



Albert Memmi and Audre Lorde

Gender, Race, and the Rhetorical Uses of Anger

Maria del Guadalupe Davidson

Journal of French and Francophone Philosophy - Revue de la philosophie française et de langue française, Vol XX, No 1 (2012) pp 87-100.

Vol XX, No 1 (2012)
ISSN 1936-6280 (print)
ISSN 2155-1162 (online)
DOI 10.5195/jffp.2012.546
www.jffp.org



This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-Noncommercial-No Derivative Works 3.0 United States License.



This journal is operated by the University Library System of the University of Pittsburgh as part of its D-Scribe Digital Publishing Program, and is co-sponsored by the University of Pittsburgh Press

Albert Memmi and Audre Lorde

Gender, Race, and the Rhetorical Uses of Anger

Maria del Guadalupe Davidson

The University of Oklahoma

Introduction

Feminists, like members of other oppressed groups, are likely to embrace many aspects of Albert Memmi's profound analysis of domination and oppression. Even though feminists can find common cause with Memmi in many respects, nevertheless they are likely to find themselves at odds with what Memmi says and does not say about women. Susan Gilson Miller, in her afterword to Memmi's *The Colonizer and the Colonized* (1965), foregrounds this omission of women from the work and observes:

Memmi's view of women, for example, reflects a male-centered stance that the author himself has come to regret. In this work colonizer and colonized are always men, both implicitly and explicitly. No women are mentioned among those longing to be free.¹

Memmi's omission of women from *The Colonizer and the Colonized*, Miller continues, does not only pertain to their role as the colonized but extends equally to their position as the colonizer, inasmuch as "...we know that women were agents on both sides in the process of colonization and decolonization..."² As a result, female readers of all backgrounds will be unlikely to find their own specific experiences addressed in this important text.

This difficulty is compounded for black feminists in light of a parallel omission of race from Memmi's analysis, which, along with the influences of gender and class, forms the matrix of black women's oppression. bell hooks, for instance, has criticized Memmi and other writers of his era for the limitations of their analyses of oppression. On her view, one cannot struggle against one aspect of oppression – such as racism – but at the same time remain complicit with other aspects of oppression – such as classism or sexism. She cautions that "their ambivalent relationship to oppression in

general is a contradiction that must be resolved, or they will daily undermine their own radical work."³ On hooks's view, the struggle against oppression cannot be piecemeal but instead must grapple with the matrix of all types of oppression, and Memmi's account of colonialism falls prey precisely to this sort of difficulty.

The feminist and black feminist critiques of Memmi will form the starting point for this paper. While the first part of this paper will develop and deepen the basis for this critique of Memmi's omission of gender and race from his early work on oppression, this critical gesture will not be the end point. In spite of its shortcomings, I do not think that feminists (either black or white) should dismiss Memmi's analysis of colonization altogether. Quite the contrary, they ought to draw from resources already developed within their own discourses in order to enhance and creatively extend Memmi's work. As one example of what this might yield, I turn to the work of the black feminist Audre Lorde, and in particular, her work on the productive power of anger. I will show that Memmi's failure to appreciate the legitimate role of anger at the colonial system, its oppression and humiliating effects upon the colonized, restricts his understanding of the range of legitimate responses to oppression. By bringing Memmi and Lorde into dialogue, we can thus show how the productive use of anger can be an important tool for combatting oppression.

The Duo of the Colonizer and the Colonized

Memmi's work throughout his career is guided by the notion of the *duo*, which is expressed in terms of binaries such as man/woman, white/black, Jew/Arab, first generation immigrant/second generation immigrant, and so forth. The most famous of these *duos* is that of colonizer/colonized, which forms the centerpiece of his work *The Colonizer and the Colonized*. There Memmi begins by sketching a portrait of the colonizer. The romantic vision of the colonizer depicts "a tall man, bronzed by the sun, wearing Wellington boots, proudly leaning on a shovel."⁴ This man is envisioned as both an "adventurer" and "righteous pioneer"⁵ to be admired and emulated. Yet, Memmi sees through this mythical image with the following observation: "I don't know whether this portrait ever did correspond to reality or whether it was limited to the engravings on colonial bank notes."⁶ By unmasking this mythic image, Memmi seeks to paint a more realistic portrait of the colonizer, one that is more attuned to the nefariousness of the colonial undertaking.

One way that he does this is by linking the portrait of the colonizer to the quest for money and profit. Instead of seeing the colonizer as a modern day Prometheus who brings light to dark humanity, Memmi regards the colonizer as one who is on a "voyage toward an easier life."⁷ There is

nothing romantic or noble about the colonizer or the colonial undertaking, instead the colonizer is depicted as someone who is ineffective in his home country and who seeks success by living elsewhere and off the backs of others. This realization quickly becomes apparent to the colonizer himself:

Actually this is not long in coming. For how long could he fail to see the misery of the colonized and the relation of that misery to his own comfort? He realizes that this easy profit is so great only because it is wrested from others. In short, he finds two things in one: he discovers the existence of the colonizer [sic] as he discovers his own privilege.⁸

Privilege is the dividing line that separates the condition of the colonizer from that of the colonized. It comes in many different forms: the colonizer earns higher wages than the colonized; the colonizer has access to better jobs; he is protected by his flag; state exams are given in his language.⁹ Along with these privileges, there are also some supposed “hardships” connected to colonial life:

Repelled by its climate [the colony’s], ill at ease in the midst of its strangely dressed crowds, lonely for his native country, the problem would be whether or not to accept these nuisances and discomforts in exchange for the advantage of a colony.¹⁰

In spite of the “discomforts” of colonial life, Memmi surmises that the colonizer will choose not to return home again, asking: “How can he return to his homeland if this would mean cutting his standard of living in half?”¹¹ In spite of the supposed hardships of colonial life, there is little incentive for the colonizer to change the colonial situation.

The second half of Memmi’s text provides the reader with what he calls a “Mythical Portrait of the Colonized.” This portrait, like the romantic vision of the colonizer, is also fictitious because it too plays the role of justifying colonial privilege. Memmi identifies three particular qualities of the colonized subject that are constructed by the colonizer: laziness, the lack of autonomy, and the lack of liberty.

The characterization of the colonized as “lazy” sets up another one of Memmi’s important *duos*. If the colonized is lazy, then it is the colonizer who is industrious and deserving of higher wages and a better standard living. The laziness of the colonized is reinforced through jokes and exaggerated language about the colonized so that:

Nothing can describe well enough the extraordinary deficiency of the colonized. He [the colonizer] becomes lyrical about it...the colonized doesn’t let grass grow under his feet, but a tree, and what tree! A eucalyptus, an American centenarian oak! A tree? No, a forest!¹²

Behind the joking lies the true intention of the colonizer. The false accusation of laziness becomes embedded in the very being of the colonized—the colonized did not become lazy, nor is his relationship to labor seen as an appropriate response to his subjugation—he was born that way. Following Memmi's line of reasoning, it is not a far jump from viewing the colonized as inherently lazy to viewing him as a "weakling" and from there to viewing him as someone who "...requires protection. From this comes the concept of a protectorate."¹³

Another feature of the mythical portrait of the colonized is that colonized people are regarded as one person rather than many individuals—put another way, there is no recognition of individuality. Memmi calls this "the mark of the plural" since "the colonized is never characterized in an individual manner; he is entitled only to drown in an anonymous collectivity."¹⁴ As a result, the colonizer speaks about the colonized through generalizations; phrases like "They are this" and "They are all the same"¹⁵ are ubiquitous in the language of the colonizer.

The final feature of the colonized is that they lack "liberty."¹⁶ Memmi sums up this lack of liberty as the inability of the colonized to choose freedom over bondage. Memmi writes:

The colonized has no way out of this state of woe—neither a legal outlet (naturalization) nor a religious outlet (conversion). The colonized is not free to choose between being colonized or not being colonized.¹⁷

This leads Memmi to ask: "What is left of the colonized at the end of this stubborn effort to dehumanize him?" His answer is that the colonizer's "supreme ambition" is for the colonized to "exist only as a function of the needs of the colonizer i.e., to be transformed into a pure colonized."¹⁸ In this way, Memmi's *duo* of the colonizer and the colonized ultimately implodes on itself. By becoming a "pure colonized," the colonized person is "no longer an alter ego of the colonizer," because he is no longer recognized as human at all.¹⁹

Memmi and the Status of Colonized Women

There can be little doubt that the above description speaks to the plight of the colonized man, but the question remains open as to whether the colonized *woman* can see herself in Memmi's analysis. Certainly, the colonized woman can identify with the colonizer's mythic portrayal of the colonized as lazy, depersonalized and lacking autonomy, inasmuch as these characterizations are also applied to them. Yet, it still seems that the exploitation of the colonized is presented from a decidedly masculine orientation. The easiest way to see this is through Memmi's use of the

gendered pronouns *he* and *him*. One might respond, in defense of Memmi, that these pronouns are used in conformity with older standards of correctness and that they can simply be replaced with feminine pronouns or the neutral pronoun “one.” However, this response can easily be disarmed if we look at some actual examples of the colonized and the colonial situation. There we find that the examples themselves reflect a decidedly male perspective, which cannot be corrected simply by the substitution of the pronoun *her* for *him*. A good example of this comes from Memmi’s analysis of the public sphere in the chapter “Situations of the Colonized.”

This chapter, which examines the role of citizenship and the lack of civic participation by the colonized, depicts the public sphere exclusively as a male space. The colonizer, as noted above, believes that the colonized lacks an interest and ability for self-rule. This implies that, even if the colonized did display an interest in the workings of the government, they would be incapable of self-government. Their supposed apathy can be explained in the following way:

The fact is that the colonized does not govern. Being kept away from power, he ends up by losing both interest and feeling for control...among the colonized few men are suitable for government. How could such a long absence from autonomous government give rise to skill?²⁰

Memmi does not dispute the claim that the colonized display a lack of interest in government, but this cannot be attributed either to laziness or a lack of ability. Instead, their lack of interest in government is due to their historical exclusion from the practice of governing.

What is especially interesting, for our purposes, is to consider how Memmi extends this analysis to the circumstance of the children of the colonized. Memmi states: “Not considering himself a citizen, the colonized likewise loses all hope of seeing his son achieve citizenship.”²¹ The son of the colonized realizes that the only way that he can change his situation is through revolt. But, as Memmi observes, the desire to revolt eventually withers away as one grows older. Sooner or later, “the potential rebel falls back on the traditional values” due to his familial connections and obligations. When this occurs: “The young man will marry, will become a devoted father, reliable brother, responsible uncle and, until he takes his father’s place, a respectful son.”²² This example clearly demonstrates that this retreat from the public sphere is linked with the domain of the feminine. The private sphere, as Memmi goes on to describe, exerts a negative influence over the public life of the son: “He will remain glued to that family which offers him warmth and tenderness but which simultaneously absorbs, clutches and emasculates him.”²³ By disparaging the only sphere in which women’s presence is acknowledged – the private sphere – I want to

suggest that Memmi resists one form of oppression but participates in another one.

To make this point, we can turn to a related point that bell hooks makes with regard to the continuation of unequal gender roles during the enslavement of Africans in the United States. hooks notes that it is often argued that the American enslavement of black men amounted to the emasculation of black men and that black society today still suffers the effects of this loss. "Implicit in this assertion," hooks observes, "is the assumption that the worst that can happen to a man is that he be made to assume the social status of woman."²⁴ In response, hooks counters that the system of patriarchy actually went unchallenged during enslavement:

No annals of history record that the masses of black male slaves were forced to execute roles traditionally performed exclusively by women. Evidence to the contrary exists, documenting the fact that there were many tasks enslaved African men would not perform because they regarded them as "female" work.²⁵

In this way patriarchy was upheld through the different types of work assigned to black men and women—black women performed the cooking and the cleaning for their white enslavers as well as in their own domiciles. hooks goes on to claim that black enslavement did not feminize black men, instead it masculinized black women. Many black women toiled in the fields. Since fieldwork was considered men's work, black women lost their standing as women, and because they were no longer seen as women, this allowed all types of atrocities to be committed against them.²⁶ Sojourner's Truth's question, "ain't I a woman?," is a direct response to that situation.

hooks' analysis can, in my opinion, be extended to illuminate Memmi's depiction of the colonial context. Memmi associates the oppression that takes place in the colonial situation with "emasculation." Colonialism emasculates the colonized male by excluding him from the public sphere and relegating him to the private sphere, the domain of women. In this way, Memmi's account reflects his position as a colonized male in a society that oppresses women. What he fails to see is how his own *duo* set up between the male public sphere and the female private sphere embodies another type of oppression – gender inequality – which excludes women from the public sphere. His endorsement of this *duo* in his analysis leads him not to see women as the object of colonization. If women fare poorly under colonial oppression, it is assumed that this is because their freedom is adjunct to that of colonized men. That is to say that if men become free, it is assumed that women will become free in turn. If this is the case, then hooks's critique of scholars who privilege the experiences of enslaved black men can be extended to the privilege that Memmi grants to the experiences of colonized men. For both, "what matters most among the experiences of men is their ability to assert themselves patriarchally."²⁷

Moreover, in the *Colonizer and the Colonized*, Memmi never acknowledges that women may have distinctive constraints on them related to their status as women in an unequal society, such as rape, sexual assault, work restrictions, and limitations of public participation. These constraints, while part of the colonial situation, are not simply the product of colonization. They are, more broadly, part of the fabric of gender hierarchies that preceded colonization – part of societies that already relegated them to live solely in the private sphere. Here we come to see the crux of the problem. Feminists of all kinds are not likely to find their experiences or their condition voiced adequately in the *Colonizer and the Colonized*. Memmi only addresses one aspect of the oppression that exists in the colonial situation but leaves the matrix of oppression untouched. As a result, everything about the situation that he describes could be transformed without anything at all changing in the lives of colonized women. And, if that is the case, what use can his work have for feminists of any kind?

Salvaging Memmi

Admittedly, Memmi's point of view is not very different from those of many other postcolonial thinkers of his time and later such as Frantz Fanon, Aimé Césaire, and Chinua Achebe. Memmi and his counterparts either do not see or at least fail to acknowledge that colonized women have a relationship to colonization that is different from that of the colonized male subject. This is why, as Tracy Sharpley-Whiting points out, many feminist scholars are critical of Fanon, especially of his work *Black Skin/White Mask*. They object, much as we have done in the preceding section with respect to Memmi, to his use of "masculine referents," to "his use of the masculine as normative," to his "rigid constructions of gender and sexuality," to his "erasure of (black) feminine subjectivities," and to his "grossly reductive discussion of (white) women."²⁸ Although Sharpley-Whiting understands these criticisms of Fanon, she nonetheless maintains that his work can be useful to feminist scholarship. After briefly considering her rationale for this, similarly I want to propose that feminists should undertake a salvaging effort of Memmi's work as well.

Several factors, as Sharpley-Whiting notes, complicate Fanon's theory regarding the situation of colonized women and their resistance to colonization. First, Fanon studied psychiatry in France and practiced in Algeria, but he did not have the opportunity to record the impact of colonization on the women of Martinique. Second, many of Fanon's most important observations on colonization come from his time in Algeria where the majority of his patients were Muslim men and European women.²⁹ And although Fanon is acutely aware that Algerian women were profoundly impacted by sexual violence, for example, such things were not openly discussed. Sharpley-Whiting notes:

If sexual silence plagues contemporary Arab women, even to the point of censorship on the subject among women themselves, one can very well imagine the codes of sexual silence in the 1950s and 1960s and subsequently to Fanon's inability to write extensively on the sexual lives of sexual neuroses of Algerian women.³⁰

Regardless of Fanon's inability to fully assess the condition of colonized women, Sharpley-Whiting still sees Fanon as a feminist ally—one who perhaps worked harder for women's liberation than those who claim to be feminists. Sharpley-Whiting rightly contends:

Fanon believed in and worked for the liberation of the damned of the earth, "men and women who are colonized." He interrogated and challenged specifically the contradictions in women's lives... Fanon believed that revolution would transform the exploitative and oppressive spheres of formal and informal political, social, and economic life for men, women, and children—humanity from the bottom up.³¹

Like Fanon, Memmi was also profoundly constrained by the customs and dictates of his society, but he was also committed to the liberation of the oppressed.

In *The Pillar of Salt* (1955), a loosely autobiographical account of his youth in Tunisia, Memmi is clearly aware that there is a difference between the fate of his sister and himself. This difference is shown in the roles assigned when they play:

In an old tin can in which tobacco was sold we put the semolina we made from chalky plaster we scrapped from between loose stones in the walls. Measuring and mixing very seriously, I played the part of the grocer while Kalla [Memmi's sister] was the housewife: as among grown-ups, I benefited from the masculine privileges.³²

This and other instances throughout his text show that Memmi's society and religion³³ was guided by gender roles that limited women to the private sphere of the home and the family.

In spite of such examples, it does not seem accurate to label Memmi's writing anti-woman or misogynistic. Instead, I would like to propose that Memmi is a "masculinist" writer, which, as explained by Joy James, refers to someone who:

...can share patriarchy's presupposition of the male as normative without its antifemale politics and rhetoric. Men who support feminist politics, as profeminists, may advocate the equality or even occasionally for the superiority of women...however, even without the patriarchal intent some works may replicate conventional gender roles.³⁴

As a masculinist, Memmi uses language that supports male normativity and uncritically replicates stereotypical gender roles. Yet, his language is never explicitly anti-female. Indeed, Memmi is apologetic of the role that he played in the oppression of women. In *Dominated Man* (1968) he writes:

For the first time in my life I am on the wrong side of the fence: in talking about women, I observe, with embarrassment and a touch of malice that this time I am to be counted among the oppressors.³⁵

Based on this supposition that Memmi is a masculinist but not a misogynist, the task of feminist readings of Memmi becomes more clearly defined. Instead of looking for the places where women are excluded, the point is to look for places where women are able to insert themselves into Memmi's discourse. This new dialogue, as I will show below, can be beneficial to Memmi and feminism alike. On the one hand, it enhances Memmi's overall analysis of the colonial situation by extending it to aspects that he was unable to glimpse, while on the other hand, it enriches feminist discourse by providing new resources to use in the struggle against oppression. As an example of the creative potential of such a dialogue, I will draw inspiration from the work of the feminist Audre Lorde.

Audre Lorde's Rhetorical Uses of Anger

One clear way that Audre Lorde's work converges with the work of Memmi is in her analysis of anger. Lorde, in her essay "The Uses of Anger: Women Responding to Racism," sees anger as a justified and reasonable response to racial violence. According to Lorde, racism is "the belief in the inherent superiority of one race over all others and thereby the right to dominance, manifest and implied."³⁶ Anger is perhaps a natural response to racism: "Women responding to racism means women responding to anger; the anger of exclusion, of unquestioned privilege, of racial distortions, or silence, ill-use, stereotyping, defensiveness, misnaming, betrayal, and co-optation."³⁷

Lorde, like many black women, is aware of the pitfall that anger holds for women in general and for black women in particular. A controlling image³⁸ commonly used to manage the behavior of black women is that of the *angry black woman*. Like the angry black man who is depicted as a threat to the security and safety of society, there is also a social fear of the *angry black woman*. Interestingly enough, as Philip Kretsedemas observes, images of the angry black woman seem to be increasingly prevalent in the media today:

Much of the recent criticism of black media stereotypes has focused on portrayal of women. Some scholars and media critics have argued that these media depictions have become distinctly more negative over the past two decades and that stereotypes of black

women have begun to eclipse the more familiar stereotypes of the aggressive black male.³⁹

The angry black woman is the epitome of irrationality—responding disproportionately to the slightest trigger. This leaves her beyond sympathy or understanding in the eyes of the general public. Like other controlling images, the angry black woman stereotype functions primarily to show society how to behave toward black women and indirectly shows the black woman how not to behave if she hopes to avoid social scorn.⁴⁰ For, the smallest roll of an eye or snap of the head could totally discredit anything a black woman has to say.

While Lorde understands the tremendous amount of social pressure on black women not to display their anger, she believes that black women pay a steep price when they do not allow themselves to do so. She begins by describing her experience of suppressing her own anger: “once I did it in silence, afraid of the weight. My fear of anger taught me nothing.”⁴¹ For Lorde, anger is not simply a negative or destructive feeling. It can also be instructive for black women themselves and to other people in general.

Lorde goes on to describe a number of other situations that make her angry for legitimate reasons. One of these includes an event where “a well-known white American women poet interrupts the reading of the work of a woman of Color to read her own poem, and then dashes off to an ‘important panel.’”⁴² Lorde is angered by the rudeness of the white female poet, but she is also angered that this woman may not have been able to see the racism and white privilege embedded in her action. In another instance, a white female academic applauds the appearance of “a collection by non-Black women of Color,” because, as she explains to Lorde, “it allows me to deal with racism without dealing with the harshness of black women.”⁴³

Through these examples, Lorde is addressing white women who may “recognize these attitudes as familiar” as well as the women of color “who live and survive thousands of such encounters.” Like her, she suspects that they “tremble their rage under harness, or who sometimes question the express of our race as useless and disruptive (the two most popular accusations).”⁴⁴ Her message is that such moments provide an opportunity for the positive use of anger in which the expression of anger “can become a powerful source of energy serving progress and change.”⁴⁵ Some people may remain silent in response to sexism or racism, because they do not want to be labeled as disruptive or worse yet – angry. But, according to Lorde, these are moments where anger should not be silenced but rather channeled into action: “anger expressed and translated into action in the service of our vision and our future is a liberating and strengthening act of clarification, for it is in the painful process of this translation that we identify who are our allies with whom we have grave differences, and who are our genuine enemies.”⁴⁶

One might suppose from reading Memmi and Lorde that they would share similar views and that Memmi would easily be able to endorse the above description of anger. After all, Lorde is a black feminist theorist who is fiercely opposed to the politics of Western domination, while Memmi is a postcolonial thinker opposed to a related domination in his homeland. Additionally, Memmi's definition of racism is similar to Lorde's. He defines it as: "the generalized and final assigning of values to real or imaginary differences, to the accuser's benefit and at his victim's expense, in order to justify the former's own privileges or aggression."⁴⁷ Yet in spite of their shared understanding of racism, and the marginalization and disenfranchisement that both denounce, it might be surprising for readers to discover that Memmi actually repudiates anger as an appropriate response to oppression. In his long-awaited sequel to *The Colonizer and the Colonized – Decolonization and the Decolonized* (2006) – Memmi offers an interesting but controversial evaluation of the decolonized's feelings of anger. Memmi rejects the anger that the decolonized feel and even goes so far as to claim that anger begets nothing. On Memmi's account, there is no viable use of anger, because it does not change the material condition of the decolonized citizen. Instead, he associates anger with *dolorism*, which signifies a feeling of general helplessness. In the section "Diversions, Excuses, and Myths," he goes on to reproach black Americans for their *dolorism* as well:

Black Americans are not decolonized people, although they have certain traits in common with them, just as they have certain traits in common with the colonized. But their evasive responses are the same. It is the fault of history, it is always the fault of the whites. *Dolorism* is a natural tendency to exaggerate one's pains and attribute them to another. Like the decolonized, as long as blacks have not freed themselves of *dolorism*, they will never be able to correctly analyze their condition and act accordingly.⁴⁸

Dolorism is paralyzing because it leaves one unable to move beyond one's situation. It leads one to blame one's problems on others, but it does not provide the tools for overcoming one's problems.

The same might be said about the feeling of anger. Like *dolorism*, the feeling of anger separates the decolonized from society. This is apparent in his description of the immigrant in *Decolonization and the Decolonized*. Memmi observes that those who immigrate to their former colonizer's nation often find themselves unable to assimilate and typically end up in a ghetto. These living conditions make clear to the immigrant: "the gap that continues to exist between former masters and the liberated. The feeling of inequality, having become intolerable, nourishes a growing bitterness."⁴⁹ For Memmi, the immigrant is to blame for this. There is never a moment where he acknowledges either in *The Colonizer and the Colonized* or *Decolonization and the Decolonized* that subjugated people may be entitled to be angered, humiliated, and resentful about their situation. At the core of

Memmi's argument against anger is the fear that the colonized or formerly colonized person will become consumed with anger. This not only leads one to lose sight of the goal of liberation and equality but also of the tools that are necessary for overcoming this condition.

Memmi is not necessarily the first to denounce the anger that marginalized people feel in response to racism and discrimination. Black thinkers, like Booker T. Washington, have also suggested that anger is unproductive. Washington believed that the best way to deal with white society was not for blacks to become angered by their situation, instead he argued that the best response would be for blacks to work hard and produce wealth for themselves and their community.⁵⁰ This economic advancement would become, in his opinion, a far more effective tool for combatting racial inequality than any display of anger or resentment. Some people, to be sure, have benefited from setting aside their anger and focusing primarily on their own advancement. Arnold Farr, for instance, responds to this view, however, when he observes that this strategy does more harm to black Americans than good because it does not deal effectively with the historical trauma of enslavement and dehumanization.⁵¹

Lorde's work on anger offers a different strategy. Against scholars like Memmi or Washington, she contends that ignoring one's anger or keeping it bottled up "will teach you nothing."⁵² Anger, on her view, has a constructive side; it is didactic. Anger, as Lorde puts it, "is loaded with information and energy."⁵³ Colonized and formerly colonized people can use anger to validate their response to oppression. Just as importantly, to deny a colonized person the right to feel and be angry is to deny him/her a natural and fitting response to injustice. Anger is, for Lorde, "an appropriate reaction to racist attitudes as is fury when the actions arising from those attitudes do not change."⁵⁴

This section began by arguing that both Lorde and Memmi fear that colonized individuals will be further marginalized if they act out in anger. But this should not be the only fear that is explored. Indeed Lorde, again, complicates the idea and refocuses the direction away from colonized people and onto the colonial subject when she asserts that: "To those women here who fear the anger of women of Color more than their own unscrutinized racist attitudes, I ask: Is the anger of women of Color more threatening than the woman-hatred that tinges all aspects of our lives?"⁵⁵

Lorde's question has a profound significance for Memmi's analysis. Instead of questioning the anger of the colonized, it suggests that Memmi might instead want to ask himself: "Is the anger of the colonized more threatening than the racism, ethnocentrism, sexism, and classism, that comes from the colonizer and tinges all aspects of lives of the colonized?" To pose the question in this way, I think, would lead Memmi to broaden his analysis of colonization and decolonization in such a way that it would come to find

a place for anger as a form of righteous indignation. This is one way, among other possible ones, in which feminists can open the resources of Memmi's analysis of colonial oppression onto multiple other struggles against oppression.

-
- ¹ Albert Memmi, *The Colonizer and the Colonized*, trans. Howard Greenfield (Boston: Beacon Press, 1965), 164. Judith Butler echoes this point when she observes that “in a social theory like Albert Memmi’s *The Colonizer and the Colonized*, an otherwise compelling call for radical enfranchisement, the category of women falls into neither category, the oppressor or the oppressed. How do we theorize the exclusion of women from the category of the oppressed?” See her “Contingent Foundations: Feminism and the Question of ‘Postmodernism,’” in *Feminist Contentions: A Philosophical Exchange*, eds. Seyla Benhabib, et. al (New York: Routledge, 1995), 21.
- ² Memmi, *The Colonizer and the Colonized*, 164.
- ³ bell hooks, *Feminist Theory From Margin to Center* (Cambridge: South End Press, 1984), 40.
- ⁴ Memmi, *The Colonizer and the Colonized*, 3.
- ⁵ Memmi, *The Colonizer and the Colonized*, 3.
- ⁶ Memmi, *The Colonizer and the Colonized*, 3.
- ⁷ Memmi, *The Colonizer and the Colonized*, 3.
- ⁸ Memmi, *The Colonizer and the Colonized*, 7.
- ⁹ Memmi, *The Colonizer and the Colonized*, 12-14
- ¹⁰ Memmi, *The Colonizer and the Colonized*, 4.
- ¹¹ Memmi, *The Colonizer and the Colonized*, 5.
- ¹² Memmi, *The Colonizer and the Colonized*, 80.
- ¹³ Memmi, *The Colonizer and the Colonized*, 82.
- ¹⁴ Memmi, *The Colonizer and the Colonized*, 85.
- ¹⁵ Memmi, *The Colonizer and the Colonized*, 85.
- ¹⁶ Memmi, *The Colonizer and the Colonized*, 85.
- ¹⁷ Memmi, *The Colonizer and the Colonized*, 86.
- ¹⁸ Memmi, *The Colonizer and the Colonized*, 86.
- ¹⁹ Memmi, *The Colonizer and the Colonized*, 86.
- ²⁰ Memmi, *The Colonizer and the Colonized*, 95.
- ²¹ Memmi, *The Colonizer and the Colonized*, 97.
- ²² Memmi, *The Colonizer and the Colonized*, 99.
- ²³ Memmi, *The Colonizer and the Colonized*, 99.
- ²⁴ bell hooks, *Ain’t I a Woman: Black Women and Feminism*. (Boston: South End Press, 1981), 20.
- ²⁵ hooks, *Ain’t I a Woman*, 21.
- ²⁶ hooks, *Ain’t I a Woman*, 22-23.
- ²⁷ hooks, *Ain’t I a Woman*, 22.
- ²⁸ T. Denean Sharpley-Whiting, *Frantz Fanon Conflicts and Feminisms* (Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield, 1998), 10.
- ²⁹ Sharpley-Whiting, *Frantz Fanon Conflicts and Feminisms*, 16.
- ³⁰ Sharpley-Whiting, *Frantz Fanon Conflicts and Feminisms*, 17.
- ³¹ Sharpley-Whiting, *Frantz Fanon Conflicts and Feminism*, 24.
- ³² Albert Memmi, *The Pillar of Salt* (New York, Criterion Books: 1955), 7.
- ³³ Memmi provides several accounts of the domestic duties performed by his mother and other women, as opposed to the outside lives of men in *Pillars of Salt*. Most interesting is his chapter titled “The Party” where Memmi writes: “On the appointed evening, I demanded of my mother that she supply me with a spotless white shirt, a symbol of all that is both solemn and clean. I

made her iron it a second time beneath my very eyes as all our linen, crowded in drawers that were too full, always had a crumpled appearance” (196).

³⁴ Sharpley-Whiting, *Frantz Fanon Conflicts and Feminisms*, 11.

³⁵ Albert Memmi, *Dominated Man: Notes Toward a Portrait* (New York: Orion Press, 1968), 141.

³⁶ Audre Lorde, *Sister Outsider*, (Berkeley, CA: Crossing Press, 1984), 124.

³⁷ Lorde, *Sister Outsider*, 124.

³⁸ The term controlling image comes from Patricia Hill Collin’s seminal text *Black Feminist Thought: Knowledge, Consciousness, and the Politics of Empowerment* (New York: Routledge, 2000). For a complete discussion see her chapter “Mammies, Matriarchs, and Other Controlling Images,” 69-96.

³⁹ Philip Kretsedemas, “But She’s Not Black! Viewer Interpretation of “Angry Black Women” on Prime Time TV,” *Journal of African American Studies* 14 (2010): 49-50.

⁴⁰ Patricia Hill-Collins talks about this issue extensively in “Mammies, Matriarchs, and Other Controlling Images.”

⁴¹ Lorde, *Sister Outsider*, 124.

⁴² Lorde, *Sister Outsider*, 126.

⁴³ Lorde, *Sister Outsider*, 126.

⁴⁴ Lorde, *Sister Outsider*, 127.

⁴⁵ Lorde, *Sister Outsider*, 127.

⁴⁶ Lorde, *Sister Outsider*, 127.

⁴⁷ Albert Memmi, *Dominated Man*, 185.

⁴⁸ Albert Memmi, *Decolonization and the Decolonized* (Minneapolis: Minnesota UP, 2006), 19.

⁴⁹ Memmi, *Decolonization and the Decolonized*, 90.

⁵⁰ Booker T. Washington, *Up From Slavery: An Autobiography* (New York: Doubleday, Page & Co., 1917), 217-25.

⁵¹ See Arnold Farr, “Racism, Historical Ruins, and the Task of Identity Formation” in *The Quest for Community and Identity: Critical Essays in Africana Social Philosophy*, ed. Robert E. Birt (Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield, 2002), 15-28.

⁵² Lorde, *Sister Outsider*, 124.

⁵³ Lorde, *Sister Outsider*, 127.

⁵⁴ Lorde, *Sister Outsider*, 129.

⁵⁵ Lorde, *Sister Outsider*, 129.