phenomenon that happened in the past, but also a proof of the eternal desire to enrich the Self and to determine and exploit the alien, the non-Self.

The desire of the colonial powers was to make their countries strong by exploiting the others (Illiffe 1997:251). King Leopold II of Belgium, for example, had invested his private property in the construction and expansion of trade basis in Africa since 1880s. Those colonial powers who went to Africa first and established themselves enabled the late comers a free trade (for example Portugal enabled the free trade of Great Britain in the lower Congo). For some colonial powers the protection of trade interest in Africa was a political obligation. In order to materialise this, Germany established in 1884 its protectorates in Namibia, Cameroon and Togo. Besides the trade interests and protectorates the elimination of the competing colonial powers in the respective regions was an important colonial strategy (for example, the occupation of Tunisia by France in 1881 in order to prevent the Italian dominance in the region). Under disguise of "stabilising" the government and the finances of the country Egypt was occupied by Great Britain in 1882.

During the so-called conference of Berlin the colonialism was agreed under international law. The delegates of the conference accepted the British hegemony at the upper course and the French hegemony at the lower course of the Niger river in west Africa. The future European demands for African territory began to be more substantial than the informal supremacy enjoyed by Great Britain because of its sea dominance and trade power for

example to India and Nigeria respectively ((Illiffe 1997:254). The politics of protectorate enabled Germany in 1886 to occupy Tanzania. Because of the agreement in the Berlin conference Great Britain could take up Uganda as its colonial territory in 1890. In 1886 the right to protectorate in the Niger delta enabled Great Britain to expand its supremacy in the region. Benin and Ivory Coast were some of the areas of the French occupation in the region. Towards the end of the 19th century the French succeeded occupying the territories at the upper course of Niger and Chad see.

The competition for colonisation continued also in the North East Africa. Startled by the French ambitions in Ethiopia, Great Britain pushed the Italians to overtake the French in the competition, which caused the occupation of Eritrea by the Italians in 1889. Moreover the Italians tried to expand their occupation into the Ethiopian Empire ((Illiffe 1997:255). In 1889 the Sudan was controlled by Great Britain. Since the demand of Great Britain for Egypt was stubborn, France was allowed to occupy western Africa, and the Italians could march into Lybia. In 1885 Great Britain declared Botswana as its protectorate. The gold deposit in the South African Republic increased the interest of Great Britain to expand its colonial territory to the north. Even though because of these reasons the occupation of north Rhodesia (Zambia) and Nyassaland (Malawi) by Great Britain could endanger the interests of Portugal in the region the colonial demand of both sides could be settled through an agreement on the course of the border lines of Mozambique and Angola ((Illiffe 1997:256).

The colonial occupation was based on the hope of a long term exploitation. The decisive economic reasons for the division of colonial territories were the global imperial interests of Great Britain; long term hopes and fears because of the visions of King Leopold II concerning the richness of Congo, and French dreams of an *eldorado* in Timbuktu or the British fears of exclusion from the colonies under the French control (Illiffe 1997:257). The territories and properties owned by colonial division had to be regulated. This regulation was nothing but violence against the nature and against human beings. The maintenance of an established order demands the implementation of violence. One of the aspects of the violence against the human beings began with the tax collection from the oppressed. It had happened very often that the colonised could not pay the demanded taxes and committed suicide. Forced labour such as carrier, construction worker, soldier etc. were a kind of animalisation (dehumanisation) of the colonised Africans. The French were forcing each man to work for them 12 days a year for an unpaid labour (Illiffe 1997:264). In 1903 the people of the Belgian Congo were forced to work 40 hours per month for free. The forced labour was formally abolished in the Portuguese colonies only in 1961/62. In the British colonies the Africans

were forced to work 5 months annually up until the 1920s ((Illiffe 1997:264). The advanced step of this dehumanization of the Other and universalization of the Self is the spiritual annihilation or immaterial colonization.

Immaterial colonization as negation of communication in the civilizing process

Colonialism is a relationship without a social contract. Since the relationship between the coloniser and the colonised is based on oppression and intimidation, colonialism is a relationship without communication. When the colonised - sick and undernourished - protested against the oppressor intimidation will teach them how to behave. The rifles proceed and the civil colonisers come and scourge the oppressed on the ground to work for them. If the oppressed nevertheless protests, they shoot him. If he obeys he is humiliated and is not a human being. The shame and fear disintegrated his character, dissolved his personality. This brutality was enhanced by the merciless experts or scientists. The "psychological treatment" and brainwashing are not modern inventions. Nevertheless, in spite of all these attempts the aim is met nowhere: neither in Congo where they chopped off arms, nor in Angola where they made holes in the lips of the revolting Africans to lock them. To animalise a human being, i.e. to dehumanise him, is not impossible, but it needs attrition. The coloniser new that just beating the colonised would not suffice to oppress him. Therefore, he kept him undernourished. The beaten, undernourished, ill, frightened colonised is for the coloniser lazy, cunning, thief and violent (Sartre 1966:14).

Colonisation is an act of denying the Selfness of the Other. This denial is caused by the consciousness of the own deficiency. Paradoxically, the mind of the coloniser is colonised by the colonised; he needs the other to know himself. The coloniser permanently tries to create and maintain a difference between himself and the colonised. Therefore, any tendency of universalism is not a process or desire for equality, instead a process to demonstrate the superiority and Otherness of the Self.

Universalism applies basically for equal persons. However, the goal of the universalism is not the equality of the persons, instead the superiority of the subject (Silverman 1999:40). The colonial soldiers rejected the ideology of the universalism of their countries. Since no one who believes in the universal equality of human beings exploits the others without perpetrating atrocities the principle of the coloniser and his soldiers is that the colonised is not a human being, a mere animal. This animalisation had to be obvious. The colonised had to be pressed down to the level of the apes. This dehumanisation permits the

coloniser to use the colonised as labour animals. Denial of respect and dehumanisation go hand in hand. The tradition of the colonised has to be annihilated, the language replaced by that of the oppressor, culture destroyed, and the colonized made lifeless and exhausted (Sartre 1966:13).

By trying to dehumanise the human beings the colonizer dehumanises himself: he degrades himself to scourge and rifle. In his world of communication he has replaced language by violence. Before dehumanising the other the coloniser has to dehumanise himself. In this state the communication of the colonizer is nothing but negation. The colonised reply to the denied communication saying, "we became what we are only by radical internal negation of what the coloniser has made out of us". This is an ontological fight. The fact that the coloniser has denied communication is an ontological negation, an extermination of existence. The other is not real, not existent. The own being is dependent on the non-being of the other: becoming through negation.

The effect of colonialism is curved in the mind of the colonised. The eternal attempt of the colonised is to demonstrate the coloniser the own civilisation and culture, this means to liberate himself from immaterial colonization. The colonised wants to negate the negation. In the eyes of the coloniser, the colonised African is not only black, but also a personified anti-thesis of the white world; it is not only a despised being, but also the *not-being* of the *worth-being*. He is internally pushed to negate and disprove the prejudices of the coloniser, i.e. the aim of his acts are to disprove the qualities attributed to him such as black as dirty, disordered, unpunctual, uncivilised, etc.

The Ego of the colonised is positioned as opposition (Fanon 1991:141). The colonised moves from negative identity to the negative dialectics. The Ego establishes its being on the wreckage of the others (Fanon 1991:133). In search for identity the negated Self tries to gain back itself through the negation of the Other by which the colonized even believes to be superior. Superiority complex is the outcome of the inferiority complex. The first cause of the black revolts is first of all because he has socially and historically felt the inculcated inferiority. Fanon says that since the black was since centuries an inferior being it tries to react with superiority complex (Fanon 1991:135). Through this demand for recognition the colonised tries to come out of the uncertainty of the Self. The desire for recognition is nothing but the transformation of the subjective uncertainty into universal objective truth (Fanon 1991:138). The universal objective truth increases the subjective certainty. This is a metaphysical struggle: the colonised wants that his negating act is recognised, an assertion that he is not a non-being. Fanon says, "I demand that one has to take into consideration my

negating act as far as I look for something other than life; as far as I fight for the birth of a human world, for a world of mutual recognition. The one who does not recognise me opposes me. In a wild struggle I accept the shattering death, the irreversible dissolution, but also the possibility of the impossible."(Fanon 1991:139)

The coloniser understands himself as the subject of history. According to him the decolonisation is a granted freedom. For example in the political and historical literature of the German speaking countries it is very common to find phrases "in die Unabhängigkeit entlassen", which implies that the colonizer sets the colonized free or even "expelling" the unwilling colonized into freedom, since the German word "entlassen" actually means "to expel" or set free. To set the colonised free means graciousness of freedom and passivity of the colonised. The dehumanised blacks are - thanks to the generosity of the coloniser - elevated to the level of the human being, the coloniser. This gracious and generous attitude of the coloniser demands gratefulness from the colonised. Only the coloniser robs the freedom of the colonised and give him it back, recognises his humanity and says "there is no difference between us" (the colonised and the coloniser) (Silverman 1999:41).

The coloniser loves the colonised not because he is his equal, but because he is inferior to him. His being is the non-being of the colonised; his non-being is the being of the colonised. The existence of the colonised guarantees him his being. The colonised has saved him from nothingness. He is a human being through the negated human beings. However, by his attempt to decolonise itself the colonised jeopardises the existence of the colonised. The colonised wants to eliminate the difference between the colonised and the coloniser, to annihilate the coloniser by humanising himself. What is the being of the human being without the consciousness of the difference? The superior ones want to maintain their being based on the difference; the inferior ones want to attain their being that is blocked by the difference. Fanon says, the view of the colonised on the cities of the coloniser is nothing but of jealousy, dream of possession, to sit at the table of the coloniser, to sleep in the bed of the coloniser, if possible with his wife. The colonised is jealous. The coloniser knows that exactly. He knows that the colonised wants to supersede him. At least once a day the colonised dreams of sitting at the place of the coloniser (Fanon 1966:33).

The consciousness of the non-animality of the colonised endangers the consciousness of the absolute being of the coloniser. The being of the coloniser is an ambivalent being, an imaginary being, which is at the same time relativised for its ontological dependence on the non-being. The consciousness of the own humanity of the colonizer is the beginning of the consciousness of the "animality" of the other. On the one hand, the coloniser with his superior

being enjoys the increasing self-consciousness of the colonised. This recognition of the colonised has to be allowed to some extent so that at least the marginal similarity between the opponents is not lost from the sight. On the other hand, the similarity has to be denied so that through the repression of the consciousness of similarity the sub-human has to be degraded to the non-human. The true being of the colonised will be recognised if the animalisation (dehumanisation) of the colonised cannot be sustained forever and if the colonised is on the way of liberation from the externally imposed dehumanisation. In this process of decolonisation, as Fanon says, the coloniser suddenly appeals to the rationality of the colonised (Fanon 1966:36). As a sign of the beginning of a new communication the dialogue will be conducted with the colonised elite who has internalized the universal rationality of the colonizer (Fanon 1966:33).

The re-humanisation is the negation of the dehumanisation and animalisation of the colonised by the coloniser. This new creature needs the creation of an identifying substance. The colonised has to create a being on whose being the being of the former is dependent. The first being in this act of creation is the being constructed by all those who are colonised. This being reminds the colonised the common “colonisedness” and the collective process of humanisation (liberation). This new entity exists as long as the consciousness and the memory exist. This entity, i.e. the common identity, is the negation of the common enemy. On the hand, it is not only the negation, but also the maintenance of the common enemy. This entity exists as long as this enemy exists. Its being is dependent on the being of the opponent. Therefore, paradoxically, the enemy is the creator of the self-liberating subject. The Africans had a more solid collective identity during the independence struggle than afterwards.

The second indispensable entity for the construction of identity is the land where the colonised are settled. The fact that this land was occupied by the strangers endows it with a special nature and quality. The enemy is the being that at the same time has consecrated as well as desecrated the land. He has desecrated it because he is a stranger; he has consecrated it because through him the land has given the colonised a common identity. The land that has to be freed is the liberator of the colonised. The colonised liberate themselves by liberating the land: the land creates the humans and the humans create the land. This act of creation would be impossible without the existence and inclusion of the enemy, the colonizer. The being is a relative being: the being of the coloniser is dependent on the humiliated being of the colonised. Similarly, the oppressed want not only to be treated equally, but also or rather to replace the oppressor.

The coloniser looks for values that characterise him and make him the only true being. He has to essentially substantiate his economic development, industrialisation and "civilisation". He is not like the colonised. He is the one who has created democracy and human rights; his principles are based on the rational choice. Non-democratic governments and violation of human rights in the developing world certify moral superiority of the coloniser and constitute his being. In every moment of fear to fall into the negating equality, he has to glorify his culture, values and civilisation and universalise them. The ontologically insecure coloniser can universalise his values only when he proclaims them openly and universally that these values are exclusively his. He can repress his anxiety of non-being only by proclaiming and universalising the extraordinariness of his being. Universalisation of the values but preceded by particularisation (monopolization) of human values. The colonizer believes that he alone possesses the human, superior and universal values, though basically the colonised is not better or worse than him. Both opponents are not in essential but accidental roles. The colonised could be the coloniser. As Fanon says, "the colonised is a pursued who permanently dreams to be pursuer (Fanon 1966:44)." Nevertheless, in his attempt to fight the colonizer the colonized constructs a collective identity.

Constructed collective identity is the origin of the dehumanising destruction. In the process of humanisation (decolonisation) the colonised has constructed through his optimism his own destruction. He has constructed "brothers", "sisters" and "comrades": Re-humanization through Re-Africanization. He believed in an illusionary unity of the Africans which is not realisable. The colonized has created unreal world of *brotherliness* and *sisterliness* with his colonised co-humans in adoration and abhorrence of the coloniser at the same time. Adoration because the memory of the colonizer sustains his Africanity as identity; abhorrence because the colonizer has dehumanized him.

The colonized believes to attain his salvation by imitating the colonizer. "To the lies of the colonial situation the colonised replies with the same lies. His behaviour is transparent towards his own people, but tense and opaque towards the colonisers. Truthful is that which decomposes the colonial regime and causes a new nation. Truthful is that which protects the indigenous people and expells the foreigners. In the colonial context there is no an unconditional principle of truth. For the colonized the Good is which hurts the colonisers (Fanon 1966:44)." On the other hand, the coloniser tries to euphemize his desire to colonize while he tries to universalize the moral or cultural values. The coloniser constructs the history. He is the absolute beginning. In his "white man's burden" he has civilized the colonized. The coloniser is the everlasting Cause of all that is Good. When the colonizer left Africa said,

"When we go away, everything is lost, this land will fall back into the middle ages'. Though lazy and internally scourged creatures by fever and primitive customs, they will have to manage this land" (Fanon 1966:42). The coloniser justifies and perpetuates his colonial will by presenting himself as the saviour of the colonised world. His political and cultural deeds are a messianic mission: civilising the blacks. What a contradiction is it when a coloniser who has for centuries enslaved, killed and exploited the blacks now mixes up his unwillingness of decolonisation with selfless messianism with the pretext of civilising the savages. The coloniser believes that his perception of the colonised blacks as animals is unshakable when he sees how the colonised fight each other in east, central and west Africa. He cannot grasp that the post-independence inter- and intra-state wars in Africa are colonial heritage.

The nationalism, patriotism, state-building, collective security policies are the heritage of the colonial culture. "The intention of the colonised is not to compete with the coloniser, but to take his place and imitate him in his political culture" (Fanon 1966:42), to replace him in his violence, atrocity, dehumanisation and extermination in order to become a human being as the coloniser himself became human being through the dehumanisation of the colonised. "The deeds of the coloniser are to make the freedom of the colonised impossible. The attempt of the colonised is to invent all possible mechanisms to destroy the coloniser. The Manichaeism of the coloniser yields a Manichaeism of the colonised. The theory of the absolute evilness of the colonised will be negated by the theory of the absolute evilness of the coloniser... The violent act functions as something integrating since everyone makes himself part of the violent chain and organisations. This chain is the consequence of the primary violence of the coloniser. The groups recognise each other, and the future nation is from the very beginning an undivided unit" (Fanon 1966:76).

The factor that constitutes the colonised identity is the common struggle, the national destiny and the collective history. The nation of the colonised is a binder created in blood and anger, says Fanon. When the coloniser was expelled the colonised had thought it would be the end of violence. The Africanity, communality, hospitality were proclaimed. Many national parties were named as African parties (in Kenya, Tanzania, Zimbabwe, etc.). The colonized African tries to imitate and consequently perpetuate the colonizer by all means: by maintaining the African borders drawn by the colonizer, by copying his political and economic culture, by copying African Union from the European Union, etc. The African is attempting to show by all means that he was colonized, he can imitate the colonizer, he possesses the same cultural values like the colonizer. In his apologetics he attempts to prove that he is not inferior to the colonizer.

The apologetics of the colonised

The human being is comparing and emulating being. This fact negates the assertion of the coloniser that the black is a less-human being. The coloniser has believed in the animality and dehumanisability of the black. As the black proved by his level of emulation that he is not a mere animal but a rational human being. The colonised wants not only to emulate the coloniser, but also to become the master. The colonised black wants to achieve what his coloniser has achieved. The coloniser has created values, level of richness, development, luxury, etc. The coloniser has made himself the origin and the aim of humanisation. The coloniser will be removed from his position of absoluteness by the colonised in the process of economic and industrial development of the latter, first by being equal to the coloniser and then by overtaking him. Fanon says, "the Europeans have, as it is believed, attained their development goal by their own efforts. Therefore, we have to prove the world and ourselves that we are capable of achieving the same thing" (Fanon 1966:78). The proof of equality of the blacks with the whites exceeds the goal of assimilation and envisages superiority. By trying to defend the blacks and their culture against the colonial prejudices and discriminations, Senghor (former president of Senegal) says the following: "Land and everything on it is a collective property which is divided under the members of the family [in Africa]. Everyone is insured, he has the minimum to live according to his necessities. When the harvest is ripe, it belongs to all" (Senghor 1967:18).

The colonizer is the benchmark of the values, wealth, development and culture of the colonized. Through Aficanity the colonized has to destroy not only the colonizer, but also all forms of values monopolized by the coloniser, since they remind him of the coloniser. It is from this background that President Mugabe of Zimbabwe in his elections campaign for March 31 2005 designates the opposition groups fighting for more democracy and human rights as "men of black skins with white blood". He considers himself as a personified Africinity, discards outside appeals for human rights and democracy as a perennial desire of the Europeans to colonize and universalize their values, though he himself propagates that he and his ZANU-PF party are for democracy and human rights. He hates democracy and human rights as long as they are demanded from outside and by the Zimbabwean opposition, but he professes that he is pursuing democracy and human rights. This is not a mere contradiction between words and deeds, rather the product of colonization which engraved in the colonized mind the ambivalence between inferiority complex (isolating the Self in the name of

Africanity) on the one hand, and receptivity for the universal (colonial) values in the civilizing process on the other.

As the political behaviour of the African political elites shows us Africanity is the offspring of inferiority complex. Pan-Africanism after the end of the Apartheid era is just the engine of violence and homogenization of African cultures in the name of state-building or African Union. Africanity is basically the invention of the colonizer whose will is a perennial destruction of the blacks. "To be black was conceived as to possess no revolutionary consciousness. By carrying in ourselves the inferiority complex of lacking culture and civilisation, we believed that we can attain civilisation and culture only by defining ourselves in comparison with those who have alienated our personality. By doing so we endowed them with racism that we wanted to avoid. We have maintained, if the ratio is Hellenistic, the feeling is black" (Doppelfeld 1994:221)

The relationship between the colonised and the coloniser is an unending mutual negation. Negation is destruction. The negated and colonized being wants to stand up since he cannot come in terms with his state of non-being given him by the colonizer; he wants to survive. To survive means to show up the own being, to defend the non-*destroyedness* and the non-destructibility. In the black-white-relationship of colonisation, this is the capacity to prove and to defend the "black's whiteness". "It is contended that the black has invented nothing new in the areas of religion. No Dogma, moral, but just a small religiosity. But if we think over that, the central point lies not in this ridiculous assertion, instead in the matter itself. Therefore, I would like to analyse the dogma and the moral of the blacks..." (Senghor 1967:13). In the face of the religious inferiority complex, in order to prove the African monotheism, Senghor maintains as follows: "The black is monotheist everywhere. If one studies his history carefully, there is only one God who has created everything and who is almighty and will-power. All powers, all will-powers of the spirits and ancestors are just emanations from him." (Senghor 1967:13)

Colonisation is an existential destruction. It is very simple to make a colonised happy: one needs only to praise him. That is what he needs. He does not bear any criticism, since his existential wounds are not yet cured. Every criticism exacerbates the pain. One has to caress the colonised mind, praise and talk about his fascinating family culture on which his hospitality and communality are based. Many black intellectuals are colonised more than the uneducated ones; the black intellectual loves and hates the coloniser at the same time; he tries to prove his equality and even superiority. Senghor says as follows concerning this issue: "We would like to illustrate those elements, which the black families have to cherish so that they

can be in line with the modern humanism by enriching it at the same time... If the African succeeds in this transition period to protect them from any kind of external pollution and deformation, there is no need to worry about the African future" (Senghor 1967:16). The coloniser sees how the colonised is staying at the shore of nothingness in searching for identity and constructing Africanity and Pan-Africanism and tries to prove his religious dogmatism. What Senghor does is nothing else than this in his "Negritude and humanism"

The coloniser has maintained that the black man does not have culture. By doing that he has privatised the power of judgment for himself to define what culture and art are. The colonised man, hence, who does not have culture has to learn the culture and art of his coloniser and has to create his own and prove that he is capable of creating culture. In this situation the colonised man begins to distance himself from his own culture since he first of all as a comparing being has to see and admire the culture and art of his coloniser. He underlines and explains the possible similarities between his culture and that of his coloniser, or justifies the difference and emphasize its special elements. About the peculiarity of the culture of the blacks Senghor writes the following: "it is a practical but not a utilitarian art, and it is in this original sense classical. Especially it is a spiritual art - some have unjustly called it idealistic and intellectual - since it is religious. The central function of sculptors consists of presenting the dead ancestors and spirits in sculptures, which are at the same time symbols and dwelling." (Senghor 1967:23)

As further sign of the peculiarity of the blacks' culture Senghor underlines the rhythm. In order to emphasize this peculiarity of the African music Senghor criticises the lacking flavour of the music of the coloniser (Senghor 1967:25). According to him the African music can enrich the "deficient" European music. "It gives the lacking flavour to the impoverished western music that is based on narrow rules" (Senghor 1967:26) Senghor understands the black as an incarnated rhythm. "Because of their purity, power and nobility of their sound instruments such as Xylophone are predestined to convey the style of the blacks" (Senghor 1967:27). Furthermore, Senghor says, "the contribution of the black consists of recreating with other peoples the unity of man and world; reconciling the body and spirit, human beings among each other and the stone with God" (Senghor 1967:28).

It is the African intellectual who is suffering from identity crisis. The constructed identity does not save him from the colonialism brought upon him, the nothingness. In order to overcome this nothingness African intellectual underlines the otherness: "the white reason is utilitaristically analytical, whereas the black reason is participatorily intuitive" (Senghor 1967:157).

The anxiety about the nothingness is the first cause of the dualistic worldview. Since the being of the coloniser is based on the non-being of the colonised, the coloniser has to perpetuate the colonised in his nothingness. The white colonial art depicts the colonised black as artless. The black is without religion, or in an ideal case he is polytheist. Senghor defends the African religion and monotheism against the colonial assertions that the African does not have them.

The everlasting and dangerous effect of colonialism on the colonised black is that he has developed an African apologetics: to show the colonizer the "high African culture". He has to react to the dehumanising history of the colonising trauma, to defend himself and to negate the white coloniser. Senghor quotes what J. P. Sartre has written about the colonised black intellectual "when a black in the US discovers in himself the talent as writer then he also discovers his material: he is a person who observes the white from outside and who assimilates himself with the white culture and in his works he shows the peculiarity of the black race in the American society. It is not objective in the way of the realists, but emotional that disgraces the readers [whites]" (Senghor 1967:157).

The coloniser constructs, essentialises and universalises his culture. Since the colonial world is dualistic (differentiating between the morally superior whites and inferior blacks), the colonised tries to disprove his nothingness constructed by the colonizer. His apologetics against the colonial negation develops the same procedure as that of the colonizer in order to negate the negation. The colonized constructs, essentialises and universalises his culture: the Africanity. "...Capitalist attitude of mind which was introduced into Africa with the coming of colonialism and is totally foreign to our own way of thinking. In the old days the African had never aspired to the possession of personal wealth for the purpose of dominating any of his fellows. He had never had labourers or 'factory hands' to do his work for him. But then came the foreign capitalists. They were wealthy. They were powerful. And the African naturally started wanting to be wealthy too" (Nyerere 1968:6).

"The foundation, and the objective, of African socialism is the extended family. The true African socialist does not look on one class of men as his brethren and another his natural enemies. He does not form an alliance with the 'brethren' for the extermination of the 'non-brethren'. He rather regards all men as his brethren - as members of his forever extending family." (Nyerere 1968:11) The thoughts of Nyerere [former Tanzanian president] about African socialism show that the collective unity and identity and along with it the Africanity are mere constructs for a certain period of time as his own words betray it. Indirectly, Nyerere admits that there is no a continental African culture which all Africans would identify

themselves with. "It was in the struggle to break the grip of colonialism that we learnt the need for unity. We came to recognise that the same socialist attitude of mind which, in the tribal days, gave every individual the security that comes of belonging to a widely extended family, must be preserved within the still wider society of the nation. But we should not stop there. Our recognition of the family to which we all belong must be extended yet further - beyond the tribe, the community, the nation, or even the continent - to embrace the whole society of mankind." (Nyerere 1968: 2).

In order to show the African idealism and its apologetics it would be interesting to reflect on some of the works of some statesmen of Africa during and after the struggle of independence. Kenneth Kaunda [former Zambian president], the former president of Zambia, in his "humanism" says the following: "high respect for human dignity, which is the legacy of our tradition that should not be lost in the new Africa. How modern and progressive - in the western sense - the young nation might be, we are ardently determined not to let darken this humanism by anything. In the African society man is the centre of everything. It has to be like that." (Doppelfeld 1994:189) Sekou Touré (the former president of Guinea) says the following "each individual must go back to the African cultures and moral origins, must rediscover his consciousness, must convert himself in his thoughts and deeds to the values, conditions and interests of Africa". (Doppelfeld 1994:208) Similarly, Nkrumah (the former president of Ghana), says: "In the traditional African society no group interests were seen as the highest; neither the executive nor legislative authority supported any group. The general welfare was at the highest level." (Doppelfeld 1994:218) The main reason of African idealism is the colonial negation. In the western culture philosophy is an integral element of its culture. It is a colonial assertion that the black does not have philosophy. Through this assertion the coloniser opposes the spirit of philosophy.

The offended black intellectual begins to prove the African philosophy. He has to try to show his abstract thinking to the coloniser, in order to be able to belong to the right and noble humanity, to be part of the universal. The problem, however, is that the coloniser is not interested to know if the black man has philosophy or not. His main motivation is to differentiate himself from the colonised and colonisable and to feel himself better by doing that. His being is dependent on the non-being of the other. The offended black lets himself provoked by the coloniser and undertakes all possible attempts to prove his philosophy. In order to prove African philosophy some African philosophers maintain that the Greek philosophy has a strong Egyptian influence.

By attempting to prove his cultural coequality and his philosophy this colonized intellectual suffers from inferiority complex (Fanon 1991). Through what does the African intellectual overcome his philosophical inferiority complex? The first step is to describe the North African of ancient times as African philosophers. "Little do some of us know that the first woman Philosopher, Hypathia was from Alexandria and was murdered by Christians. Names like Saint Augustine, Origen, Cyril, Tertulian are not unfamiliar to you; they are black Africans. More pertinent to our subject is the fact what today we call Greek or Western Philosophy is copied from indigenous African philosophy of the 'mystery system'. All the values of the mystery system were adopted by the Greeks and Ionians who came to Egypt to study, or studied elsewhere under Egyptian-trained teachers. These included Herodotus, Socrates, Hippocrates, Anaxagoras, Plato, Aristotle and others..." (Onyewuenyi 1998:250)

The offended colonized tries, instead of studying his philosophy peacefully, to work out the similarity of his philosophy with that of his coloniser. "...Several other authors could be quoted to show what I would regard as a concerted effort on the part of Western scholars to deny Africa any contribution in the field of Philosophy"(Onyewuenyi 1998, 245). If it seems difficult to create a similarity between western and African cultures, the colonised intellect becomes proud of his constructed peculiarity. "We must construct an African Philosophy with categories that are typically African and where these categories do not correspond with those of either East or West; we dare to be different." (Ruch 1998:267)

The first step in the process of liberation is self-consciousness. This self-consciousness presupposes the recognition of the Other. Self-consciousness means nothing but re-integration of the self. The divided self is not conscious of itself (Fanon 1991). There is a fundamental unity between the thinker, thought, thinking and the thing which is thought about. This mental act is the unification of the thinking subject with himself and the object of the thought. The liberation process of the African society followed the same procedure: unity of the thinkers, singularity of the object thought and the way of thinking. In other words: ontologically there is only one thing to think about (African liberty); epistemologically there is only one way to think (a one and closed continental-Africa wide cooperation). Therefore, during the liberation movement of the continent of Africa it was more or less forbidden to establish a multi-party political system, because multiparty was seen as antithesis to collective African identity.

The construction of African personality, Negritude and Pan-Africanism is based on self-consciousness, which is in political terminology called self-government. This self-consciousness includes the economic, social and cultural development, the avoidance of conflict among African states, promotion of African unity and influence in the world politics.

(Esebebe 1982:1) Pan-Africanism was a protest and refusal. (Esebebe 1982:2) Esebebe understands the Pan-Africanism as "a campaign to rehabilitate the value aspects of African culture and that the phenomenon means the political unification of the continent." (Esebebe 1982:3)

As we have seen above there are two ways to liberate oneself: either by assimilating oneself with and adapting the values of the negating being (the coloniser), which is the process of ingratiation; or - where this ingratiation does not seem to be possible - by construction of own identity, which is the process of dissociation. This was the case of many black Americans in the 18th and 19th centuries. After they in vain tried to integrate themselves in the land of strangers by adopting their culture and assimilating themselves they began to mobilise the blacks of the USA to come back to Africa in order to create Pan-Africanism whose components are "the homeland of African persons of African origin, solidarity among men of African descent, belief in an African personality, rehabilitation of the Africa's past, pride in the African culture, Africa for Africans in church and state, the hope for a united and glorious future Africa." (Esebebe 1982:3)

Some white scientists began to substantiate the impossibility of ingratiation of the blacks and their innate inferiority because of two reasons: evolutionary and teleological. In the first case, some maintained that in the evolutionary process of human being, culture and civilisation, the modern history as the last (highest) step was inherited from the Greeks by the Romans and from the Romans by the Northern Europeans. Since the latter not only received these Greek and Roman civilisations, but also made the modern history, any race which did not participate in this evolutionary act is less human. Whereas, the teleological school maintains that "God deliberately made men unequal. The whites he gave intelligence to enable them to direct wisely the activities of the others. The non-whites, this usually meant blacks, he gave strong backs fortified with a weak mind and an obedient temper so that they might labour effectively under the supervision of the white masters." (Esebebe 1982:19)

The above quotation and similar examples show two aspects: definitions of the identities of the whites and blacks. More than a clear distinction between the blacks and whites this definition has a very important significance for liberation of the oppressed and despised blacks. That means, by anamnetically reiterating the discriminatory and prejudicial contention of the coloniser the blacks paradoxically intensify their consciousness of the Self. The definition of the colonised by the coloniser is the beginning of the own definition of the self of the black. This means the existence of the coloniser intensifies the identity of the colonised. It was during the colonial oppression and occupation of Africa that the African

leaders founded the Organisation of African Unity. The main aim of this organisation was to liberate Africa by constructing a collective identity. The coloniser and oppressor became the best unifying factor. The African liberation policy was seen as an internal policy of the continent. The boundaries between the countries were blurred by this identity. The decisive factor was to see Africa as a single unit, and to liberate the whole of Africa as it was said during the establishment of the Organization of the African Unity in 1963 in Addis Ababa, "I ask your Imperial Majesty [the Ethiopian Emperor Haile Sillase I] and my brothers assembled here that we collectively should now view the continued occupation of Africa by any foreign power with the same gravity and in the same seriousness as each one of us would have viewed the occupation by a foreign power of a part of the country that he has the privilege and the honour to lead. We can no longer go on saying that Angola is not free or Mozambique is not free etc., and that we are helping Angolans or Mozambicans to free themselves. Such statements are hiding the truth. The real humiliating truth is that Africa is not free; and therefore, it is Africa which should take the necessary collective message that should go from here to the security council of the United Nations." (Ansprenger 1975:31)

The direct and indirect consequences of the colonization are factors that undermined sustainable peace, respectful intercultural relations and tolerance. The colonizer first monopolized the human values as western civilized values and directly and violently forced the colonized to internalize these values by colonizing the mind. Since the colonization of mind happened successfully, the colonized African intellectuals are following the pattern the colonized has shown them, such as state-building, establishing regional and continental collective security, creating African Union in order to universalize and homogenize the fictitious common African values and single African culture. The fatal consequence of this African civilizing process is the destruction of various ways of political cultures, peace making and social relations appropriate to the respective places and time. This universalization is nothing but the death of many peaces, which means death of various cultures, their world views and interpretations and the death of each individual's political creativity and responsibility within its culture to mould the form of politics as part of its cultural self expression.

The de-politicking of cultures

As has been discussed above the beginning of the death of many cultures in the colonized world began when the colonizer started to subdue the blacks and their environment. In his

destruction and exploitation the colonizer euphemized colonization as civilization. By destroying the nature and social structures of the colonized the colonizer started to blackmail the colonized either by starvation or by promising high wages for those working on his exploitation branches. The “great transformation” of the civilizing process began for African societies during the colonization and continued after the independence. The common factor of both historical events is that the destruction of the socio-cultural structures that were indispensable to cope with particular socio-economic problems started. For the sake of exploitation, civilizing process, universal values, state-building through territorial integrity started. The ordinary people lost their political creativity and responsibility. The political profession, as a consequence, disregarded the existing socio-cultural structures and systems that worked for respective small political and cultural groups. But for this political professions whose aim is state-building and national identity these small political cultures and systems seemed not only irrelevant, but also an impediment to the identity of the state. In these small political groups, the individual was not anonymous; the individual cares for the community, and vice versa. However, in the modern mega state system, the individual has become anonymous, the society grew quantitatively but not qualitatively, and the community (organic society) ceased to exist anymore. The new mega state society began to liquidate the organic society which refused to permit the individual to become anonymous and to starve (Polanyi 1957:165). In the modern state concept the protection of society falls not to the community where individual is not anonymous, but to the rulers who directly enforce their will and represent numbers not persons.

The civilizing process of the African intellectuals introduced the system of representative democracy. The groups and cultures that used to actively and personally participate in the political activities prior to the mega state formation are now represented by intellectuals and elites. In this professionalization of politics the representatives of the groups or interests are too far from the hinterland, and they are too mighty to be influenced (Kohr 1995:65-66). In this civilizing process the state and the political representatives determine the permissions and prohibitions of the individual actions. The Good or Bad is predetermined by the state apparatus. The individual tends to act or omit something not out of conviction, rather because it regards it as duty. Laws of the state including the human rights politics alienate the individuals from their natural sense of responsibility. The moral judgements are mediated. the state takes away the sense of responsibility of the individual and gives back it to it to exercise this responsibility through the process of which it alienates and weakens the immediacy of the moral consciousness and judgement of the individual.

Security, stability and unity are the pillar and means of the formation of collective identity and civilizing process. The unifying, stabilizing and securing actor, which is the state its apparatuses neutralize the members called citizens. It enacts the laws that substantiate this stability, security and unity. The individual is not anymore an active creator of life and mobility in a manageable quantity but a mere anonymous being.

In spite of this de-politicking of the individual the civilizing process has been successful by constructing a collective sense of belongingness. The state owes this success to its violent alienation of the pre-state political and social groups and their cultures. The culturally alienated groups and individuals sought something vicarious to compensate the new state of oblivion. The mega states and its architects began to form nations, as a new bestower of identity and sense of belongingness.

The civilizing process maintains that the world is full of dangers, therefore, a mega organization, African Union, European Union or supra-national institutions will be required to secure security, unity and stability. The civilizing process's point of departure is that unity is an indispensable prerequisite for progress. The unity in the modern state form and the globalization in the larger context create a new world. A world of *everything-is-everywhere*, hence there is no elsewhere; The *here* becomes the *everywhere*, since everything is here. There is only one culture, one language, one technique, one system. In the monoculturalism of the system, assimilation and absorption the individual and the small cultural groups cease to exist, and their desires will not be fulfilled as unique beings or entities. They disappear in the world of the average, the universal (Kohr 1995:67).

The aim of the civilizing process, state-building and extensive unity is to create good organizations. Good organization presupposes totalitarian uniformity, not democratic diversity (Kohr 1995:68). Global organizations such as United Nations, African Union, European Union, are the constituent elements of the civilizing process.

Almost all states in the world are integrated and interconnected economically or politically to fight all threats collectively. But meanwhile there is no significant "outside" anymore. The world is becoming more or less a single subject. Fight of nations against nations is becoming less and less likely. The only remaining (probably forever) enemy is the individual. The paradox of the mega state and civilizing process is that on the one hand it consists of the individual called citizen, on the other hand it sees in every individual a potential threat to its principle of unity, security and stability. Its very nature, i.e. its size makes it paradoxical.

A question raised by Kohr is fundamental for understanding and dealing with the problem of tension between modernism and cultures of the peripherized peoples. "What are the advantages the individual owes the community and would miss them, if he were alone?" (Kohr 1995:128). Kohr, in his *Small is Beautiful* (1995), sees in the modern political system of the mega states the danger of de-politicking the people, mobilizing them for wars, emergence of totalitarianism and expansionism. In their transcendental illusion the civilizing process and its pre-established rules attempt to create a totalizing unity (Lyotard 1999:81).

In his strategy of dehumanization and negation of communication the colonizer despised and destroyed the indigenous cultures and universalized his values in his civilizing process under the banner of cultural and economic development. He created a new universal world. For his part the colonized intellectual, in his attempt to demonstrate that he has philosophy and culture similar to that of the colonizer, is attempting to be part of the universal culture designed by the colonizer.

Conclusion

Colonialism has hindered the African development and peace in two ways: 1) it has exploited the nature and the human beings; 2) it has deluded the reason of the African political class and many African intellectuals. Because of this delusion the African political class has developed a negative identity. According to the view of the African political class, what constitutes the African identity is the mere negation of colonialism and neo-colonialism; or in as a paradox, to copy all western political culture which now culminated in the creation of the African Union.

Africa has to deconstruct the antithetical Africanity. Moreover, the western world still colonises Africa as long as the human values are monopolized as western values and manipulated and enforced on African cultures. Peace means to respect, accept and understand the Other. By negating the universalizability of the colonial and postcolonial culture and by strongly doubting the existence of a single African culture this paper pleads for possibilities of many peaces according to many cultures in Africa. Acknowledging the plurality of societies and their truths against the civilizing process of universalism, objective truth, the belief in solving conflicts by pre-established rules and formulae, fighting underdevelopment by the concept and strategy of the educated and westernized colonized blacks will keep on undermining peace cultures.

Since most African countries are economically the least achieving in the world, discussions about taking seriously various African cultural richness are usually considered as

useless nostalgia and romanticism. Consequently it is usually argued that the cultural aspect has to be put aside for the time being to solve the socio-economic problems such as poverty, AIDS, conflict resolution, etc. through the civilizing process. If peace is considered as the foundation for development and stability the cultural contextuality and sustainability of peace has to be taken seriously.

Bibliography

- Brown, Lesley (1993) (ed.): Peace, in The New Shorter Oxford English Dictionary V.2, pp.2130-2131, Oxford: Clarendon Press
- Camilleri, Joseph A. and Falk, Jim (1993): The end of sovereignty? The politics of a shrinking and fragmenting World, Aldershot: Elgar
- Galtung, Johan (1993): Peace, in Joel Krieger et al. (eds.) The Oxford Companion to Politics of the World, pp.688-689, New York: Oxford University Press
- Gebrewold-Tochalo, Belachew (2002): The impact of the socio-cultural structures of the Kambata on their economic development. Wien: ÖFSE
- Ansprenger, Franz, Die Befreiungspolitik der Organisation der afrikanischen Einheit (OAU) 1963-1975, Kaiser, Grünewald 1975.
- Dopelfeld, Basilius, In der Mitte der Mensch, Münsterschwarzach 1994.
- Esedebe, Olisanwuche P., Pan-Africanism. The Idea and Movement 1776-1963, Howard University Press Washington, D.C. 1982
- Fanon, Frantz, Die Verdammten dieser Erde, Frankfurt am Main 1966.
- Fanon, Frantz (1991): Black skins, white masks, London: Pluto Press
- Iliffe, John, Geschichte Afrikas, München 1997.
- Nyerere, Julius K. Ujamaa. Essays on African Socialism, Dar es Salam 1968.
- Onyewuenyi, Innocent Chilaka, Is there an African philosophy, in: Claude Sumner (ed.) African philosophy, Addis Abeba 1998.
- Ruch, E.A., African philosophy. Regressive or Progressive? In: Claude Sumner (ed.) African philosophy, Addis Abeba 1998.
- Senghor, Léopold Sedar, Négritude und Humanismus, Düsseldorf/Köln 1967.
- Polanyi, Karl (1957): The great transformation, Boston: Beacon Press.
- Kohr, Leopold (1995): "Small is beautiful": ausgewählte Schriften aus dem Gesamtwerk, Wien : Deuticke.
- Elias, Norbert (1978): The civilizing process, Oxford: Blackwell
- Lyotard, Jean-Francois (1999): The postmodern condition: a report on knowledge, Manchester University Press
- Best, Steven/Kellner, Douglas (1997): The postmodern turn, New York: Guilford Press

- Silverman, Max (1999): Facing postmodernity, London: Routledge
- Derrida, Jacques (1991): A Derrida Reader: between the blinds, ed. By P. Kampuf, Brighton: Harvester Wheatsheaf