

INTRODUCTION

The Work of Vision in the Age of European Empires

Sumathi Ramaswamy

The conquest of the earth, which mostly means taking it away from those who have a different complexion or slightly flatter noses than ourselves, is not a pretty thing when you look into it too much. What redeems it is the idea only. An idea at the back of it; not a sentimental pretence but an idea; and an unselfish belief in the idea—something that you can set up, and bow down before, and offer a sacrifice to.

—Joseph Conrad, *Heart of Darkness*

Seeing is an art . . . which must be learnt.

—William Herschel

Empires of Vision assembles recent scholarship that draws our attention to the mutual implication of the global overseas empires of Europe and modern regimes of visibility and their reciprocal constitution. The past few centuries have witnessed not only the sweeping expansion of Europe beyond its putative borders and subsequent contraction but also an exponential escalation in the global flows of peoples, objects, ideas, technologies, and images. This volume explores the range of pictorial practices, image-making technologies, and vision-oriented subjectivities that have been cultivated, desired, and dispersed within the contexts of modern empire formation and decolonization. The essays collected here consider the transformations undergone by these technologies, practices, and subjectivities as they get entangled in empire-building, nationalist reactions, postcolonial contestations, and transnational globalization. In addition to tracking the intertwined histories of “empire” and “vision” in modernity, the selections elucidate what might be specifically colonial about the image-making technologies, practices, and subjectivities encountered in these pages. The goal is also to understand

the “(post)colonial” as among many competing ocular fields in the scopic regimes of modernity.¹ In considering these themes, *Empires of Vision* also opens up for scrutiny what “Europe” looks like when seen with (post)colonial eyes.

As such, this volume is located at the intersection of two vibrant cross-disciplinary fields in contemporary humanist and social scientific scholarship—colonial and postcolonial studies and visual culture—and invites the reader to consider the new configurations and reordering of received knowledge enabled by this nexus. Adapting from Ann Laura Stoler, the question is *the force of the image* in empire-building and self-making.² Section I, “The Imperial Optic,” is concerned substantively with modern European empires as image-making, image-consuming, and image-collecting regimes and with sketching the lineaments of an optical theory of colonial power.³ Theoretically and conceptually, the essays in this section illuminate the place of visibility—of seeing and being seen—in what Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak called “the planned epistemic violence of the imperialist project.”⁴ Primarily (but not exclusively) focused on empire formation and consolidation in the age following the Industrial Revolution, they explore the global dispersal of five image-making technologies that fundamentally reconstituted the visual regimes of both Europe and its colonies: oil and easel painting, mechanically reproduced print (in its many forms), maps and landscape imagery, photography, and film.⁵ Rather than presume these image-makers as uniquely “Western” technologies whose development was exclusively molded by isolated (and heroic) individuals located in the metropole, we learn from these works that they are imperially dispersed but locally appropriated in creative and unexpected ways. We are also interested in understanding why Europe’s industrial empires cultivated these particular visual technologies and the image practices and protocols of seeing associated with them, and how in turn these were transformed through their entanglement in colonial and imperial projects. In making the case for the constitutive role of vision in the age of global overseas empires and imperialism’s role in shaping modern visibility, this section examines the various means by which the naked eye came to be vastly enhanced and extended through the technological innovations of industrial modernity even while skepticism and suspicion accumulates about and around the colonizing power of “the gaze” and “the look.”

Furthermore, *Empires of Vision* suggests that the influential postcolonial argument “Can the subaltern speak?” has to be necessarily supplemented—

and here I use the term in the complex Derridean sense—with questions of seeing and looking. Does the empire not only speak and write back but also look back in unexpected ways, and at whom and with what effect? Does subaltern seeing extend imperial ways of looking even in the course of countering it, does it produce an alternative emancipatory vision, or is it a haphazard mix of both? Section II, “Postcolonial Looking,” shifts the focus from image-making technologies to the subaltern image-worker, both resident in Europe’s overseas colonies and increasingly in the metropole (such as Yinka Shonibare, one of whose works serves as the cover illustration for this volume).⁶ In the decades accompanying and following formal decolonization, many artists immigrated to the metropole, demographically transforming the very heart of whiteness in the process. In such “voyages in,” to borrow Edward Said’s felicitous formulation, what happens to Europe itself as an object of regard—and reference?⁷ This is an important question to ask if we want to understand how Europe as sovereign subject changes when viewed from the perspective of the global flow of images and visual apparatuses and from imperially transformed habits of seeing and being seen.⁸

The essays collected in this volume draw in various ways on postcolonial theory in all its myriad dimensions. At the same time, they manifest the limits of that theory whose own theoretical and conceptual roots largely draw on the world of words.⁹ But images are not mere illustrations or passive reflections of something already established elsewhere through the vast verbal archives of these modern industrial empires; instead, imperial and postcolonial history, culture, and politics are at least partly constituted by “struggles occurring at the level of the image.”¹⁰ This volume demonstrates that the image is a site where new accounts of empire, the (post)colony, and Europe itself emerge that depart from—even challenge—the more familiar narrative line(s) of nonvisual histories. This is fundamentally what is at stake in this project. We are interested not so much in making a case for the sovereignty of the image—that would be a futile, even undesirable exercise—as in arguing against treating it as merely an eye-catching accessory. At the very least, by placing the “colonizing” image (and its linked technologies and subjectivities) at the center of our thinking, theorizing, and writing, we aim to expand and complicate the archive on the basis of which both imperial histories and the histories of modern vision in the industrial age have been written so far. We seek to write against the disciplinary confinement and containment of images to the academic field of art history, where they

have been understood until recently with a lamentable lack of attention to the colonial and the postcolonial; this, too, is at stake.

Empires of vision becomes a productive concept with which to work *only* when the boundaries of both constitutive terms of our title—*empire* and *vision*—are tested by asking which aspects of empire did not leave their trace in the image or the figural, and correspondingly, which modalities of the visual have been unconcerned or indifferent to the impress of imperialism.¹¹ Our selections teach us that it is not a matter of whether “art follows empire” (as Sir Joshua Reynolds claimed circa 1790) or whether “empire follows art” (as contrarily amended by William Blake circa 1810–20),¹² but that empire and art—or more broadly, power/knowledge and visual subjectivities—are mutually constituted and entwined, both in the colonies and in the metropole. Furthermore, the extraordinary movements of images across neatly laid borders and geopolitical boundaries, as well as the heterogeneous uses to which visual technologies have been put, challenge theories that conceive of the West and the East, the colonizer and colonized, the center and the periphery, as Manichean oppositions locked in perpetual struggles of domination on the one hand and subordination or resistance on the other. What we are instead learning from the work of the image in colonial and postcolonial settings is to consider empire formation as a messy business of mutual entanglements and imbrications, of collisions and compromises, and of desiring-while-disavowing and disavowing-while-desiring. Europe or its technologies no longer appear as the sole motor of modern visual culture; by the same token, the colonies can no longer be cast as either passive recipients of the white man’s magic or massive resisters of formations and influences fanning out from Europe. Faced with such enmeshments, ideological undertakings such as visual decolonization, motivated by nativism and nationalism, seem inadequate (and even, possibly, undesirable), as do studies based on an insulated and fenced-off Europe—pure, white, untouched, and untropicalized. Indeed, as Christopher Pinney writes, “Europe was always a reflection of other times and places, never a self-present unity awaiting its replicatory colonial enunciation.”¹³ Nowhere is this arguably more apparent than in the realm of the visual, and demonstrating this is also one of the briefs of this collection being assembled at a time when the very concept of Europe—a “Europe in black and white”—is generating new scholarly and media discussion.¹⁴

The Panic of the Visual in (Post)Colonial Studies

This collection is consciously poised against what Barbara Stafford has identified as “the entrenched antivisualism pervading western neo-Platonizing discourse from the Enlightenment forward.” Commenting on the totemization of language in the putative West where writing is identified with intellectual potency, Stafford observes that the passionate visualist “is haunted by the paradoxical ubiquity and degradation of images: everywhere transmitted, universally viewed, but as a category generally despised.” More so than verbal genres, images have historically been perceived as more treacherous and lacking in integrity, in the face of which she calls for making public “the affirmative actions of images throughout time and across civilizations.” This entails recognizing their “marvelous capacity to make abstractions concrete, their ability to provide both meaningful direction and delight to the individual thrashing her way through the maze of experience.”¹⁵ The need to make public “the affirmative” work of images is even more urgent in colonial and postcolonial contexts weighed down by the additional burden of the European denigration and delegitimization of preexisting and “native” visual cultures on one hand, and their exoticization and sensationalization on the other hand. At the same time, all such affirmative attempts rub up against the undeniable fact that visual technologies and practices frequently underwrote colonial governance and power. Steering a path between affirming “the virtue” of images and charting their participation (vicariously or conscientiously) in new regimes of imperial mastery over the Other is a challenge faced by all those who work at the nexus of empire and vision.¹⁶

In going against the grain of the entrenched antivisualism of much social scientific thought and practice, the image interrupts and intervenes, disturbing the discursive field of colonial and postcolonial studies that has for long been dominated by the hegemony of the word and the tyranny of the textual archive.¹⁷ A few years ago, in a conversation with W. J. T. Mitchell, Edward Said revealed that he got “tongue-tied” when asked about pictures, admitting that “just to think about the visual arts generally sends me into a panic.”¹⁸ This is an ironic confession from a scholar whose work has exerted enormous influence on those who think and write at the intersection of imperialism, postcolonialism, and visuality. I seize on the word *panic* in Said’s disclosure, however, and use it to argue that the value of the sometimes disorderly, frequently unpredictable, and occasionally incoherent world of

images lies precisely in its capacity to disrupt the flow of history-as-usual based on the certitudes of the written word; to take us down routes not readily available in the official archives of the state with their privileging of the document; and to bring to the center of our analyses that which is unsayable and ineffable—that which words have failed.¹⁹ Almost a century ago, Walter Benjamin, in his aphoristic “Theses on the Philosophy of History,” proposed that to articulate the past historically does not mean to recognize it “the way it really was.” Instead, “it means to seize hold of a memory as it flashes up at a moment of danger . . . to retain that image of the past which unexpectedly appears to man singled out by history at a moment of danger.” As others have noted, the historical materialist actively and creatively shuttles between the present and the past, between the living and the dead, with the all-too-keen awareness that “every image of the past that is not recognized by the present as one of its own concerns threatens to disappear irretrievably.”²⁰ This urgent need to retrieve and redeem images and visual technologies that have all too quickly been dismissed as inconsequential or marginal to the serious business of empire-building or anticolonial politics underlies the work of the scholars collected in this volume.

In visually “panicking” the field of colonial and postcolonial studies, Edward Said’s presence looms large, all the more noteworthy because neither his *Orientalism* (1978) nor his *Culture and Imperialism* (1993) critically engaged with the graphic image or pictorial practice.²¹ All the same, as Saloni Mathur has eloquently argued, Said’s early critique refutes any approach that views “the realm of art and aesthetics as relatively autonomous, or existing in a ‘super-structural’ relation to the economic, social and political spheres.”²² In his later work, Said directed our attention to “the massively knotted and complex histories” of colonizer and colonized that are perforce the product of the dynamically interconnected field occupied by both Europe and its colonies since at least the age of industrial capitalism.²³ This led him to suggest that the seemingly discrepant experiences of colony and metropole, hitherto radically separated, be read “contrapuntally, as making up a set of what I call intertwined and overlapping histories.” Such contrapuntal readings would serve as “an alternative both to a politics of blame and to the even more destructive politics of confrontation and hostility.”²⁴

In the wake of the publication of *Orientalism* in 1978, art historian Linda Nochlin was among the first to extend its insights to the field of visual studies in her reflections on nineteenth-century French Orientalist painting

and its relationship to colonial ideology.²⁵ Nochlin wrote her essay explicitly in response to an exhibition in 1982 called “Orientalism: The Near East in French Painting 1800–1880,” whose catalog invoked Said only to distance itself from any examination of the political scaffolding that enabled such works to emerge in the first place.²⁶ Categorically rejecting the insulation of the realm of aesthetics from colonial ideology and also calling into question her own discipline’s canon, which had marginalized such artworks, Nochlin identified the absences and excesses that enabled the European white male artist to paint and frame the Orient for Western contemplation and consumption. So Orientalist painting is marked by an absence of history or change, industrious work by natives, and the looming colonial presence in the Orient, especially the violence visited on the conquered (land). On the other hand, the fleshly native body is displayed in excessive plenitude, typically in settings and postures of lassitude and indulgence, especially as the nude female and the cruel despotic male. Gratuitous attention to redundant architectural details (which added to the “reality effect” of these works) and ethnographic exactitude are other hallmarks of this prolific genre that dominated European attempts pictorially to enframe the Orient.²⁷

Nochlin’s astute observations today are vulnerable to some of the same criticisms leveled against Said, including the neglect of participation by “Orientals” themselves in Orientalist art-making or of native resistance to such caricatures.²⁸ As Roger Benjamin persuasively shows in a revealing catalog essay published in 1997, Europe’s Orientalist art is very much in demand among collectors of Arab and Turkish origin, who seem to value it because it appears to them to restore a lost past: “The fact that it was Western artists who had the means to record such images is almost incidental from this perspective.”²⁹ Faced with the paradox of the so-called Orientals as assiduous collectors of Orientalist art that apparently demeaned and denigrated them, Benjamin invites us to consider how such acts of repossession of European cultural documents may instead be read as “an assertion of selfhood, and as redressing historical imbalances.”³⁰ Although the Saidian framework adapted by Nochlin does not readily explain such paradoxes, her essay nevertheless inserted the critical new problematic of “visual orientalism” into art historical and colonial studies by inexorably linking art, aesthetics, and colonial power/knowledge, a problematic that has been enormously enabling for those who have written in her wake.³¹ Indeed, so enduring is this paradigm shift that a critic of the Saidian approach like John Mackenzie who seeks to undo the connection and return

the art of the imperial age to a realm untouched by colonial politics, ideology, and operations of power seems unconvincing, although his cautionary comments against homogenizing all experiences under the single umbrella of “Orientalism” is important.³²

The nexus between power, visibility, and the global spread of European empires is also at the heart of Mary Louise Pratt’s *Imperial Eyes: Travel Writing and Transculturation* (1992), another work that, although based largely on analyses of the written word, has left its mark on those who write on colonial visual cultures and economies.³³ Like the later Said, whom interestingly she does not invoke, Pratt is concerned with the constitution of “the domestic subject of Euroimperialism”³⁴ through practices of travel, acts of discovery, and masterful writing. In contrast to *Orientalism*, *Imperial Eyes* includes (brief) analyses of close to forty images drawn from eighteenth- and nineteenth-century travel writings that are a product of the age of mechanical reproduction discussed at greater length in part 2 of section I, “The Mass-Printed Imperium.” Such mass-produced prints—and the narratives in which they were embedded—emerge in the “contact zone,” social spaces in distant lands away from the metropole where subjects previously separated by geographic and historical disjunctures meet, clash, and grapple with each other, often in highly asymmetrical relations of domination and subordination. Prints like these were the work of a wide-ranging male “imperial eye” that perforce adopted a “monarch-of-all-I survey” stance that anchored nineteenth-century travel narratives. Such “promontory” images of subordinated lands and the peoples who inhabited them—viewed by the imperial eye from a distance or from a safe spot above them—masterfully reordered them as would a painting, appropriating them into European schemes of possession, enjoyment, and desire. In Pratt’s analysis, domination and control emerge from such imperial protocols of seeing and gazing (upon). Sight, therefore, is critical to the imperial enterprise that, in her understanding, is a “relation of *mastery* predicated between the seer and the seen.”³⁵

Although she does not invoke him, Pratt’s argument regarding the constitutive capacity of sight and vision in the politics of imperialism recalls the powerfully evocative discussion, indebted to Jean-Paul Sartre, of “the look” and modern subject-formation in Frantz Fanon’s *Black Skin, White Masks*.³⁶ As Robert Stam writes in his essay included in this collection, there has been a tremendous resurgence of scholarly interest in the past few decades in the works of this West Indies-born, French-educated writer who practiced psychotherapy in North Africa in the 1940s and 1950s, and who with

extraordinary prescience anticipated much that is central to cultural studies and postcolonial theory as we know and practice them today. Even Michael Taussig's recent call to pay attention to color as the motor of world and colonial history had already been signaled in Fanon's much-invoked discussion of "the fact of blackness" as the sine qua non of empire.³⁷ The image-saturated and visually charged vocabulary of his writings makes Fanon a "disturbing" figure for a colonial and postcolonial studies steeped in the world of words and texts. Consider statements such as "All around me the white man . . . All this whiteness that burns me"; or, the black woman "asks for nothing, demands for nothing, except for a little whiteness in her life"; and most iconically, the opening assertion of chapter 5 in *Black Skin, White Masks*, "Look, a Negro."³⁸ Such inexorable connections that Fanon makes on subject formation triggered by "the look from the place of the Other"³⁹ in the cauldron of color ("The glances of the other fixed me there, in the sense in which a chemical solution is fixed by a dye . . . Look at the nigger! . . . Mama, a Negro!") enables his writings to "panic" the field of textually driven colonial scholarship, which otherwise takes for granted the power of color and the color of power.

Colonizing Visual Studies

In one of the founding moments of postcolonial critique in 1985, Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak observed: "If . . . we concentrated on documenting and theorizing the itinerary of the consolidation of Europe as sovereign subject, indeed sovereign and subject, then we would produce an alternative historical narrative of the 'worlding' of what is today called 'the Third World.' To think of the Third World as distant cultures, exploited but with rich heritages waiting to be recovered, interpreted and curricularized in English translation helps the emergence of the 'Third World' as a signifier that allows us to forget that 'worlding.'"⁴⁰

Through such a worlding, hitherto uninscribed and uncolonized space is forcefully brought into a world (via activities such as cartographic mapping) that has been essentially constituted around and by the idea of Europe. Spivak's arguments regarding worlding compel us to move even beyond the important juncture between operations of colonial power/knowledge and the production of artworks toward which Said and Nochlin take us, by suggesting that colonial violence was not so much the precondition of or pretext for modern visual culture but critically integral to its very making,

for, as Deborah Cherry reminds us, “it was in ‘the planned epistemic violence of the imperialist project’ that earth was transformed into world, land into landscape.”⁴¹ To forget the worlding of the world through the project of imperialism has consequences not just for the way we think about lands and lives outside Europe but for Europe itself and its particularistic experiences writ large as History and Theory.

Fanon, Said, Pratt: we encounter their names and works, although rarely constitutively, in the numerous visual culture anthologies and readers that have proliferated in the academic marketplace since the onset of the so-called visual turn in the human sciences. Despite the massive presence of Europe’s imperial project and its aftermath in the very centuries in which metropolitan theorists of the visual and the image issued their authoritative statements, empire is not an organizing idea or argument for most existing published collections or surveys on modernity’s visual culture.⁴² In 1996, the influential journal *October* published a widely read and much-quoted “Visual Culture Questionnaire.” Responses to four questions on the then-emergent cross-disciplinary field of visual culture were invited from a range of art and architecture historians, film theorists, historians, literary critics, and artists, nineteen of which were published. It is telling that not one respondent was a dedicated specialist on the worlds outside Euro-America, even though the questionnaire sought a response to the claim that the new visual studies prepared “subjects for the next stage of globalized capital.”⁴³ With one exception—the historian of art Keith Moxey rightly observed in passing that the assumed universality of European art and aesthetics was critical to the exercise of colonial power—no respondent even commented on the presence of large global empires as one of the constitutive matrixes within which modern visual culture was forged between the sixteenth and twentieth centuries.⁴⁴

This questionnaire is not alone in this regard. Critical theorist W. J. T. Mitchell’s 1995 model syllabus on the new visual studies, organized around the rubrics of “signs,” “bodies,” and “worlds,” largely ignores European empire-building as a constitutive phenomenon.⁴⁵ The nineteenth century was fundamentally reconstituted by European imperialism at home and abroad and famously inaugurated a global “scramble” for colonies whose consequences we are still living with multiple decades later. Yet the otherwise exemplary *Nineteenth-Century Visual Culture Reader* merely gestures toward the reordering force of this global project.⁴⁶ A recent anthology called *Images: A Reader* does not even do this.⁴⁷ Two other recent works

that bring together the reflections of key thinkers in this vibrant field of visual studies do not heed scholars whose work has been informed by their engagement with the colonial and the postcolonial.⁴⁸ *Critical Terms for Art History*, edited by Robert S. Nelson and Richard Shiff (University of Chicago Press, 1996; 2003) does not include *empire* as one of the critical terms necessary for us to understand “art history.” *Art since 1900: Modernism, Antimodernism, and Postmodernism* (Thames & Hudson, 2004) edited by Hal Foster and his colleagues at *October*, has only passing references to Europe’s colonial projects and their undoing in the twentieth century and a mere nod toward postcolonial theory. As I hope that the reader will (re)learn from Simon Gikandi’s essay on Pablo Picasso’s foundational encounter with African art reproduced in this volume, it is impossible to think of modernism, antimodernism, and postmodernism without thinking of Europe’s aesthetic confrontation with the Other.⁴⁹

The result of such erasures and silences is that there is now a new visual studies canon in which the historical experience of European visibility is unproblematically taken as universally true and valid, or just as perniciously, it is assumed that there is a distinctive “non-Western” aesthetic that should be a matter of concern for only those who study parts of the world outside of Euro-America. The fundamental reshaping of modern and global visual culture by Europe’s encounter with and control over the Other remains massively occluded.⁵⁰ Certain themes have become de rigueur—the mechanical reproduction of the image, the society of the spectacle, scopic regimes, the simulacrum, the fetish, and the gaze most notably—yet the colonial roots of such concepts or their postcolonial trajectories have been barely interrogated. In her response to the “Visual Culture Questionnaire” in 1996, Susan Buck-Morss quipped (from a position very much within the U.S. academy), “Visual culture, once a foreigner to the academy, has gotten its green card and is here to stay.”⁵¹ *Empires of Vision* is a (gentle) reminder that large numbers of green card holders today hail from former colonies of European empires, and their visual experiences—and theories based on them—are here to stay as well and even to demand equal rights.

Hating Empire’s Images Properly

The twin assertion of this volume is therefore that no history of imperialism is complete without heeding the constitutive capacity of visibility, and correspondingly, no history of modern visibility can ignore the constitutive

fact of empire. Images interrupt and realign the flows of a textually driven colonial and postcolonial scholarship; correspondingly, facts of empire and the postcolony disrupt the claims of metropolitan visual culture and image studies: these are the reordering forces at work in this volume.

In making these assertions, this volume benefits hugely from what Mitchell has identified acutely as the “pictorial turn” in the human sciences:

Whatever the pictorial turn is, then, it should be clear that it is not a return to naive mimesis, copy or correspondence theories of representation, or a renewed metaphysics of pictorial “presence”; it is a rather a post-linguistic, post-semiotic rediscovery of the picture as a complex interplay between visibility, apparatus, institutions, discourses, bodies and figurality. It is the realization that *spectatorship* (the look, the gaze, the glance, the practices of observation, surveillance, and visual pleasure) may be as deep a problem as various forms of *reading* (decipherment, decoding, interpreting, etc.) and that visual experience or “visual literacy” might not be fully explicable on the model of textuality. Most important, it is the realization that while the problem of pictorial representation has always been with us, it presses inescapably now, and with unprecedented force, on every level of culture, from the most refined philosophical speculations to the most vulgar productions of the mass media. Traditional strategies of containment no longer seem inadequate, and the need for a global critique of visual culture seems inescapable.⁵²

Yet Mitchell’s call for a global critique of visual culture is possible *only* if we think Europe and its (former) colonies together within the same field of inquiry. This is a fact that is especially important to underscore in our “globally post-imperial, endlessly neo-imperial moment.”⁵³ In scrutinizing the work of vision in the age of European empires, which necessarily includes an analysis of the postcolonial aftermath, we ought to be concerned with what a particular art object or visual document might mean in its own times, and as importantly with tracking how it does its work, producing effects in the world that range from power and mastery to desire, ambivalence, and anxiety. Even more insistently, instead of considering a visual practice or an image-maker as merely a means to know something else, be it “empire” or “modernity,” “race,” or “difference,” we ought to be committed to these as objects of knowledge in and of themselves, as world-making and world-disclosing, rather than merely world-mirroring. The essays reproduced here neither naively celebrate empire’s visual work nor innocently go about the

task of recuperating it. Instead, they document the contradictions and ambivalences in the very processes by which territorial conquest, settlement, and mastery went hand in hand with ocular possession and ordering.

As Joseph Conrad observed, empire indeed is not a pretty thing when one looks into it too much. Nevertheless, it is important to look deeply and systematically because imperial acts of looking (and being looked at), the technologies for looking and for documenting the observed, and the ever proliferating archives and sites for (re)presenting that-which-has-been-looked-at have continued to endure long after the empires of the industrial age and as formal structures of mastery and control have given way to other (postcolonial) formations. This recognition also drives this volume, underscoring the stakes of what we look at and how we look.⁵⁴

As such, as we look deeply, systematically, and expansively in our postcolonial times, we ought to cultivate an ethic of hating empire's images *properly*.⁵⁵ Sunil Agnani from whom I adapt this idea rethinks Theodor Adorno's enigmatic aphorism, "One must have tradition in oneself, to hate it properly," to propose "One must have empire in oneself to hate it properly." For Agnani, hating empire properly entails "entering into its terms and allowing the internal contradictions to be heightened rather than covered over by a political veil." To paraphrase him, hating empire properly is a peculiar combination of an antagonistic relationship to empire, alongside a (tragic?) immersion in it, "a subtle form of inhabitation."⁵⁶ This form of subtle inhabitation of antagonism and immersion, of hating and (tragic) loving at the same time, is especially true for our postcolonial encounter with empire's images, many of which remain objects of great beauty and value, much sought after and collected, even (and possibly especially) in the postcolonial world, if we recall Roger Benjamin's work discussed earlier in this essay.⁵⁷ Anthropologist Liam Buckley perceptively observes as he reflects on the challenges of working with colonial photographs in the Gambian National Archives today, "If projects of visual design were central to the regulation and presentation of the imperial world, then our encounter with that world was and remains via the medium of visual record. *It was and remains love at first sight.*"⁵⁸ Paradoxically therefore, although as good postcolonial scholars we may hate empire and with a passion, we fall in love with its images, which we come to study with care and thought, indeed, as Buckley insists, with love. These images undoubtedly "depict times that we no longer love," but nevertheless they "remain loved objects themselves."⁵⁹ I may "try to wrest myself from the amorous Image-repertoire: but the

Image-repertoire burns underneath, like an incompletely extinguished peat fire; it catches again; what was renounced reappears; out of the hasty grave suddenly breaks a long cry.”⁶⁰ This condition of desiring-while-disavowing and disavowing-while-desiring *oblige*s us to hate empire’s images properly. As Neil Lazarus reminds us in his reading of Adorno’s aphorism, “‘Properly’ . . . does not mark a plea for conformity, orderliness, civility, or good manners. Adorno calls for something far more profoundly ruptural, far less contained, or indeed, containable, than this . . . Adorno wishes us to learn to hate in the right way, rigorously and thoroughly.”⁶¹ Agnani pushes this further to suggest that an “improper hating would seem to be an example of that which is purely oppositional, a rejection from an external position.” Instead, following Adorno, he calls for a disposition that requires “experience, a historical memory, a fastidious intellect and above all an ample measure of satiety.”⁶² Following Adorno and Agnani, then, *Empires of Vision*, too, asks for a rigorous and thorough engagement with empire’s images with an “ample measure of satiety” and a “loving” immersion in them, so that we may learn to hate them properly.

Notes

1. For the influential concept of scopic regimes, see Martin Jay, “Scopic Regimes of Modernity,” in *Force Fields: Between Intellectual History and Cultural Critique* (New York: Routledge, 1992), 114–33; and his concluding essay in this volume. Given the complexity of colonial formations over time and across cultures and spaces, it would be naive to speak of a singular “imperial” or “postcolonial” scopic regime. Nonetheless, it is worth exploring constituent elements and features of such a regime and identify what it might share with the other dominant formations identified by Jay (Cartesian perspectivalism, the art of describing, and the baroque) and what was indeed specific to the colonial condition. Like many of the authors collected in this volume, I share with Nicholas Thomas the foundational understanding that “the dynamics of colonialism cannot be understood if it is assumed that some unitary representation is extended from the metropole and cast across passive spaces, unmediated by perceptions or encounters. Colonial projects are construed, misconstrued, adapted and enacted by actors whose subjectivities are fractured—half here, half there, sometimes disloyal, sometimes almost ‘on the side’ of the people they patronize and dominate, and against the interests of some metropolitan office” (see Nicholas Thomas, *Colonialism’s Culture: Anthropology, Travel and Government*. [Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1994], 60). In spite of its recent appearance (or perhaps because of it), the term *postcolonial* has a more complex (even vexed)

- history. Though I use it here in the temporal sense of the aftermath of colonialism following formal decolonization, conceptually it covers projects dedicated to interrogating empire eccentrically, from its margins, and as Edward Said might put it, from the perspective of its victims.
- 2 Ann Laura Stoler, *Along the Archival Grain: Epistemic Anxieties and Colonial Common Sense* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2009), 1. Replete with fascinating images and discursive imagery (in her discussion, for example, of the “watermark” and “the historical negative”) this work, however, only addresses the written and textual archive of empire.
 - 3 In this regard, consider Michael Taussig’s statement, “Colonial history too must be understood as a spiritual politics in which image-power is an exceedingly valuable resource.” Michael Taussig, *Mimesis and Alterity: A Particular History of the Senses* (New York: Routledge, 1993), 177.
 - 4 Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak, “Rani of Sirmur: An Essay in the Reading of the Archives,” *History and Theory* 24(3) (1985): 247–72, see p. 253. Although I invoke Spivak, I do so with the recognition that her essay is based on the reading of a verbal archive.
 - 5 Daniel Headrick’s much-cited book *Tools of Empire: Technology and European Imperialism in the Nineteenth Century* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1981) ignores the constitutive role of image-making technologies in empire formation, as also noted by Paul Landau (“Empires of the Visual: Photography and Colonial Administration in Africa,” in *Images and Empires: Visuality in Colonial and Postcolonial Africa*, ed. Paul S. Landau and Deborah Kaspin [Berkeley: University of California Press, 2002], 141–71). The scholars whose works are reproduced in this volume have played a critical role in correcting this important oversight, as has Duke University Press’s important series *Object/Histories* in which this reader appears.
 - 6 I use the term “subaltern” in its extended sense of the disenfranchised, marginalized, and neglected. Even as I do so, I draw attention to the fact that the Subaltern Studies collective whose scholarship has done so much to transform our understanding of the colonial and postcolonial world has largely ignored images and the visual domain.
 - 7 Edward Said, *Culture and Imperialism* (New York: Vintage Books, 1994), 239–61. See also Rasheed Araeen, “When the Naughty Children of Empire Come Home to Roost,” *Third Text* 20(2) (2006): 233–39; and Ian Baucom and Sonya Boyce, *Shades of Black: Assembling Black Arts in 1980s Britain* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2005).
 - 8 I borrow this idea from Gayatri Spivak, who writes that Europe had consolidated itself as “sovereign subject by defining its colonies as ‘Others,’ even as it constituted them, for purposes of administration and the expansion of markets, into near-images of that very sovereign self” (Spivak, “Rani of Sirmur,” 247).
 - 9 Homi Bhabha’s formulations regarding hybridity and mimicry and Gayatri Spivak’s on worlding have had considerable influence on those who work at

- the intersection of visibility and imperialism. Nevertheless, in their theorizing, “the visual’ remains a concept that is actualized in the domain of writing” (Geoff Quilley and Kay Dian Kriz, “Introduction: Visual Culture and the Atlantic World, 1660–1830,” in *An Economy of Colour: Visual Culture and the Atlantic World, 1660–1830*, ed. Geoff Quilley and Kay Dian Kriz [Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2003], 1–12, quotation p. 2). For Bhabha’s more recent writings on the postcolonial art world and diasporic image practices, see especially Homi Bhabha, “Postmodernism/Postcolonialism,” in *Critical Terms for Art History*, ed. Robert Nelson and Richard S. Schiff (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2003), 435–51; and “India’s Dialogical Modernism: Homi K. Bhabha in Conversation with Susan S. Bean,” in *Midnight to the Boom: Painting in India After Independence*, ed. Susan S. Bean (New York: Peabody Essex Museum in Association with Thames & Hudson, 2013), 23–35.
- 10 Christopher Pinney, *Photos of the Gods: The Printed Image and Political Struggle in India* (New Delhi: Oxford University Press, 2004), 8.
 - 11 I am adapting here from W. J. T. Mitchell, “What Is Visual Culture?,” in *Meaning in the Visual Arts: Views from the Outside (A Centennial Commemoration of Erwin Panofsky)*, ed. I. Lavin (Princeton: Institute for Advanced Study, 1995), 207–17, see especially p. 208.
 - 12 Hermione de Almeida and George H. Gilpin, *Indian Renaissance: British Romantic Art and the Prospect of India* (Aldershot, U.K.: Ashgate Publishing, 2005), 271; W. J. T. Mitchell, *What Do Pictures Want? The Lives and Loves of Images* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2005), 145.
 - 13 Christopher Pinney, “Creole Europe: The Reflection of a Reflection,” *Journal of New Zealand Literature* 20 (2003): 125–61; quotation on pp. 127–28. The demonstration of the constitution of modern Europe through its colonial adventures is of course a foundational goal of the postcolonial project. Writing in 1992, Mary Louise Pratt observed, “Borders and all, the entity called Europe was constructed from the outside in as much as from the inside out. . . . While the imperial metropolis tends to understand itself as determining the periphery . . . it habitually blinds itself to the ways in which the periphery determines the metropolis” (Mary Louise Pratt, *Imperial Eyes: Travel Writing and Transculturation* [London: Routledge, 1992], 6). Dipesh Chakrabarty’s “provincializing” Europe project has as its agenda the task of displacing “a hyperreal Europe from the center toward which all historical imagination currently gravitates” (Dipesh Chakrabarty, *Provincializing Europe: Postcolonial Thought and Historical Difference* [Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2000], 45). See also Ella Shohat and Robert Stam, “Narrativizing Visual Culture,” in *The Visual Culture Reader*, ed. N. Mirzoeff (London: Routledge, 1998), 27–49, esp. pp. 29–30.
 - 14 Rodolphe Gasché, *Europe, or The Infinite Task: A Study of a Philosophical Concept* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2009), and Manuela Ribeiro Sanches, Fernando Clara, João Ferreira Duarte, and Leonor Pires Martins, eds., *Europe in Black and White: Immigration, Race and Identity in the “Old Continent”*

- (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2011). See also Martin Jay's concluding essay in this volume.
- 15 Barbara Maria Stafford, *Good Looking: Essays on the Virtue of Images* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1995), 5, 11–12. See also Martin Jay, *Downcast Eyes: The Denigration of Vision in Twentieth-Century French Thought* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1994).
 - 16 On “the virtue” of images, see Stafford, *Good Looking*.
 - 17 I borrow and adapt this argument from Roland Barthes via Christopher Pinney. See Christopher Pinney, *The Coming of Photography in India* (London: British Library, 2008), 5. Among pioneering scholars who early on “interrupted” via the image the textualist preoccupations of colonial studies, Bernard Smith, especially his *European Vision and the South Pacific* must be singled out (1960; New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1985). In this and other works, Smith demonstrated how since the eighteenth century, the Pacific Ocean and its various landmasses came to be visually constituted through the image work of explorers, scientists, and artists (both metropolitan and native) across a range of visual media, including scientific illustration and the travel narratives. Several early volumes in John Mackenzie's *Studies in Imperialism* series (published by Manchester Press) should also be mentioned in this regard. Over the past decade, the number of monographs, edited volumes, and journal articles on this subject have dramatically increased. I especially draw the reader's attention to the following collections that serve as good introductions to the key debates: Catherine B. Asher and Thomas R. Metcalf, eds., *Perceptions of South Asia's Visual Past* (New Delhi: American Institute of Indian Studies, 1994); Paul S. Landau and Deborah Kaspin, eds., *Images and Empires: Visuality in Colonial and Postcolonial Africa* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2002); T. J. Barringer, Geoff Quilley, and Douglas Fordham, eds., *Art and the British Empire* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2007); Quilley and Kriz, *An Economy of Colour*; and Volker M. Langbehn, ed., *German Colonialism, Visual Culture and Modern Memory* (London: Routledge, 2010). For an introduction to the visual culture of “the end of empire,” see especially Simon Faulkner and Anandi Ramamurthy, *Visual Culture and Decolonisation in Britain* (London: Ashgate, 2006).
 - 18 W. J. T. Mitchell, “The Panic of the Visual: A Conversation with Edward W. Said,” in *Edward Said and the Work of the Critic: Speaking Truth to Power*, ed. Paul A. Bové (Durham: Duke University Press, 2000), 31–50, see esp. pp. 31–32.
 - 19 James Elkins, *On Pictures and the Words That Fail Them* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998). See especially pp. 241–66 for a discussion of “the unrepresentable,” “the unpicturable,” “the inconceivable,” and “the unseeable.”
 - 20 Walter Benjamin, “Theses on the Philosophy of History,” [1940] in *Illuminations: Essays and Reflections*, ed. Hannah Arendt (New York: Schocken, 1985), 253–64; quotations on p. 255.
 - 21 Many critics have puzzled over the absence of attention to images in the work

- of a scholar who has written so much on the connection between power, visibility, and spatiality. For example, Derek Gregory, "Orientalism Re-Viewed," *History Workshop Journal* 44 (Autumn 1997): 269–78, 273; and Edmund Burke and David Prochaska, "Introduction: Orientalism from Postcolonial Theory to World Theory," in *Genealogies of Orientalism: History, Theory, Politics*, ed. E. Burke and D. Prochaska (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2008), 1–74, 33. The cover illustration for the paperback version of *Orientalism* (1979) is a detail from Jean-Léon Gérôme's *Les charmeurs des serpents* (circa 1880), a classic example of French Orientalism. Neither the artist nor the painting is analyzed by Said, leading the reader to wonder "whether this seductively symbolic packaging is of the author's or publisher's choosing" (Daniel Martin Varisco, *Reading Orientalism: Said and the Unsaid* [Seattle: University of Washington Press, 2007], 24–25). This is also the case with the striking image that adorns the Random House paperback version of *Culture and Imperialism* (1994), Henri Rousseau's *The Representatives of the Foreign Powers, Coming to Hail the Republic as a Token of Peace* (1907). Reprints of both *Orientalism* and *Culture and Imperialism* feature other striking cover images. At the very least, such book covers, when left unaccompanied by explanations or justifications for their choice, raise the issue of images being taken out of context and mobilized in new circuits of consumption that range from voyeurism to bafflement.
- 22 Saloni Mathur, *India by Design: Colonial History and Cultural Display* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2007), 7.
 - 23 Said, *Culture and Imperialism*, 32.
 - 24 Said, *Culture and Imperialism*, 18; see also pp. 31–43.
 - 25 Linda Nochlin, "The Imaginary Orient," *Art in America* 71 (1983): 118–31, 186–89; subsequently, the essay was reprinted in Linda Nochlin, *The Politics of Vision: Essays on Nineteenth-Century Art and Society* (New York: Harper and Row, 1989), 33–60. Nochlin notes that although the insights offered by Said's *Orientalism* are central to her arguments, "Said's book does not deal with the visual arts at all" ("Imaginary Orient," n. 3). For some other reevaluations of colonial art and aesthetics, published soon after in response to *Orientalism*, see Olivier Richon, "Representation, the Despot, and the Harem: Some Questions around an Academic Orientalist Painting by Lecomte-de-Nouy (1885)," in *Europe and its Other*, ed. F. Barker (Colchester: University of Sussex Press, 1985), 1:1–13; James Thompson, *The East: Imagined, Experienced, Remembered: Orientalist Nineteenth Century Painting* (Dublin: National Gallery of Ireland, 1988); Asher and Metcalf, *Perceptions of South Asia's Visual Past*; and *The Lure of the East: British Orientalist Painting*, ed. Nicholas Tromans (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2008).
 - 26 Nochlin, "Imaginary Orient," 119. The exhibition was on display in museums at the University of Rochester and State University of New York in late 1982.
 - 27 I borrow the notion of enframing from Martin Heidegger, "The Age of the World Picture," in *The Question Concerning Technology and Other Essays* (New

- York: Garland 1977), 115–54. For a pioneering use of this concept in a colonial context, see Timothy Mitchell, *Colonising Egypt* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1988). Building on Nochlin, Olivier Richon characterizes French Orientalist art as fundamentally a creation of nineteenth-century imperialism (“Representation, the Despot, and the Harem,” 2). See also Darcy Grimaldo Grigsby, *Extremities: Painting Empire in Post-Revolutionary France* (London: Yale University Press, 2002); and Roger Benjamin, *Orientalist Aesthetics: Art, Colonialism, and French North Africa, 1880–1930* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2003).
- 28 For a sustained criticism of Nochlin’s approach, see especially John MacKenzie, *Orientalism: History, Theory and the Arts* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1995), 45 ff. For post-Saidian attempts to “disturb” the neat divisions of Orientalism’s “imaginative geography,” see especially Jill Beaulieu and Mary Roberts, eds., *Orientalism’s Interlocutors: Painting, Architecture, Photography* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2002).
- 29 Roger Benjamin, “Post-Colonial Taste: Non-Western Markets for Orientalist Art,” in *Orientalism: From Delacroix to Klee (Exhibition Catalogue)* (Sydney: Art Gallery of New South Wales, 1997), 32–40; quotation on p. 33. See also Krista Thompson’s essay in this volume.
- 30 Benjamin, “Post-Colonial Taste.”
- 31 Burke and Prochaska, “Introduction,” 34.
- 32 Insisting that European creative arts acted “in counterpoint rather than conformity” to imperial ideologies, Mackenzie writes, “there is little evidence of a necessary coherence between the imposition of direct imperial rule and the visual arts” (Mackenzie, *Orientalism*, 14–15). Statements like these are unfortunate, because studies published in Mackenzie’s pioneering series *Studies in Imperialism* from Manchester University Press, have helped lay the groundwork for the burgeoning scholarship on empire and visual culture. For a useful discussion that compares Said’s and Mackenzie’s approaches, see Gregory, “Orientalism Re-viewed.”
- 33 A second edition with a new preface was published by Routledge in 2008.
- 34 This is a term that she borrowed from Spivak (Pratt, *Imperial Eyes*, 4).
- 35 Pratt, *Imperial Eyes*, 204, emphasis in original. For a recent fascinating analysis of how such visual “mastery” over and surveillance of native terrains was further consolidated with the spread of colonial aviation, see Federico Caprotti, “Visuality, Hybridity, and Colonialism: Imagining Ethiopia through Colonial Aviation, 1935–1940,” *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* 101(2) (2011): 380–403.
- 36 Originally published in French as *Peau Noire, Masques Blancs* (1952), this pioneering work was translated into English in 1967.
- 37 Arguing that the Western experience of colonization is the experience of “colored Otherness,” Taussig evocatively characterizes the past four centuries as “the layered history of Western expansion into the lands of colored people,

- home to all manner of bright colors and wondrous varnishes” (Michael Taussig, *What Color Is the Sacred?* [Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2009], 160). This expansion (and the fantasies that nurtured it) “effectively divided the world into chromophobes and chromophiliacs” (16).
- 38 Frantz Fanon, *Black Skin, White Masks* (New York: Grove Press, 1967), 114, 42, 109. I have benefited here especially from the analysis of Fanon’s phenomenology of the racial look in Bill Schwarz, “Afterword: ‘Ways of Seeing,’” in *Visual Culture and Decolonisation in Britain*, ed. Simon Faulkner and Anandi Ramamurthy (London: Ashgate, 2006), 263–70.
- 39 Stuart Hall, “The After-life of Frantz Fanon,” in *The Fact of Blackness: Frantz Fanon and Visual Representation*, ed. Alan Read (London: Institute of Contemporary Arts, 1996), 13–37.
- 40 Spivak, “Rani of Simur,” 247. In formulating this argument, Spivak built on Martin Heidegger’s essay on the origins of the work of art.
- 41 Deborah Cherry, “Earth into World, Land into Landscape: The ‘Worlding’ of Algeria in Nineteenth-Century British Feminism,” in *Orientalism’s Interlocutors: Painting, Architecture, Photography*, ed. J. Beaulieu and M. Roberts (Durham: Duke University Press, 2002), 103–30, quotation from pp. 106–7.
- 42 An exception here are the two editions of Nicholas Mirzoeff’s *The Visual Culture Reader* (Routledge, 1998, 2002), which excerpted landmark essays by such leading figures as Malek Alloula, Anne McClintock, and Timothy Mitchell, who wrote at the intersection of visibility and colonialism, even while noting (in 1998) that the field was still very emergent (a third edition was released in 2012). Soon after the publication of the first edition of Mirzoeff’s volume, Sage published *Visual Culture: A Reader*, edited by Jessica Evans and Stuart Hall (1999; subsequently reprinted). Although this volume incorporates valuable pieces by Fanon, Pratt, and Bhabha, clearly colonialism or empire formation is not an organizing concern.
- 43 “Visual Culture Questionnaire,” *October* 77 (Summer 1996): 25–70; quotation on p. 25.
- 44 “Visual Culture Questionnaire,” 58.
- 45 Mitchell, “What Is Visual Culture?,” 210–14. The occlusion of the colonial question in this syllabus is especially noteworthy given Mitchell’s important reflections on the relationship between landscape painting and European imperialism (W. J. T. Mitchell, “Imperial Landscape,” in *Landscape and Power*, ed. W. J. T. Mitchell [Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1994], 5–34). See also his argument that “art” and “aesthetics” emerged as critical categories in the age of colonial encounters in W. J. T. Mitchell, “Empire and Objecthood,” in *What Do Pictures Want?*, 145–68.
- 46 Vanessa R. Schwartz and Jeannene M. Przyblyski, ed., *The Nineteenth-Century Visual Culture Reader* (New York: Routledge, 2004).
- 47 Sunil Manghani, Arthur Piper, and Jon Simons, ed., *Images: A Reader* (London: Sage, 2006).

- 48 Margarita Dikovitskaya, *Visual Culture: The Study of the Visual after the Cultural Turn* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2005); Marquard Smith, *Visual Culture Studies: Interviews with Key Thinkers* (Los Angeles: Sage, 2008).
- 49 Stuart Hall observes as well, “The world is . . . littered by modernities and by practicing artists, who never regarded modernism as the secure possession of the West, but perceived it as a language which was both open to them but which they would have to transform” (Stuart Hall, “Museums of Modern Art and the End of History,” in *Modernity and Difference*, ed. S. Hall and S. Maharaj [London: Institute of International Visual Arts, 2001], 19). See also in this regard Said, *Culture and Imperialism*, 242–43, and Sieglinde Lemke, “Picasso’s ‘Dusty Manikins,’” in *Primitivist Modernism: Black Culture and the Origins of Transatlantic Modernism* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998), 31–58.
- 50 Ella Shohat and Robert Stam make this point even more trenchantly: “Europe thus appropriated the material and cultural production of non-Europeans while denying both their achievements and its own appropriation, thus consolidating its sense of self and glorifying its own cultural anthropophagy” (“Narrativizing Visual Culture,” 28).
- 51 “Visual Culture Questionnaire,” 29–30.
- 52 W. J. T. Mitchell, *Picture Theory: Essays on Visual and Verbal Representation* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1994), 16 (emphases in original).
53. I am grateful to an anonymous reviewer of an earlier draft of this introduction, who I quote.
- 54 For an eloquent defense of “looking at” rather than “looking through” images, see Michael Gaudio, *Engraving the Savage: The New World and Techniques of Civilization* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2008).
- 55 Sunil Agnani, *Hating Empire Properly: The Two Indies and the Limits of Enlightenment Anticolonialism* (New York: Fordham University Press, 2013).
- 56 Agnani, *Hating Empire Properly*, 186–87. Agnani also refers to Neil Lazarus’s critique of Adorno’s aphorism in which he clarifies, “to hate tradition properly is rather to mobilize its own protocols, procedures, and interior logic against it—to demonstrate that it is only on the basis of a project that exceeds its own horizons or self-consciousness that tradition can possibly be imagined redeeming its own pledges” (Neil Lazarus, “Hating Tradition Properly,” *New Formations* 38 [1999]: 9–30; quotation on p. 13).
- 57 See also Krista Thompson in this volume.
- 58 Liam Buckley, “Objects of Love and Decay: Colonial Photographs in a Postcolonial Archive,” *Cultural Anthropology* 20(2) (2005): 249–70; quotation on p. 265, emphasis added.
- 59 Buckley, “Objects of Love and Decay,” 265. Correspondingly, our discourse about them, “a lover’s discourse,” betrays “our feelings for, and intimacy with, colonial culture” (250). See also British filmmaker Isaac Julien’s observation, “I also wonder about the kind of murky question of our attraction to these images—this question of having perhaps a critical nostalgia, the fact that some

of these images are in fact quite beautiful, some of them are very disturbing, and this kind of surplus identification that comes about when looking at these images” (Isaac Julien, “Undoing the Colonial Archive,” in *Film and the End of Empire*, ed. Lee Grieveson and Colin MacCabe (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011), 273–75, quotation on p. 274.

60 Roland Barthes, quoted in Buckley, “Objects of Love and Decay,” 249.

61 Lazarus, “Hating Tradition Properly,” 12, 13.

62 Agnani, “Hating Empire Properly,” 183–84.