

Enviado em: 20/11/2006 - Aceito em: 29/01/2007

NADINE GORDIMER'S "NOT FOR PUBLICATION"
AND POST-COLONIAL POLITICAL POWER
DURING THE APARTHEID REGIME

Sarah Casagrande (PLE/UEM)

Dr. Thomas Bonnici (DLE/PLE/UEM)

RESUMO: Analisa-se o conto "Not for publication" (1965), da escritora sul-africana Nadine Gordimer, pela crítica pós-colonial. Os trabalhos literários de Gordimer denunciam e criticam o colonialismo e suas conseqüências no contexto do regime do *apartheid*. O texto retrata o poder do discurso colonial e desmascara as falsas (às vezes bem-intencionadas) intenções dos colonizadores referentes ao sujeito colonial representado por Praise Basetse. O pobre menino negro, manipulado por colonizadores que dedicaram suas vidas aos negros, é fabricado para que o poder deles continue dominante no país. Praise enfrenta a necessidade e as dificuldades inerentes à resistência contra a situação. Sua rebelião revela que o discurso colonial pode ser subvertido. Os resultados mostram as estratégias que os colonizadores empregam para perpetuar o poder na colônia e, ao mesmo tempo, a conscientização gradual e silenciosa dos sujeitos coloniais contra os impedimentos postos a sua autonomia e a sua subjetividade.

Palavras-chave: pós-colonialismo; Gordimer; *apartheid*; resistência; estratégias.

ABSTRACT: Post-colonial criticism of the short story 'Not for publication' (1965), by South African Nadine Gordimer, is provided. Gordimer's literary works deal with denunciation and critique of colonialism and its consequences in the context of apartheid. The text deals with the power of colonial discourse and unmasks the false, apparently good intentions of the colonizer towards the colonized, represented by Praise Basetse. The poor Negro boy is manipulated by well-intentioned, pro-Negro white colonizers in order to sustain their political power over the country. Praise faces the necessity and difficulty of resisting against the situation. His rebellion proves that colonial discourse may be disrupted and undermined. Results reveal the strategies the colonizers use to perpetuate power in the colony and the silent and gradual conscious-raising stances of the colonial subjects against further impairment to their autonomy and subjectivity.

KEYWORDS: post-colonialism, Gordimer, apartheid, resistance, strategies.

¹ Mestranda em Letras pela Universidade Estadual de Maringá: Programa de Pós-Graduação em Letras (PLE) Mestrado. Área de Concentração: Estudos Literários.

² Doutor em Letras e professor titular de Literaturas em Língua Inglesa no Departamento de Letras (DLE) e no Programa de Pós-Graduação em Letras (PLE) Mestrado da Universidade estadual de Maringá.

INTRODUCTION

Accounts about colonialism have first been reported in Antiquity, or rather, Greek and Roman imperialism and consequent colonialism in the Mediterranean Sea, North Africa and Asia. Although ancient colonialism was very different from the post-Renaissance colonialism of the 16th century and especially the British one which ranged from the 18th to the 20th century, the various types of colonialism had always a common denominator, particularly it has always been a violent process, synonym of land occupation, exploitation and annihilation of different cultures, and "legitimized" by a powerful hegemonic discourse, practically impossible to undermine (WESSELING, 1998; FERRO, 2004).

During the 450 years of colonialism in the modern age more than 85% of the world was colonized in various ways (settler colonies, invaded colonies, doubly invaded colonies) up till the years following the World War II. Since the disintegration of the British Empire brought independence to many former colonies, this situation provided a rich material for the arts and for literature. Post-colonial literature in English consists of a growing set of literary works by which post-colonial writers denounce the degradation, atrocities and cultural annihilation caused by the colonizers, which had been based on the false idea of civilizing the supposedly "barbarian" peoples and giving them healthy Eurocentric social, economic, political and cultural conditions (IYER, 1993). Post-colonial literature is not only concerned with the past as a historical document but also with the present. In fact, political independence does not necessarily mean an independence of the mind. A colonized country, of course, absorbs social, economic, political and cultural features from the colonizer country which are really hard to get rid of. This delicate situation, which prompts the hegemony of one nation over another, is one of the main subjects for today's post-colonial writers, who deal with important subjects such as colonial strategies, hegemony, resistance, diaspora, transculturation, postmodernism and globalization (O'REILLY, 2001).

The aim of this article is to make a post-colonial critique of Nadine Gordimer's short story 'Not for Publication', originally published in a short story collection of the same name in 1965. The critique will comprise the process of reproduction of the colonized person as an object by the colonizers for the perpetuation of the latter's regime and the resistance of the co-

lonial subject to ensure personal subjectivity. This critique will be underpinned by a short introduction on colonialism, post-colonial literature and post-colonial literary theory and the importance that this subject has not only in the literary academic field but also in the political and sociological construction of hegemony and the resistance against it.

Methodology comprises some important theoretical items in Post-colonial Theory, a brief analysis of the Apartheid regime and its implications, and an investigation on the fictional character Praise Basetse involving the fabrication of his ideology by well-intentioned white people and his final resistance against his objectification for the colonizers.

NADINE GORDIMER

Nadine Gordimer was born in 1923, in Springs, Transvaal, South Africa, in a white middle-class family of British descent. *Face to Face* (1949), her first collection of short stories, and *The Soft Voice of the Serpent* (1953), were published in Johannesburg. Due to the success of the latter she became known as an international figure with a reputation which has grown steadily, especially since she made it a point to fight against the apartheid regime in South Africa. She was a founding member of the Congress of South African Writers and even at the height of apartheid she never considered going into exile. She lectured and taught at schools in the United States during the 1960s and 1970s, traveled extensively worldwide disseminating her ideas on equality between all people, the devastating effects of Apartheid on the lives of South Africans, the constant tension between personal isolation and the commitment to social justice, and the inability to change apartheid's devastating policy. In 1991, she won the Nobel Prize for Literature. Even after the abolition of the regime in 1990, the writer is renowned for her stance against it, discussed in almost all her works, and for her updating novels dealing with diasporic subjects and transculturation in the post-apartheid period. Gordimer has also written books of non-fiction on South Africa subjects and made television documentaries and a television film *Choosing Justice: Allan Boesak. The Pickup* (2001) and *Loot and Other Stories* (2003), her most recent works, deal with racial matters from a globalized and diasporic point of view (ROSS, 1999).

Sarah Casagrande - Thomas Bonnici

COLONIALISM AND POST-COLONIAL LITERATURE

According to Ashcroft et al. (1998), more than 85% of the world was a colony of one of the European nations by the time of World War I and in some cases had been so for hundreds of years. After the disintegration of the British Empire in the 1960s and 1970s, a high quality literature started to be produced in these countries, starting from Nigeria and the Caribbean. This new literature manifested a position against Western imperialism and against the hegemony of its ideologies. Post-colonial literature in English (wrongly called Commonwealth Literature) is nowadays considered one of the most important and innovative kinds of literature in the postmodern period and comes not only from settler countries (Australia, Canada, New Zealand) but also from invaded (India, Nigeria, Ghana, South Africa) or doubly invaded countries (Jamaica, Guyana, St Kitts, Trinidad and Tobago). Although post-colonial writers have different views on the use of the English language (in contrast to their own pre-colonial ones) as a destruction of their native language and, thus, of their culture, their literature written in various "englishes" has grappled the minds of many people worldwide. Strong criticism and denunciation against Western ideologies, which consistently enforced their hegemony mainly through the degradation of the "colonial other", are in the foreground of post-colonial literature. In spite of many post-colonial writers exhibit innovative formal techniques such as the rewriting of metropolitan canonical works (Coetzee's *Foe* against Defoe's *Robinson Crusoe*) and the appropriation of so-called standard English, the main feature of post-colonialism literature remains its content, subject matter and its social, political and cultural commitment.

According to Bonnici (2003), it is important not to think about post-colonialism as something over, after the colonized country's political independence. Actually, the term post-colonialism involves not only the overall ideology pervading the colonial subjects and their works from the moment the European stepped on their shores but also the very contemporary situation of a certain type of globalization, synonymous to veiled colonialism, practiced nowadays by hegemonic industrialized countries, such as England and the United States, in the wake of their worldwide economic power.

POST-COLONIAL LITERARY THEORY

The term "post-colonial" is used to cover all the culture affected by the imperial process from the moment of colonization up to nowadays (ASHCROFT et al., 1989). This is due to the fact that a nation that underwent such a process will never remain the same and will have to live with the cultural scars left in its society even after political independence.

For an effective colonization of a country, the metropolis and its colonizers employed a colonial discourse with the aim of legitimating the colonization and the subsequent exploitation of the land and its peoples. This boils down to degrading the other: the colonial subject, in fact, becomes an object in the hands of the colonizer and Eurocentric ideology. Post-colonial literary theory, elaborated to help in the reading and criticism of post-colonial works of literature, is a necessary tool to detect the oppressor's and the oppressed's discourse and what is behind this relationship. Some key-concepts from post-colonial criticism will be explained below so that the short story under analysis will be adequately investigated and its theme expounded.

Colonial discourse. Edward Said's *Orientalism*, based on Foucault's discourse, examines the ways in which colonial discourse operated as an instrument of power. In fact, Said's views initiated the colonial discourse theory in 1980 and were followed by Bhabha's, who pointed towards the inherent vulnerability of the colonial discourse. Discourse is thus a system of statements within which the world can be known. Through this system dominant groups in society constitute the field of truth by imposing specific knowledge, disciplines and values upon dominated groups. Colonial discourse is thus a set of signs and practices that organize social existence and reproduction within colonial relationships and deal with Eurocentric assumptions on history, language, literature and technology.

Thus, colonial discourse is generated within the society and cultures of the colonizer and establishes how the colonized must see themselves. Consequently, it creates a deep conflict between the previous kind of knowledge worked out by the now colonial subjects for thousand of years and that imposed by the colonizer. Rules of inclusion and exclusion are worked out by the superiority stance of the colonizer's culture, history, language, arts, politics and social conventions, or rather, a superior race has a "mission" to civilize an inferior and primitive

Sarah Casagrande - Thomas Bonnici

race. It emphasizes the inferiority of the colonized, their barbaric depravity (cannibalism; idolatry), their lack of culture (no literature, sculpture) and the imperial duty to civilize the colony through trade, administration, cultural and moral improvement. Colonial discourse proved to be very powerful and dangerous, since the colonized were rarely aware of the colonizers' duplicity. Actually, colonial discourse constructed the colonizing subject as much as the colonized. Contradicting this discourse implied in punishment and being seen as subversive and abnormal. The strategy developed by the colonizer to depreciate the colonized took the form of the philosophically binary ideology by which the colonized were turned into voice-less subalterns (ASHCROFT et al., 1998).

Binarism is the basis of European philosophy and has been reinforced by Saussure's emphasis on his theory of the sign. Binary oppositions, such as, sun/moon, man/woman, civilized/primitive, good/evil, are very common in the cultural construction of reality. Actually they suppress ambiguous or interstitial spaces between the opposed categories and any overlapping region between the categories becomes impossible. The idea behind binarism is that one term is always dominant. The binary logic of imperialism is supported by the Western ideology to put the world in terms of binary opposition and establish a relation of dominance. Any activity or state that does not fit the binary opposition will become subject to repression and punishment. While the male, white, civilized are, according to the binary philosophy, always opposites to female, black and barbarian, the first category is superior in all instances and annihilates the latter. A hierarchy ensues and has been adopted by colonial discourse with a desire to dominate for trade purposes.

Necessarily this involves *hegemony* which, according to Gramsci (1988), means the power of the ruling class to convince the other classes that their interests are the interests of all. Domination is thus exerted by subtle and inclusive power over the economy, state apparatuses, such as education and media. The ruling class's interest is presented to be of common interest and thus easily accepted. Applying hegemony to the colonial situation, it means that domination over a colonized people seduced by the false notion of the greater good, or social order, stability and progress. Influence on the mentality of the colonized is a guarantee of full imperial success, whereas the consent of the colonized consent in accepting the imperial hegemony is achieved through imperial discourse. The colonizer's values, assumptions, cultural, social and political ideas impregnated with

their ideologies are considered better than the previous cultural, social and political ideas of the colonized.

Further, the concepts of *subject* and *subjectivity* are fundamental to post-colonial theory since they affect colonized peoples' perception of their identities and their capacity of resistance to the subjugation imposed by the colonizer whose interest is to reduce the colonized subject into an object, a subaltern subject without voice. In former types of colonization this was achieved by physical violence. Even though the British colonization was not exempt from violence, new indirect strategies to dominate the colonized people, disseminated by colonial discourse and its ideology, were employed to reduce the colonized people by objectification and stereotyping. The former subject was transformed into a colonial object.

Descartes's subject involves the centrality of the autonomous human individual, a founding precept of humanism that separated the subject from the object and the self from the other. Nietzsche, Freud and Marx brought forth elements to disrupt the integrity and the autonomy of the human individual. Contemporary views argue that the subject is not autonomous, that is, the human subject is produced through ideology, language and discourse, determining factors in the construction of individual identity, which becomes an effect rather than a cause of such factors. Together the theories of ideology, psychoanalysis and post-structuralism are against the Enlightenment assertion of individual autonomy, but confirm the capacity of the subject formed by established social and cultural forces to disrupt and to undermine them.

Concerning the colonized subjects, they have their subjectivity formed by colonial ideology, language and discourse. Colonial ideology establishes through binarism and hegemony what is right and what is wrong with a subtle persuasion. Since the colonized have to learn the colonizer's language, they leave behind their own culture and language to accept the colonial discourse which stereotypes the colonized as a subaltern, inferior and uncivilized race needing civilization.

Obviously *resistance* is one of the main points of the post-colonial theory, since it represents the recovery of the oppressed colonial subaltern turned into an object. Resistance occurs when the colonized recover their voice and their former subjectivity before colonization. Resistance implies extreme courage, since it means going against the grain; at the same time the seemingly

Sarah Casagrande - Thomas Bonnici

invulnerable and coherent imperial discourse is undermined. The apex of resistance is when a whole nation has the courage to go against the colonial discourse imposed. At this point, it gains political independence even though it may be a long way to achieve absolute independence from the colonial discourse, from its strong hegemonic ideologies imposed subtly in the colonized's mind (ASHCROFT, 2001; GRIGOLETTO, 2002).

APARTHEID: THE CONTEXT OF 'NOT FOR PUBLICATION'

'Not for Publication', originally published in 1965, belongs to the collection of short stories *Some Monday for Sure* (1976), written during the Apartheid regime of South Africa. Since the text deals strongly with apartheid and British colonization in South Africa, some concepts involving Apartheid (Afrikaans for "apartness") policy and its implications are needed. Apartheid consisted of a policy governing relations between South Africa's white minority and non-white majority which sanctioned racial segregation and political and economic discrimination against non-whites. It also implies "separate development" and the introduction of Bantustans, implemented in the 1960s through the Population Registration Act of 1950, which classified all South Africans as Bantu (black Africans), Colored (mixed race), white and later also Asian (Indian and Pakistani). Although law-sanctioned racial segregation existed before 1948, it was the National Party, which gained office that year, that extended the policy and called it Apartheid. The Group Areas Act of 1950 established residential and business sections in urban areas for each "race" and those from other "races" were barred from entering them. This law and the Land Laws of 1954 and 1955, completing the 1913 and 1936 Land Acts, resulted in the fact that more than 80% of South Africa's land was in the hand of the white minority. Segregation of the races was enforced through the "pass" laws, while white-black marriages were made illegal, segregated public facilities were authorized, separate educational standards were established, each "race" was restricted to specific jobs, and non-whites were denied participation in the national government.

In spite of the strong suppression of the government to any criticism, opposition to apartheid started to grow. Negroes African groups, supported by whites, held demonstrations, strikes, violent protests and sabotages. International censure forced South

Africa to withdraw from the Commonwealth in 1961, culminating in a real shift of policy by South African president F. W. de Klerk in 1990-91 who repealed the apartheid policy including the Population Registration Act. Although racial segregation continued strongly in South African society, even after its legal abolishment, the Negroes had not a full enfranchisement. It was finally conquered with the first Negro democratically elected president, Nelson Mandela (1994-1999), famous for his struggle against apartheid (NEW ENCYCLOPAEDIA BRITANNICA, 1993).

'NOT FOR PUBLICATION'

The chronological context of 'Not for Publication' occurs during apartheid, although its exact date is unknown; maybe by the time of the division's tribes in South Africa. It presents strong features of the British colonial discourse, their colonization's strategies impregnated with Western's ideology of superior civilization highly supported by the apartheid.

Praise Basetse, an 11-year-old South African Negro boy, practically a beggar on Johannesburg's streets, was met by chance by the white British social assistant Adelaide Graham-Grigg, who takes him off the street. After discovering his acute intelligence, she decides to "offer" him Western education, which will make an object of him without knowledge of his own culture and customs; in order to turn him into a high rank politician to struggle for the South African people, but following the British Western political ideology. As a result, Praise finds himself under psychological pressure and tries to resist against objectification, although we do not know whether his resistance was completely successful, since a part of the short story is left untold. It may be supposed that he became a good politician if his resistance is taken into account.

PROCESS AND STRATEGIES OF REPRODUCTION OF THE OBJECT

The characters Adelaide Graham-Grigg, a English social assistant, and Father Audry, a white Anglican priest, are the people who form Praise's mentality after he had been taken off the streets. It is evident that for the last eleven years he had received his "education" from the cultural environment of a large Negro

Sarah Casagrande - Thomas Bonnici

family, originally from a British Protectorate in the interior of southern Africa, but now living in one of the shanty town around Johannesburg. At least, Praise was taught the rudiments of the tribal language and he himself learned all (significantly reading) that the street and poverty offered him.

When Miss Graham-Grigg recovered the boy from the street, he became for her a sort of hope, or rather, she endeavored to prepare him to be the political leader destined to govern the British Protectorate after independence. While Graham-Grigg was against the educational system run by the Jesuits in South Africa, which, in her opinion, provided low quality education for Negroes, paradoxically she was in favor of the Anglican school run by Father Audry, even though it was totally impregnated with British values and mores. Graham-Grigg was actually in favor of Negro subjectivity and real independence from Britain. "By the time independence comes, we'll be free not only of the British government but of the church as well!" (GORDIMER, 1976: 87).

However, she failed to realize that she was using British ideology to form Praise's mentality and to fabricate his future, especially when the fact that he was just an eleven-year-old boy, and thus, a perfect victim to absorb anything put into his head, has been taken into consideration. The narrator presented Praise as a *tabula rasa* whose mind and character could be impregnated with British and Western ideology by the educational activities of white non-South African educators so that he might turn into a well-prepared politician, trigger the Independence process and govern the would-be ex-Protectorate: a South African governing an independent South-African country.

Instinctively sensitive to the cultural issues, however, the concocted colonial and pedagogical scheme for Praise's future was somewhat initially objected to both by Graham-Grigg and by Father Audry.

He said, 'What you want is someone who will turn out to be an able politician without challenging the tribal system.'

They both laughed, but, again, he had unconsciously taken the advantage of admitting their deeply divergent views; he believed the chiefs must go, while she, of course, saw no reason why Africans shouldn't develop their own tribal democracy instead of taking over the Western pattern.

'Well, he's a little young for us to be worrying about that now, don't you think?' He smiled (GORDIMER, 1976: 92).

If the discussion had continued within the context of "education on the Western pattern", the white people involved would have perceived that, precisely because Praise was young and in his formative years, an education lacking South African culture and dissociated from the cultural context was extremely dangerous for the young intelligent boy. How would it be possible for Praise to be a good South African politician, seeped in solving the problems of the colonial subjects, othered for hundreds of years, without knowing, studying his own culture and roots?

In this atmosphere of candour, they discussed Praise's background. Father Audry suggested that the boy should be encouraged to resume relations with his family, once he was back within reach of Johannesburg.

'They're pretty awful.'

'It would be best for him to acknowledge what he was, if he is to accept what he is to become' (GORDIMER, 1976: 92).

Graham-Grigg was more radical than Father Audry and wanted Praise's destiny in her hands, which included being kept off from his family's "bad influence". In fact, Praise began to be raised as if he were an educated white British boy, totally severed from his family, culture and roots. It may be said that a different sort of mental colonization, seething with British ideology, was being grafted on an already born-into colonial mentality. To the objectification and othered mentality, "inherent" to all colonized peoples, may be added a true reproduction of the British education's system which would result in an epidermal "black leader" with all the qualifications of a European, seeking Eurocentric systems and means for his country's ails. The study of Mathematics, Geometry, Latin, and a host of other subject matters were giving him the British and colonial point of view, and, at the same time, distancing him even more from his own culture and people. Even when the theatre and music were concerned, the Nativity play and classical music (Bach, for example) involved, or rather, the white elite's taste, strategically shunned African music and preferred a type of jazz influenced by European harmonic structures. This is the emblematic significance of the "encounter" of a well-educated Praise with his relatives.

[...] the old woman, a couple of children who had been babies when he left, and one of his grown-up 'sisters' came to the school on a visiting day. They had to be pointed out to him among the other boys' visitors; he would not have known them, nor they him. [...] They did not come back (GORDIMER, 1976: 94)

Sarah Casagrande - Thomas Bonnici

The lack of a true contact with his own culture would turn Praise into a perfect South African colonized object produced according to British ideology and pervaded by British social, political, economical and cultural values which were presented to him and accepted by him as the best. As a matter of course, he would develop a negative opinion on his own country and culture, considered inferior to the British ones. This is precisely the aim of the British education he was receiving, or rather, to become a South African politician, immersed in British ideology and power, and, in an indirect way, maintain British political control of the South African country. This had been the strategy of colonial governments and church-run schools worldwide when the metropolis educated promising colonial subjects in their universities. On returning to their country they reproduced colonial mores which impaired the true development of the country towards independence and subjectivity.

THE OBJECT UNDER PRESSURE

Brought up and educated according to the British educational pattern, Praise was objectified from his eleventh to his sixteenth birthday by well-intentioned white British people around him. They only saw in him an outstanding intelligence which, well monitored, would be highly useful to impose British mentality and its social, political and cultural standards on the people of the South African protectorate. The question whether the protectorate, with its different tribes, cultures, languages, needed that type of education and whether it would develop an independent stance more in accordance to its in-bred culture, was not even raised.

The problem is how this could in fact happen, or rather, how Graham-Grigg and Father Audrey, completely against apartheid and totally in favor of the African subjects and their capacities, could blundered in such a sensitive matter as in the education of a small child who would reproduce the colonial trappings. British colonial ideology has always been based on the principles of "the civilizing mission", "the superiority of British culture" above all and every different, especially non-white, culture, and on the "universal need" of the other to development according to and exclusively on Western culture. The colonial mentality had not merely fabricated the colonial subject but also molded the colonizer to such an extent that, even radically opposed to colo-

nial objectification of the other, fails to perceive that his/her own ideology is already vitiated by the above-mentioned principles.

As a consequence of such ambiguity, colonial discourse, materialized through Western music, school subject matters, games, clothes, brought about the opposite of what, unwittingly, was intended. Since Praise was a very intelligent boy, he immediately accepted the offer without suspecting any trap. In fact, Graham-Grigg convinced him of his special intelligence. "You're got an awfully good one. More in there than other boys – you know? It's something special – it would be such a waste. Lots of people would like to be clever like you, but it's not easy, when you are the clever one. [...]" (GORDIMER, 1976: 91). Then she remarked to Father Audrey, "D'you think he could do a Cambridge entrance? My committee in London would set up a scholarship, I'm sure – investment in a future prime minister for the Protectorate!" (GORDIMER, 1976: 93). The hint was taken and once more the colonial subject accepted the offer but failed to realize that he was again objectified for the benefit of the metropolis and all that it stood for. Post-colonial authors so wide apart as Chinua Achebe and Pauline Melville denounced how missionaries and governments prepared elite colonial subjects to perpetuate the hierarchical and binary poles of the colonial structure to serve the former's needs. Feeling the high expectations the colonizers were putting in him and finding himself unrooted from his culture, Praise started to visualize a better, albeit an exclusively, personal future but failed to understand the mire he would put his people into if a different "revelation" had not occurred. In fact, although seemingly treated as a person, he was actually objectified throughout due to the psychological pressure on him which, in the course of time, became unbearable. It was the pivot of a turn about, even though the narrator did not pinpoint the exact moment or the cumulating factors that produced a conscious-raising stance in the colonial subject.

RESISTANCE

Perhaps the first signs of subversion and revolt began to appear when he hid his early initiation to smoking and to sex during his first years at school. Sly civility (Bhabha, 1998) was needed to continue in the school sustained through a meritorious system of good behavior, strict discipline and complete

Sarah Casagrande - Thomas Bonnici

dedication to intellectual work. Further, on the verge of a breakthrough in colonial education when he would be a university student at sixteen, an achievement and a feat in the protectorate and in the colonial world, somewhere at that point, he reacted to colonial education and, it may be surmised, to his objectification. The reaction took the form of an intellectual breakdown.

He would rest his cheek against the pages of the books, now and then, alone in the study; that was all. The damp stone smell of the books was all he needed. Where he had once had to force himself to return again and again to the pages of things he did not grasp, gazing in blackness at the print until meaning assembled itself, he now had to force himself when it was necessary to leave the swarming facts outside which he no longer seemed to understand anything. [...] Praise shed a few tears. He found himself praying, smiling with the tears and trembling, rubbing at the scalding water that ran down inside his nose and blotched on the books (GORDIMER, 1976: 96-97).

The psychological breakdown prompted him to take a watershed decision and become a subject instead of remaining an object or deepening his objectification further. The crisis came to a head when Father Audrey lost control.

But the boy leapt up, dodging a blow. 'Sir – no. Sir – no.'

It was clearly hysteria; he had never addressed Father Audry as anything but 'Father'. It was some frightening retrogression, a reversion to the subconscious, a place of symbols and collective memory. He spoke for others, out of another time (GORDIMER, 1976: 98).

The colonizer's reaction was the result of, perhaps, a hazy perception that the boy became aware of what was happening throughout all the period he was at school: objectification, imbue ment of European ideology through education, vitiated leadership for the perpetuation of colonialism, a non-decolonizing of the mind, hierarchization to dominate further and deeper. On the colonizer's part, the significance of Praise's reaction was frustration that the former's aims had been discovered and colonial strategies were not only put to test and questioned but shunned as mistaken and ambiguous for the benefit of the people. The straw that broke the camel's back was the fountain pen he was given as a present "to write the matriculation exam" (GORDIMER, 1976: 99). For Praise it smacked of the bartering strategy of 16th century colonial encounters. Graham-Grigg and Audrey's strategy was disclosed: even though well-intentioned, their educational strategy was a

flop because it would have continued the colonial policy. Hands would be different but the same ideology would be dominant. Results would be similarly devastating.

The act of running away may be understood as Praise's resistance, a conclusion he reached about the years of "good" education he had received. If during the narration the boy's voice was scantily heard and his opinion was consistently replaced by his tutors', it was when quitting everything that he became a subject. His rebellious act caused the rejection of a safe and materially comfortable "life" without subjectivity. What happened afterwards was not reported. At the start of the narrative the narrator just mentioned that Praise was the current prime minister. If we consider his attitude in running away as a very conscious act of someone who could not bear anymore being objectified and colonized, it may be possible to surmise the kind of politician he became, although no textual proofs can be brought forth. The text hints that as Praise went against all that smacked of an imperial stance and against the jeopardizing of the African people involved, he fought as prime minister not only for political independence of the protectorate but for the decolonization of the mind of his people and their culture.

CONCLUSION

From the point of view of certain post-colonial terms involving colonial discourse, binary stratification, hegemony, subjectivity and resistance, a critique of Nadine Gordimer's short story "Not for Publication" has been undertaken to analyze the educational strategies used by the colonizers and the resistance to them as manifested in the literature of South Africa. An investigation has been made on the "help" by white British people living in South Africa and their ideology of hegemony and superiority over the colonized subjects. The process of further reproducing the colonial scheme through British educational standards and the insistence on the uprooting of native culture produces a resistance that stupefies the colonizer. On the other hand, the colonial subject's gradual coming of consciousness with regard to objectification and to the possible of subjectivity even in an extremely narrow environment shows the deep-rooted traits imposed by colonization which are not readily or automatically shed off.

Sarah Casagrande - Thomas Bonnici

Further studies should be undertaken so that the theme of resistance could be further developed in the context of violent (war, terrorism) and non-violent (irony, parody) reactions to investigate the efficaciousness of both.

BIBLIOGRAPHICAL REFERENCES

ASHCROFT, B. **Post-colonial transformation**. London: Routledge, 2001.

ASHCROFT, B.; GRIFFITHS, G.; TIFFIN, H. **Key Concepts in Post-Colonial Studies**. London: Routledge, 1998.

BHABHA, H. **The Location of Culture**. London: Routledge, 1998.

BONNICI, T. **O pós-Colonialismo e a literatura**: estratégias de leitura. Maringá: EDUEM, 2000.

BONNICI, T. Teoria e crítica pós-colonialista. In: BONNICI, T.; ZOLIN, L. O. (orgs.). **Teoria Literária**: abordagens históricas e tendências contemporâneas. Maringá: EDUEM, 2003, p. 223-240.

FERRO, M. **O livro negro do colonialismo**. São Paulo: Ediouro, 2004.

GORDIMER, N. "Not for Publication." In: **Some Monday for Sure**. London: Heinemann, 1976, p. 85-99.

GRAMSCI, A. **A Gramsci Reader**: Selected Writings 1916-1935. London: Lawrence & Wishart, 1988.

GRIGOLETTO, M. **A resistência das palavras**. Campinas: Unicamp, 2002.

IYER, P. The Empire Writes Back. **Time Magazine**, v. 142, n. 6, p. 46-51, 1993.

NEW ENCYCLOPAEDIA BRITANNICA. 15th ed. Chicago: Encyclopaedia Britannica, Inc. vols. 1, 2, 5, 6, 12, 1993.

O'REILLY, C. **Post-colonial Literature**. Cambridge: CUP, 2001.

ROSS, L. (Ed.). **Colonial and Post-Colonial Fiction**: An Anthology. New York: Garland, 1999.

WESSELING, H. L. **Dividir para dominar**. Niterói: UFRJ, 1998.

