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Preliminary Remarks

The concept of development remains at the forefront of the global political agenda. ‘We are committed to making the right to development a reality for everyone’, the heads of the member states of the United Nations promised in September 2000, when they proclaimed the Millennium Development Goals at the UN General Assembly in New York (United Nations General Assembly 2000:4). Similar intentions have been voiced by the European Union (cf. Treaty of Lisbon, Art. 10A/§2d).

Among most politicians and diplomats, both in the Global North and South, development is still held in high esteem and regarded as a guiding principle of the 21st century world. Though strategies and theories have changed substantially since the 1950s, the basic view of development as something beneficial has been upheld by the global elites. But at the same time, a second line of argument has gained ground since the early 1990s, especially within the social sciences: Development came to be seen as being eurocentric, alienating, and detrimental to human needs, as a dream having turned into a nightmare (Rahnema 2005:70).

The manifold continuities, uncertainties, and controversies surrounding the notion of development have motivated us to go back in time and delve into its archives (both in the factual and the discursive senses). We will look at the last four decades of British and French colonial rule in Africa, specifically in Senegal and Tanganyika/Tanzania, in order to establish how and when the key elements of development took shape and gained ground. This historical dimension of the development concept as rooted in the colonial order of the first half of the 20th century is largely neglected in current research. As Esco- bar put it, ‘the period between 1920 and 1950 is still ill understood from the vantage point of the overlap of colonial and developmentalist regimes of representation.’ (1995:27)

Status of Research

Somewhat surprisingly, the history of colonial development has been given scant attention by those scholars who are supposed to be most interested in it, that is those of Development Studies. That many of them neglect the colonial roots of their profession may be caused by a peculiar dichotomy prevailing within this field of research: development as something beneficial is strictly set apart from colonialism as something deeply disreputable, as Uma Kothari put it (2005:63). She is one of the very few within Development Studies who recently has started to reconstruct ‘the colonial genealogies of development’ (2005:50). As an earlier, rare but very important exception, Alcalde investigated the ‘idea of Third World development’ as it was put forward in the United States and Britain from 1900 to 1950 (1987). Serge Latouche, in a similar vein, wrote an essay on the same period from a French perspective (1988). Further back in time go two ambitious explorations into the history of the development concept, one commencing in classical Greece (Nisbet 1969), the other at the turn of the 18th century
(Cowen/Shenton 1996) – both accounts include post-colonial uses of the term, but both omit the colonial period. Most explorations into the history of development take the late 1940s as their starting-point, firmly tying it to decolonisation, the hegemonic role of the US towards the newly independent states, and the emergence of development theories accompanying and rationalising this ascendency (Oman/Wignaraja 1990; Meier 2005). Even those authors who do not skip colonialism altogether make only passing reference to it, mainly focusing on the League of Nations and its mandates system (Escobar 1995:26f; Kößler 1998:81-84). Gilbert Rist stresses various continuities between colonial and contemporary development policies and deplores the ‘amnesia’ affecting the colonial period (1997:56), but still calls Point Four of President Truman’s much-quoted 1949 Inaugural Speech the ‘invention of development’ (1997:69). The majority of these historical sketches are written in the post-developmentalist vein, trying to prove the point that the concept of development is something inherently oppressive. Small wonder that these accounts lack both ambition and analytical depth to do justice to the ambiguities and changes that showed over time – Cooper’s demand for ‘a more rigorous historical practice’ which he directs at postcolonial studies (2005:13) applies to the greater part of post-developmentalist approaches to history as well.

Apart from solitary contributions by other disciplines (Birnberg/Resnick 1975), it was mainly historiography which did the most to broaden our knowledge of the connections between colonialism and development. The intellectual predecessor of the development idea, the ‘civilising mission’ of 19th and early 20th century colonialism, has received widespread attention (Bitterli 1991; Conklin 1997; Barth/ Osterhammel 2005). Several general studies on colonialism discuss at some length the development policies of imperial governments (Davis/Huttenback 1988:137ff; Thobie et al. 1991:139-163, 259-266) and issues closely related to them, e.g. industrialisation (Marseille 1984:437ff; Cain/Hopkins 2002:570ff). This is true not only of research that focuses on metropolitan decision making but also of regional studies (Brett 1973:115-140).

J. M. Lee was the first who, in 1967, devoted an entire book to the analysis of colonial development (Lee 1967). In the late 1970s and early 1980s the subject was simultaneously taken up by a small number of scholars who in various ways meticulously described the workings of the Colonial Office and the power struggles and debates within government circles (Morgan 1980; Constantine 1984; Sieberg 1985). The latest comprehensive study on colonial development was written in the early 1990s, emphasising the economic dimension (Havinden/Meredith 1993). Though these books still provide indispensable insights into political institutions and mechanisms, they have their limitations: Some of them, probably due to archival restrictions, do not cover the entire colonial period and stop some time in the 1940s; all of them focus on the metropolitan centre; all of them are concerned with the British colonies in their entirety (except India) and thus remain rather superficial as far as specific regions are concerned; and most analyses take the term ‘development’ at face value, often using it in an affirmative sense and only rarely inquiring into its various and changing meanings over time and the implications for colonial rule.
Over the past few years several attempts have been made to close some of these gaps. With regard to colonial India, development concepts have been described as a contested discursive territory (Ludden 1992; Zachariah 2005); with regard to specific development projects, both their economic and ecological effects (Diallo Cô-Trung 1998; Rizzo 2006) and the manifold interactions between colonial administrators and local populations have come under scrutiny (Cooper 1997; Van Beusekom 2002; Harris 2005; Hodge 2007).

In analysing the mental frames that shaped the meaning of development, we will draw on the literature which was written in the wake of Edward Said’s ‘Orientalism’ (Said 1979). Many of the authors concerned used literary texts to show how otherness was constructed within colonial discourse(s) and how binary oppositions defined the relations between coloniser and colonised (Spivak 1985; Bhabha 1994; Said 1994). In analysing colonial discourse, these post-colonial theorists to a large extent relied on the French and, more importantly, the British literary canon, mostly on 19th century and modernist texts (Conrad, Haggard, Kipling, Brontë, etc.; cf. Albers 2002:XX). Over the past two decades, literary studies, cultural studies, anthropology and even political science have in different ways contributed to this post-colonial strand of research both widening it (in terms of sources) and narrowing it (in terms of contexts, times, and places) (MacKenzie 1984; Spurr 1993; Thomas 1994; Doty 1996; Grillo/Stirrat 1997; Darby 1998; Savarèse 1998; Mills 2005). Nevertheless, to our knowledge no one so far has attempted to investigate colonial literature of the late colonial period along the lines we intend to follow. The history of colonialism has been analysed from such a variety of angles, many of them relevant to answering our central research question, that it would take several pages to present but the more important of these texts. This also applies to general historiographical accounts of Africa, whereas regional histories, in our case those relating to Senegal and Tanganyika/Tanzania, are notably scarce. Especially the monographic output so far, in terms of quantity, has been anything but impressive (Iliffe 1979; Benoist 1983; Mang'enya 1984; Coquery-Vidrovitch/Goerg 1992; Dumbuya 1995).

This brief overview points towards several major gaps that show in the existing research on colonialism and development: 1) French colonial development has not received the same attention as its British equivalent; 2) there has been no systematic comparative research on French and British colonial development so far; 3) research has shied away from interdisciplinary approaches; 4) the 1950s, in Africa a vital period marking the transition from colonial development to the new era of post-colonial bi- and multilateral ‘development assistance’, have been largely neglected. The proposed research project attempts to fill these gaps both by connecting existing bodies of knowledge in new ways and by advancing into uncharted territories.

1 Unfortunately, Cooper’s plan to investigate the ‘modernizing bureaucrats’ who fostered post-war colonial development seems not to have proceeded further than to an excellent essay (1997).
Focus of Inquiry

The main purpose of our study is to scrutinise the concept of development during the late colonial era by comparing French and British discourses on colonial development.

It will be of equal importance to delineate how the notion of development came to be inscribed into the colonial discourse and how its meaning was transformed according to the necessities of colonial rule. We will focus on the period from the end of World War I to decolonisation as well as on two specific African territories and their respective colonial metropolises (Senegal/France and Tanganyika/Britain), adopting a both comparative and interdisciplinary approach.

We depart from the assumption that development gradually became a central concept after World War I in conceiving of the relationship between metropolis and colony and in both legitimising and advancing specific policies towards colonised regions in Africa (and elsewhere). Based on this assumption, we aim to answer the following core questions: What did the concept of development mean in colonial Africa between the early 1920s and 1960s? How did it change over time and how can these changes be explained? How got specific actors involved in the evolving development discourse and how did they relate to each other (as well as to other institutional sites relevant to them)?

Why this Period?

Our choice of the four decades from 1920 to 1960 is not as self-evident as it appears at first sight, as historical continuities always tend to reach beyond clear-cut chronological boundaries, in this case beyond World War I on the one hand and beyond African decolonisation on the other. Cooper is one of several scholars who argues that in terms of economic and social policies the independence of African states around 1960 does not mark a decisive break, the era of state-led development stretching from 1940 well into the 1970s (2002:85). At the other end of our time span the boundary is even more porous. The first initiatives, in the British case explicitly, in the French case implicitly, aiming at colonial development date from the turn of the 20th century (Sieberg 1985:9; Havinden/Meredith 1993:87ff; Conklin 1997:54ff), thus potentially extending the period in question. By way of contrast, Coquery-Vidrovitch justifiably regards World War I as a rather Eurocentric turning point and instead suggests 1930 as the end of a long period of colonial rule which she terms système prédateur (1976:28).

Bearing in mind that all attempts at periodising colonialism in Africa are fraught with significant shortcomings, we still consider war and decolonisation as the two events which mark the period during which development rose to discursive prominence. The 1920s can possibly be regarded as a transitional phase between the old, predatory colonialism and its modified successor. The latter’s main feature, a significantly enhanced role for government action, has its roots in the aftermath of World War I when the hegemony of the colonial state ‘was consolidated and its rule thoroughly institutionalized’ (Young 1994:141). At the same time, the concept of trusteeship, which was closely related with de-
velopmentalist ideas, received a major boost from the League of Nations’ mandates system. Yet, neither the British nor the French empire realised major development projects due to the severe spending limits imposed on colonial governments under the doctrine of financial self-sufficiency. Things began to gather pace and gradually assumed a new complexion in the wake of the Great Depression which can be regarded as ‘a critical turning point in the colonial encounter’ (Hodge 2007:2). Nevertheless, the famous Colonial Development Act of 1929 largely followed the tradition of earlier policies (Constantine 1984:220), still representing a narrow economic concept of development mainly geared towards supporting the metropolitan economy. At the same time it showed the increased readiness of the imperial centres to make additional funds available in the name of development. This reaction to the Great Depression, which had strong neo-mercantilist undertones, can be witnessed both in Britain and France where government expenditure for the plans d’équipement multiplied (Coquery-Vidrovitch 1976:39) and where the Office du Niger foreshadowed the developmentalist ambitions of the Post-World War II period. But it took additional factors to turn the ‘preservationist colonialism of the 1930s’ into the ‘developmentalist colonialism of the 1940s and 1950s’ (Cooper 2002:197). Different authors name different reasons for the transition: The growing influence of Keynesian policies, the economic restructuring after the Great Depression and the onset of a new war certainly played a part in it. Moreover, the number of voices criticising the colonial system increased, not only inside (members of the Labour Party and the SFIO) but also outside Britain and France (ILO; USA, Germany), and including both moderates (philanthropic NGOs like the Aborigines Protection Society) and radicals (for example the International African Service Bureau). Governments reacted in various ways, expanding the scope of colonial development to eventually include research and social services. 2 This process culminated in the British Colonial Development and Welfare Act of 1940 whereas France introduced similar policies for obvious reasons only after the war (the Fonds d’Investissement pour le Développement Économique et Social, in short FIDES, was created in 1946). With these initiatives, Britain and France ‘moved decisively to embrace the development framework in an effort to reinvigorate and legitimise empire’ (Cooper/Packard 1997:7). Instruments were now adopted which previously were inconceivable, for example, when the Colonial Office in 1943 turned to planning in order to reach its goals (Fieldhouse 1999:85). In the final stages of the war and in its immediate aftermath came the time of grandiose attempts at economic and social engineering. As Britain and France were about to lose their possessions in Asia, their colonies in Africa were to fill the gap and supply resources for post-war reconstruction. Develop-

---

2 There were repercussions even in terms of the language used. Coquery-Vidrovitch observes that in France under the Popular Front government mise en valeur was replaced by the word développement to describe this particular field of colonial policies (1999:161).
ment plans – both for individual regions and whole colonies (Worthington 1947) – were written and implemented, individual projects of enormous proportions drawn up and realised (the two most notorious of them being a gigantic poultry farm in Gambia and the agro-industrial cultivation of groundnuts in Tanganyika). These various schemes increased the number of technicians, administrators and other European employees in such a way that the term ‘second colonial occupation’ was coined (Darwin 1988:139).

The spectacular failure of many of these measures coincided with the demise of European colonialism. During the 1950s the metropolitan state (and the public) grew more and more disillusioned with colonial development, as it failed both to live up to the economic promises and to stem the growing tide of political discontent in the colonies themselves. The final years of British and French colonialism in Africa were therefore devoted to making economic and social change as irreversible as possible and to strengthen the ties to the metropolis in such a way that they would survive political decolonisation. The USA did not only play a crucial role in dismantling the colonial empires but also in orchestrating this transition towards a new post-colonial order which should safeguard the principles of the ‘free market’. Other external forces which entered the late-colonial arena in the 1950s were the United Nations and the Bretton Woods Institutions, thus – together with the indigenous elites – completing the very development ensemble that over the following decades came to exert a massive influence on the economic and social situation in most African countries.

In the course of our research, we will use this periodisation as a preliminary framework. In analysing several discursive spheres, we will be able to determine whether their trajectory fitted in with the overall pattern or whether changes preceded or lagged behind the presumed historical breaks. If such deviation occurred on a significant scale, we would adjust the historical timeframe.

**Why this Geographical Area?**

Based on the assumption that our research may contribute to a better understanding of development as a core concept of the contemporary world, we have decided to focus on the area that figures most prominently as the object of today’s development efforts: Africa. Not only official rhetoric but also hard figures point towards this special status of the continent – in 2006 Africa received more than 40 percent of official development assistance worldwide, an ‘all time high’ according to the OECD (2007:3). Moreover, in no other region of the world the continuities between colonial rule and postcolonial present appear as significant as in large parts of Sub-Saharan Africa – and development assistance represents one of the strongest ties that have been linking African countries to the European metropolises.

---

3 One example among many: Tanganyika Territory, Re-habilitation and Development of Mbulu District (National Archives, CO 691/198/42303 _8B).
Our project will focus on the two European powers that had the greatest impact on the political and socio-economic structures of 20th century Africa, France and Great Britain. We will look at two cornerstones of their African empires, French West Africa (Afrique Occidentale Française) and British East Africa respectively, and in particular at Senegal and Tanganyika. Though there are notable differences between these two territories, with Senegal’s colonial past stretching back to the 17th century and Tanganyika having been added to the British Empire only after World War I via the League of Nations’ mandates system, there are at the same time important similarities with respect to their basic economic structures. Both territories were mainly agrarian economies with a large subsistence sector; cash-crops were largely produced by African peasants (and not by European settlers as in Northern and Southern Africa or by companies as in Central Africa). Thus, the social and economic environment in which the French and British colonial governments operated is comparable.

Disclaimer

Our research project does not claim to cover all major aspects related to colonial development. Some issues, especially some of the ‘hard facts’ (institutional, economic), have already been sufficiently described and analysed (see above) and there is no immediate need for re-examining these. Moreover, our study will concentrate on European perspectives on colonial development, for three reasons: First, ‘the idea of development is necessarily Eurocentric’, as Cowen and Shenton pointed out (1996:5). Second, we are mainly interested in development as an instrument of power and in how it took shape. Third, it would be difficult to find sources which for the four decades in question continuously reveal African conceptions of development. Only from the 1940s onwards a significant number of Africans could make themselves heard in reacting to this new centrepiece of colonial ideology. However, even if we for the most part look through a European lense, this does not preclude important insights into African views and responses – insights that might and should be followed up by further research based on African sources.

Methodological Approach

Our analysis will focus on four spheres complementary to each other and each representing a specific way of trying to come to terms with the colonial situation. These four components of development discourse (see p. 13, Figure 1) emanate from four different loci – four different desks: the (political) speaker’s, the official’s, the scientist’s, and the writer’s. Hence, they represent four genres and four distinct approaches to the realities of colonialism, all of them immediately concerned with colonial Africa: political speech trying to outline and justify policies of the colonial state; administrative documents trying both to cope with the everyday business of colonial rule and to secure its longterm foundations; academic texts trying to (re)conceptualise the developmental practices in the colonies; and colonial li-
terature trying to make sense of the author’s immediate involvement in the colonial situation. By comparing Britain and France we will try to establish whether the development discourses in the two major colonial powers of the 20th century had similar characteristics and followed similar paths within similar time horizons, thus pointing towards common structural features and circumstances that transcended the national contexts.

Our investigation will distinguish between two levels of analysis: At the first level, we will investigate the concept(s) of development within colonial discourse, try to fathom their relative importance over time and explore the relationship between colonial discourse and the emerging development discourse. At the second level, we will closely look at the internal structure of the development paradigm itself, at its various discursive strands, and its overall trajectory from the early 1920s to the late 1950s.

We will try to discern if and how the above-described spheres (and some of their subsets) interacted, whether, for example, colonial development policies were influenced by scientific research (and/or vice versa) or whether, particularly within the administrative sector, new approaches were disseminated from the metropolis to the colony (or rather the other way round). We will ask if new topics, new attitudes emerged simultaneously in the four spheres or whether these followed their own, distinct ‘rhythms’. For example, it is well worth exploring if the literary figure of the métis was in any recognisable way related to concepts of development and representations of the ‘to-be-developed’ in academic texts.

**Core Issues**

At the two levels of analysis we will deal with the following distinct sets of issues: a) relates to the first level, the relative importance of development concepts within colonial discourse, whereas b), c), d) allow for a more profound investigation into the core elements of the development paradigm.

**a) Significance and Meaning of Development**

First of all, we will examine the patterns that governed the usage of the term ‘development’ (and its French equivalent, développement). To appraise the relative importance of development within colonial discourse, we will examine its relationship to other discursive elements that underpinned and legitimised colonial rule, for example pacification and establishing law and order.

In order to better understand the notion of development, we will analyse in which contexts the word was used in what ways and how it related to similar terms like evolution, growth, progress, improvement, civilisation, mise en valeur, and modernisation. In doing so, we will have to explore the semantic field that stretches between and around the two central conceptions of development, the transitive and the intransitive (Rist 1997:73), i.e. development as a process and development as intentional practice (Cowen/Shenton 1996:IX).
b) Goals of Development

Development is mainly defined by the goals it tries to reach. Any development concept needs to answer the questions what and who is to be developed and which direction(s) these interventions should take. Therefore, we will have to ask if colonial development was about raising the productive capacity of a given territory or about creating better living conditions for its inhabitants – just to name the two most common assumptions. Should economic, technological, social and/or cultural change imitate the imperial centre, with a capitalist industrial society being the ultimate goal, – or should African colonies follow a different path? On the individual level, was there a vision of the prototypical ‘developed’ African?

Answering these questions, we will try to assess what scope the developmentalist aspirations had, whether they tended to be all-encompassing social utopias or rather limited attempts at ecological, economic and social engineering, targeted at specific regions (urban/rural) or social groups (workers, cash-crop producers, etc.). Or, to put it differently, did the ‘developers’ aim at a wholesale transformation of a given ‘traditional’ society or did they content themselves with sectoral change, leaving some of the ‘traditional’ structures intact. Another aspect worth looking at is to what extent and in what ways the natural environment became the object of developmental ambitions.

Finally, we will try to explore how the ‘developers’ themselves assessed their own role and what time horizon they envisaged for the changes to take place. Did they think that they could set in motion and control developmental transformations at will or did they hold a more modest view of their influence on colonial society, regarding development largely as an immanent process – or even as a phantasm?

A similar question pertains to the temporal axis: Was development perceived as a gradual, protracted process or did the ‘developers’ believe that they could speed it up considerably? And if the latter was true, how did they aim to speed it up? Which brings us to the second focus of our in-depth analysis:

c) Means of Development

Up to the present, not only the goals but also the means of development have remained highly contested. Though the terms may have changed over time, the proposed methods of how to achieve development for the most part have not. These still range from boosting capital investment to strengthening human capital and promoting social welfare. Among the central issues at stake was the question whether to rely on the ‘invisible hand’ of the market or on planning strategies. Another issue worth investigating is the role ascribed to science and technology. Again on the individual level, it is important to look at the ways how Europeans tried to make Africans conform to their developmentalist ideals. Did they prefer coercion and control or did they opt for positive incentives?

d) Protagonists of Development

The last question we will ask is what roles are assigned to the various groups in the colonial arena: who is the ‘developer’, who is to be developed, and are there people regarded as external to develop-
ment policies? In certain respects these issues are closely related to points b) and c), as certain goals and certain means bring specific actors into the fold, be it private companies, churches or various branches of government on the part of the ‘developers’, be it individuals or more or less well-defined social groups on the receiving end. The hierarchies, connections and rivalries within each of these two groups deserve close attention, but the main focus will be on the relationship between them.

We can safely assume that the ‘developers’ were mainly Europeans and that they conceived of themselves as the dynamic element in colonial development. Our study will closely examine the self-image of colonial ‘developers’ in various spatial and social loci (from the Colonial Office to a remote farm in the Usambara Mountains) and how they perceived the colonial subjects (if these were perceived at all). It will be worth asking, whether the relationship between Europeans and Non-Europeans was perceived as a rigid binary relation or whether there was a place for intermediate groups such as Indians, Arabs or Western-educated Africans. Special attention will be paid to the impact development had on the precarious relationship between coloniser and colonised. As development policies started to take effect, the perceived cultural gap between coloniser and colonised decreased. This in turn caused Europeans to either reconceptualise the difference in new ways or to reject development outright as undermining the traditional order.

As development policies started to take effect, the perceived cultural gap between coloniser and colonised decreased. This in turn caused Europeans to either reconceptualise the difference in new ways or to reject development outright as undermining the traditional order.

Last but not least, we shall deal with the motives of the various protagonists as far as they are discernible from our material. We will try to establish, if and how the diverse motives were related to specific development concepts and initiatives.

All these questions ask for a systematic inclusion of gender as a category of analysis in order to understand in which ways colonising as well as colonised women and men were implicated differently in the (European) conceptualization of development.

**Discourse Analysis**

In exploring these sets of questions, we will adopt elements of discourse analysis in its Foucaultian variant as our methodological framework. Discourse analysis allows us to conceive of the diverse utterances as a structured field in which certain rules determine what is ‘true’, what is ‘false’, and what becomes unthinkable and unsayable (Landwehr 2001:86). The principles that structure the discursive field are called rules of formation (Foucault 1969:55-93): they determine what becomes the object of a particular discourse, who is legitimised to take part in that discourse (and who is excluded), how the various statements within a discourse relate to each other and which patterns, which rhetorical schemata they follow, and, finally, which overall purpose connects the discursive units in a particular way

---

4 This relationship is at the same time based on exclusion and inclusion, on the coloniser’s ‘desire to emphasize racial and cultural difference’ and his/her ‘desire […] to gather the colonized into the fold of an all-embracing civilization’ (Spurr 1993:32).

5 A common reaction, according to Spurr (1993:84), was ridicule poured over the colonised when they were seen to imitate Western forms.
and relates them to specific historical processes. In short, discourse analysis is about reconstructing the production, stabilisation and change of collective stores of knowledge and how these informed human behaviour (Keller 2004:63).

Two aspects make the Foucaultian approach particularly appealing to our project: First, it emphasises the connection between discursive and non-discursive practices as parts of one and the same ‘dispositive’ which comprises such heterogeneous elements as discourses and institutions, architectural artefacts and laws, administrative actions and scientific formulae (Foucault 1978:119f; cf. also Jäger 2001). Second, discourse analysis in the Foucaultian tradition stresses the connections between the various strands that make up a discourse and at the same time does not neglect the ‘outside’ of this particular discourse. It draws attention to a variety of interdiscursive relationships which link a given discourse in either affirmative or antagonistic ways to other discourses. Heeding these two principles, we are confronted with a complex ensemble of protagonists that contributed to or interacted with the emerging development dispositive. We will have to reduce this complexity and concentrate on the four spheres mentioned above, but intend to establish from this narrower angle the wider picture. Figure 1 indicates what the major components of the colonial development dispositive could be, and how it relates to other discourses.

On a more specific level, discourse analysis (in all of its variants) provides the instruments to explore the semantic structures of selected texts. Recurring narrative patterns, metaphors, classificatory systems and binary oppositions as well as several other linguistic features serve to indicate the way reality is constructed. Discourse analysis focuses on the serial, the typical, as it tries to map out the rules that govern the conception of social realities. While sticking to discourse analysis as our common framework, we will in some cases depart from its methodological rigidity and fall back on less rigorous approaches. In our opinion, neither the complexities of history nor the particular logic of literary texts can be fully grasped by discourse analysis. We will, for example, pay attention to the motives of major protagonists (see p. 11), an aspect that is dismissed by some practitioners of discourse analysis as being purely speculative (Landwehr 2001:103). Similarly, applying classificatory codes of discourse analysis to the psychological subtlety of a novel can justifiably be regarded as simplistic. Therefore, in some instances we will use additional devices taken from historiography and literary studies that enable us to make full use of our sources. Thus we will explore under-researched areas of political, social, and economic history (particularly at the level of the colonial state in Africa) as well as the peculiar qualities of colonial fiction.

There is another reason why discourse analysis should be used cautiously: It is not clear at what point in time we can rightfully speak of a development discourse in its Foucaultian sense (with legitimate authorities, canonised texts, etc.). Up to that point, our research will amount more to a careful search for scattered fragments than to a systematic exploration of a discursive field.
Corpus

In constructing the corpus, we will distinguish between sources that cover colonial discourse as a whole and sources that explicitly focus on development. The first set of sources will help us establish the importance of the development concept within colonial discourse. To this end, we will use parliamentary debates, administrative documents, academic journals, and colonial literature. Only as a second step we will focus on those sections within these texts which pertain explicitly to development or to related notions like raising productivity and/or the standard of living. These sections will be analysed together with a second set of sources that consists of specialised texts like development plans, reports and correspondence on development projects, as well as early texts on development theory. The latter types of texts apparently began circulating from the late 1930s onwards signalling a new prominence of development issues.

For a stringent historical analysis, the corpus should consist of sources that were produced on a regular basis in a stable institutional setting. In our case, this is only true of parliamentary debates and possibly of the day-to-day paperwork of the colonial administrations. As it is impossible to collect all of these documents, we will select samples at regular intervals of about five years (taking account of the
periodisation outlined above). Especially for the late colonial period in Britain the editions by Ronald Hyam (Hyam 1992; Hyam et al. 1992; 2000) will be very helpful in minimising research time abroad and hence travel costs; the same is true of British and French parliamentary debates, some of which are accessible at libraries in Vienna. Most administrative documents will have to be retrieved from the archives. At the metropolitan level, the Archives Nationales d’Outre-Mer in Aix-en-Provence (in particular, the series AOF VIII/Affaires économiques), and the National Archives in London, which contain the records of the Colonial Office, will be essential for our research. To gather relevant material at the level of the colonial state in Senegal and Tanganyika, we will have to consult the archives in Dakar and Dar es Salaam. Part of the Archives Nationales du Sénégal are the Archives du gouvernement general de l’AOF. Their fonds moderne contains, among other important material, the records of the Conseil de Gouvernement de l’AOF and the Missions d’Inspection des colonies. The collections of the Tanzania National Archives are less impressive but the records of the Legislative Council and especially those of the Secretariat promise to provide vital insights into the colonial mindset.

Relevant academic journals are more easily accessible (many of them via the internet) than archival sources but only few of them cover the whole period in question (International Affairs comes close, other journals cover only less than two decades, for example the French Annales de Géographie which were shut down in 1936, and Politique Étrangère which was founded that same year). We will add books by British and French scholars, politicians, and colonial administrators to our corpus which came to be regarded as canonical texts on development issues (Thillard 1920; Lugard 1922; Sarraut 1923; Perham 1941; Lewis 1949).

Whereas some categories of texts within the sample (records of the metropolitan as well as the African colonial administrations, public utterances by governors and other officials in Africa, development plans and similar documents etc.) are geographically linked to Tanganyika or Senegal, other categories of texts (parliamentary debates, scholarly texts) do not have to be that specific in order to qualify for the corpus. In order to raise the number of texts and thus to increase the sample to a meaningful size, we will settle for texts which relate to Sub-Saharan Africa in general or to parts of it.

The same is true of the fourth segment of our corpus, colonial literature published between 1920 and 1960, consisting of novels and memoirs by Europeans who had lived and worked in colonised Africa for a considerable period of time, thus excluding travel writing. We concentrate on texts written by people who were immediately involved with the colonial system and who tried to make sense of their experiences by putting forward their views in literary form. Therefore, as Kirk-Greene noted, ‘[t]he novel may turn out to be one of the favourite and most enduring sources for a study of the Colonial Service in the field.’ (1999a:150) Kirk-Greene himself provided one of the most comprehensive bibliographies of colonial literature (1999b:130ff). Apart from his efforts we rely in the British case on

---

6 For a definition of colonial literature see Moura (1999:21-23).
books and articles by, among others, Meyers (1968), Brantlinger (1988), Darby (1998), Gikandi (1996), and Peterson (2004), in the French case on early classifications by Lebel (1931), Pujarniscle (1931) and Leblond (1926) and on later studies by Fanoudh-Siefer (1968), Loutfi (1971), Mouralis (1984), and Durand (1999). As only a fraction of the literary texts is available in Austrian libraries, we will have to gather the material at the British Library in London and the Bibliothèque nationale de France in Paris.

Hypotheses

To sum up, our research will revolve around the following key assumptions and, if these are found to be valid, will explore them in greater detail:

– Development as a concept gained a more prominent role over the decades in question – but it is to be determined whether there was a development discourse as such.

– The various discursive strands and institutional sites were closely interrelated; it remains to be determined to which extent, in which direction(s), and in which sequence the notion of development and its continuing transformations were transmitted.

– More specifically, we assume that development in the early decades of the 20th century, probably up to the 1930s, was mainly used in a narrow economic sense closely related to the exploitation of natural resources (as indicated by the French term la mise en valeur). We assume that only later development came to be a more extensive concept enabling and justifying the penetration and transformation of colonial societies that went far beyond setting up basic infrastructure. Towards the end of the colonial era, we expect to find an increasing diversity of discursive strands and corresponding political strategies, in part reflecting the increasing complexity of colonial state and society.

Relevance of the Study

The most immediate aim of our project is to take stock of a wide range of archival sources and publications. Most of these sources are little known and have never been looked at from our particular perspective, and many of the scholarly and literary texts involved have fallen into oblivion. If they prove as instructive as we expect them to be, we intend to make them accessible to a wider public.

As academic publications form an important part of our sources, our project will contribute to the history of science and will in particular shed new light on the prehistory of development studies.

At the center of the inquiry stands our desire to better comprehend the historical genesis and meaning of one of the key concepts in 20th and 21st century world politics. Several of the insights we hope to gain from historical analysis may contribute to a deeper understanding of the present – be it the va-
rious and changing objects of development, be it the multi-faceted relationship between ‘developer’ and ‘to-be-developed’, be it the driving forces behind the development agenda or the fabric of developmental power/knowledge regimes. Van Beusekom and Hodgson are not the only scholars in claiming ‘that the late colonial period is crucial for understanding contemporary development practices and debates.’ (2000:33)

What further distinguishes our project is its comparative approach. To our knowledge, nobody has ever attempted to systematically compare the development concepts and policies of colonial France and Britain. Moreover, our analytical framework could serve as a stepping stone for further research into additional directions, both in time (going back beyond World War I), space (other colonial empires or other colonial areas within the British and French empires, such as India and Algeria) and perspective (for example, the colonised).

On a more conventional level, the project will add to the understanding of the colonial state in Africa and its discursive embeddedness. Whereas previous research on colonial development mainly focused on decision-making processes in the respective European capitals, we will also be looking at specific African colonies, thus giving our research a more precise geographical frame and putting more emphasis on the imperial periphery. By dynamically linking the metropolis to the colonial arena we hope to go some way beyond segmental perspectives that are not uncommon in regional studies on colonialism. Nevertheless, or rather therefore, we are confident that our findings will make a substantial contribution to the social and economic histories of Tanganyika and Senegal.

The last two features of the proposed project which set it apart from similar endeavours are closely related: On the one hand its interdisciplinary approach, combining History with Development, African and Literary Studies, on the other hand the wide array of sources we will consult, from government reports to scholarly and literary texts. In this we try to follow Edward Said who highlighted ‘the traffic between what scholars and specialists wrote and what poets, novelists, politicians, and journalists then said’ (1979:344) – in his case about Islam, in our case about the ways in which African colonies should be developed.\(^7\) In order to examine the various linkages we will rely on sources that have been neglected so far and we will take a fresh look at better-known sources. Apart from these linkages, what we try to reconstruct for the first time is something that transcends the narrow confines of analysing academic prose and government documents: it is a particular segment of the ‘imperial consciousness’ (Said 1979:344), the mental frames that guided British and French officials and scholars in conceptualising and implementing colonial development.

\(^7\) Similarly, James Ferguson suggests that research should explore the ‘kinds of flows […] linking academic theories and knowledges to the world of agencies, policies, and practical politics.’ (1997:152)
Human Resources, Organisational and Financial Aspects

Researchers

The project is headed by Walter Schicho, Professor of African Studies at the University of Vienna. After having successfully established Development Studies as a degree course at the University of Vienna over the past few years, he is looking forward to adding research excellence to a department that since its inception has mainly been occupied with the exigencies of academic teaching. The proposed project brings together his two major research interests, African history and African development issues. His vast knowledge in both fields makes him exceptionally well prepared to undertake a comparative study. He will focus on the French colonial administration and the political and academic discourse in France.

His team:

Dr. Gerald Hödl is a historian who has published several books and articles on development theory, development policies, and development assistance. After years of heavy teaching at the University of Vienna’s Development Studies programme, the project will provide him with the opportunity to enter new research territory but building upon the expertise he has acquired so far. The research on colonial development will strengthen his international reputation and lay the groundwork for his Habilitation. Within the project, he will cover the British colonial administration (both in the metropolis and in Tanganyika) as well as the political and academic discourse in the United Kingdom. He will be working on a full-time basis.

Martina Kopf holds a PhD in African Studies with a focus on literary studies. Her master and doctoral theses dealt with intersections of narrative, memory and history in literature. She has taught francophone and anglophone African literature at the Department of African Studies, University of Vienna, since 1998 and possesses through her own studies and research as well as through her teaching activities a solid basis in postcolonial theory, gender studies, and cultural studies. Within this project, Martina Kopf will be responsible for the archival research in Dakar and, above all, for the analysis of French and British colonial literature. She intends to write her Habilitation based on the research in this project. She will be working on a full-time basis.

The project will provide two young researchers (N.N.) with the opportunity to get first-hand experience in archives and libraries abroad and to write their M.A. theses based on material gathered there. The recruitment will be based on performances in a research seminar to be held in 2009.
**International Partners**

**Uma Kothari** is a Reader at the School of Environment and Development, University of Manchester. Her oral history project (2005) which focuses on the life stories of former colonial administrators will in several respects serve as a perfect complement to our approach.

**Herward Sieberg**, Professor emeritus at the University of Hildesheim, has pioneered research on (British) colonial development in the German-speaking countries. His vast experience in this field will be of utmost importance, especially during the first stages of our research.

**Bernard Mouralis** is Professor emeritus at the University of Cergy Pontoise where he directed the research centre Texte/Histoire. He has conducted extensive research on French-African relations and on French colonial and francophone African literature of the 20th century. He will have an advisory function in collecting and selecting a body of sources for the investigation of French colonial discourse.

**Catherine Coquery-Vidrovitch** is a world-renowned historian of Sub-Saharan Africa, Professor emeritus of African history at the University of Paris-7 Denis Diderot and former head of the research unity SEDET – Sociétés en développement dans l’espace et dans le temps. She will accompany our research and engage in the discussion of the results.

All our international contacts will participate in a workshop to take place at the University of Vienna in the second year of the project (2010). Further cooperation will be arranged individually once the project has been accepted for funding.

There is a long-standing institutional relationship between the Department of African Studies in Vienna and the Universities of Dakar and Dar-es-Salam which will contribute to efficient research in the archives there. The project team has working experience in both countries.

**The Research Institution**

The University of Vienna’s Department of African Studies not only offers academic expertise on African languages, literature, history as well as on current political and socio-economic issues but is also home to an interdisciplinary Development Studies programme with nearly 2000 students enrolled. For details see [http://www.univie.ac.at/ie/index.html](http://www.univie.ac.at/ie/index.html). This institutional environment enables the research team to feed their findings into academic teaching and engage students with primary sources and uncommon perspectives.

The Department of African Studies will provide adequate working space for the two full-time researchers. The office equipment will include computers with internet access and adequate software.

The department’s library, which holds about 60,000 books and more than 100 Africa-related journals, will be of immense benefit to the proposed research.
## Work Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Main Tasks</th>
<th>Foci of research and research abroad</th>
<th>Dissemination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Martina Kopf</td>
<td>Gerald Hödl</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 2009 | Updating on secondary sources, compiling the corpus (research in archives and libraries), creating a comparative framework | Paris | London | Paris | University teaching: research seminar  
  First research papers during the second half of the year  
  Suitable conferences may include: European Conference on African Studies (ECAS) of the Africa-Europe Group for Interdisciplinary Studies [aegis]; 35th Annual Conference of the African Literature Association |
| 2010 | Adjusting and analysing the corpus (emphasis on comparative work and interdisciplinary exchange) | Dakar | London | London | Aix  
  Workshop (plus publication)  
  University teaching: seminar  
  Articles in academic journals  
  Suitable conferences may include: Colloque International des Centre de recherche XIX-XXème siècles de l'Université Paul-Valéry de Montpellier „Frontières du monde, frontières du moi“ 2010; African Studies Association/Annual Meeting |
| 2011 | Fine-tuning of comparative analysis and synthesising of results  
  Designing follow-up research project | British and French colonial literature | British government sources and scholarly texts | French government sources  
  French government sources | Aix | Monograph; edited volume (parallel to lecture series, in German)  
  Anthology of literary texts  
  University teaching: lecture series  
  Suitable conferences may include: European Conference on African Studies (ECAS) of the Africa-Europe Group for Interdisciplinary Studies [aegis]; Deutscher Historikertag; Development Studies Association/Annual Conference |
# Financial Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Salaries</th>
<th>Travel Costs</th>
<th>Budget Workshop*</th>
<th>Coaching**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hödl 54.180 €</td>
<td>Schicho Paris/Arch. 180 €</td>
<td>Travel costs</td>
<td>10 months à 200,00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hödl 54.180 €</td>
<td>Hödl 54.180 €</td>
<td>speakers</td>
<td>1 USA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kopf 54.180 €</td>
<td>Hödl 54.180 €</td>
<td>2 days</td>
<td>2 Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jr. R. 1 5.280 €</td>
<td>Kopf 54.180 €</td>
<td>allowance</td>
<td>5 Europe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jr. R. 2 5.280 €</td>
<td>Dar/Archive 900 €</td>
<td></td>
<td>Publication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>Schicho Paris/Arch. 180 €</td>
<td></td>
<td>Subtotal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st year</td>
<td>108.360 €</td>
<td>1.500 €</td>
<td>1 USA</td>
<td>10200 €</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd year</td>
<td>118.920 €</td>
<td>1.700 €</td>
<td>2 Africa</td>
<td>2000 €</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd year</td>
<td>108.360 €</td>
<td>1.400 €</td>
<td>5 Europe</td>
<td>2000 €</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.600 €</td>
<td>Publication</td>
<td>Subtotal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.000 €</td>
<td>10200 €</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>2000 €</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>120.860 €</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>141.110 €</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.000 €</td>
<td>112.120 €</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The team will organise an international workshop in 2010 with invited speakers from Africa, the US, and Europe. Travel costs as well as editing and printing of the resulting publication will require the amount stated above.

** We plan regular coaching sessions (one session per month, ten times a year) with a professional coach in order to optimise the work process.
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**Personal Data**

**Date of Birth:** January 1st, 1945  
**Place of Birth:** Deutsch-Beneschau, Czechia  
**Citizenship:** Austrian  
**Current Residence:** 1040 Vienna, Austria

**Curriculum Vitae**

**Since 2005**  
Head of Department of African Studies, University of Vienna

**Since 2000**  
Chair of African History at the Department of African Studies

**Since 1995**  
Director of the ‘Project International Development’ – a Development Studies Programme at the University of Vienna

1982-2000  
Associate Professor at the Department of African Studies, University of Vienna

1982  
Habilitation in African Studies, University of Vienna (*Le Groupe Muwankolo - Syntax des Swahili von Lubumbashi*)

1973-1974  
Part time lecturer (*Maître de conférence*) at the National University of Zaire, Campus Lubumbashi

1972-1982  
Assistant professor at the Department of African Studies, University of Vienna

1971-1972  
Military service

1963-1971  
Studies at the Faculty of Philosophy, University of Vienna: PhD in Anthropology and African Studies, June 1971 (*Gehöft und Siedlung bei den Kabye der Bezirke Lama Kara und Pagouda, Nord Togo / Compound and village structure in the Kabye area of Lama Kara and Pagouda, Northern Togo*)

**Research projects:**

**Since 2007**  
„Sprachmittlung bei Gericht und Behörden: Der Einsatz von Sprachkundigen als sprachliche und kulturelle MediatorInnen in Verfahren in Österreich“ (Hochschuljubiläumsstiftung)

1993-1999  
Director of two research projects (FWF financed) on „Communication in development“ & „Communication and Monitoring“

1977 and 1979  
Visiting research fellow at the Institute of Kiswahili Research, University of Dar es Salaam/Tanzania
1973-1974 linguistic / sociolinguistic research in Lubumbashi/Zaire
1969-1970 Field studies in Northern Togo, on „Rural habitat, social structure and development“

Other activities:

Member of

- the Board of the Faculty of Philological and Cultural Studies
- the Advisory Board for Development Co-operation, Ministry of European and Foreign Affairs
- the Executive Board of the Mattersburger Kreis für Entwicklungspolitik (Mattersburg Circle for Development Policies)
- the Commission for Development Studies at the Austrian Academy of Sciences
- the executive board of the working group on development politics of the Austrian Social Democratic Party
- the working group on Global Studies, University of Vienna
- the advisory board of „Afrika Spectrum“ (Hamburg)


Publications:

Monographs

Handbuch Afrika. Frankfurt/Wien: Brandes & Apsel / Südwind:

2004 Bd. 3: Nordafrika, NO-, Ostafrika und östliches Zentralafrika
2001 Bd. 2: Westafrika und die Inseln im Atlantik
1999 Bd. 1: Zentralafrika, Südliches Afrika und die Staaten im Indischen Ozean

1989 Kiswahili cha Kisasa: Sarufi. Wien: WUV.
**Edited volumes (since 2000)**


**Articles in journals and anthologies (since 2000)**


Mag.a. Dr. Martina Kopf

Personal Data

Date of Birth: November 4th 1970
Place of Birth: Bad Ischl, Austria
Citizenship: Austrian
Current Residence: 1050 Vienna, Austria

Academic Curriculum Vitae

Since 1998
Courses on anglophone and francophone African literature at the Department of African Studies/University of Vienna, since 2004 also at the Department of Development Studies
Subjects: postcolonialism; gender in African writing; relations between literature, history, memory, and narration.

1997-2004
Ph.D. Programme in African Studies at the University of Vienna
Doctoral thesis: *Heilende Erzählungen? Trauma, Narration und Gedächtnis im literarischen Text am Beispiel von Assia Djebar und Yvonne Vera* (Healing Narratives? Trauma, Narration, and Memory in the Writing of Assia Djebar and Yvonne Vera)
Awarded the Dr. Maria Schaumayer Foundation Prize in 2004

1989-1996
Master Programme at the University of Vienna
Major: African Studies, Minor: Women’s Studies, Development Studies, Non-European History, French, Italian
Final thesis: ‘Geh, kehre wieder und erinnere dich ...’: Schwellen zwischen Literatur und Geschichte auf dem Weg durch die Geschichte L’amour-cent-vies von Werewere Liking (Thresholds between literature and history in the writing of Werewere Liking)

1995-1997
Founding and active member of the association *fora – Forum for Feminist African Studies*

11/1993-06/1994
Erasmus student at the *Istituto Universitario Orientale* in Naples/Italy, Faculty of Political Science

1991-1993
Students’ representative at the Department of African Studies

1990-1993
Member of the Women’s Office of the National Union of Students at the University of Vienna (ÖH)

1988
*Matura* (Austrian general qualification for University entrance), BG Bad Ischl

Further Activities

Since 2004
Journalistic investigations and publications on governmental and non-governmental
development cooperation, political processes in Africa, problems of globalisation, and North-South-relations

Since 1989 Travels to Burkina Faso, Mali, South Africa, Senegal, Cameroon, Côte d’Ivoire, Ghana

Publications

Monographs

Edited volumes

Articles

Presentations
Mag. Dr. Gerald Hödl

Personal Data
Date of Birth: January 13, 1965
Place of Birth: Graz, Austria
Citizenship: Austrian
Current Residence: 1020 Vienna, Austria

Curriculum Vitae
Since 2001
Lecturer (since 2008 Senior Scientist) at the Departments of Geography and of Development Studies teaching on a wide range of subjects (international relations, development theory, history of North-South-relations, Austrian foreign and development policies, global sport)

2003-2004
Researcher in the research project *Austrian Economic Policies since 1945*, funded by the Austrian National Bank, headed by Prof. Dr. Dieter Stiefel

1993-2003
Ph.D. Programme in Economic and Social History at the University of Vienna; Ph.D. with distinction, November 2003

2000-2002
Researcher at Historical Commission of the Austrian Federal Government, Vienna (Research project *Expropriation of Jewish property in Vienna, 1938-1945*)

1996-2000
Freelance proofreader and translator

1995-1997
Lecturer (*Auslandslektor*) at the University of Nottingham, teaching German and giving lectures on contemporary Austria

1993-1994
Librarian and researcher at the Southern Africa Documentation and Cooperation Centre, Vienna

1991-1992
Teacher (German, History) at a secondary school in Vienna (BRG Wien VIII)

1990-1991
Researcher at the Research Centre for Technology, Work and Culture, Graz, in a research project on environmental history

1983-1990
Master Programme at the University of Graz
Major: History; Minor: German; M.A., July 1990, with distinction

Other activities
Since 2006
Member of the executive board of the *Verein für Geschichte und Sozialkunde*, University of Vienna

Since 2005
Member of the executive board of the *Mattersburger Kreis für EntwicklungsPolitik* (Mattersburg Circle for Development Policies)

Since 2003
Managing editor of the book series *Historische Sozialkunde/Internationale*
Publications

Monographs


2004 "Jüdisches" Liegenschaftseigentum in Wien zwischen Arisierungsstrategien und Rückstellungsverfahren (=Veröffentlichungen der Österreichischen Historikerkommission Bd. 27). Wien/München: Oldenbourg. [with Gerhard Melinz]
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Selected translations:
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Univ.Prof. Dr. Walter Schicho (e-mail: walter.schicho@univie.ac.at): 30% contribution. He had the idea for the project and played a vital role in designing the research.

Mag. Dr. Gerald Hödl (e-mail: gerald.hoedl@univie.ac.at): 40% contribution. He wrote most of the narrative text of the proposal.

Mag.a. Dr. Martina Kopf (e-mail: martina.kopf@univie.ac.at): 30% contribution. She wrote the sections dealing with colonial literature and drew up the financial plan.