RESEARCH JOURNAL OF ENGLISH (RJOE)
www.rjoe.org.in | **Oray's Publications** | ISSN: **2456-2696**
An International Approved Peer-Reviewed and Refereed English Journal
Impact Factor: *8.373 (SJIF)* | **Vol. 11, Issue 1 (Jan/Feb/Mar;2026)**

Postcolonial Trauma, Collective Memory, and the Narrative Ethics of Witnessing in Contemporary Fiction

Deepak Kaushik
Independent Researcher

Paper Received on 23-02-2026, Accepted on 24-03-2026
Published on 2 5 -03-26; DOI:10.36993/RJOE.2026.11.01.737

Abstract:

What does it mean to write honestly about violence you never experienced? The question is not rhetorical, and this paper does not treat it as one. It is a practical problem one that presses on every formal choice a postcolonial writer makes. Drawing on trauma theory, narrative ethics, and postcolonial criticism, I argue that the writers who handle this terrain most honestly do not paper over the gap between representation and what actually happened; they hold it open. Fractured chronology, competing narrative voices, deliberate silence, magical realism none of these are decorative. They are ways of refusing to make historical atrocity cleaner or more palatable than it was. The paper also looks at how postcolonial fiction handles collective memory: not as a straightforward act of retrieval,but as something requiring constant vigilance about the distortions that any act of recovery brings with it. What this fiction can offer and what I find genuinely valuable about it is a way of sitting with a difficult past that remains honest about the limits of what we can know, what has been irretrievably lost, and what the present still owes.

Keywords: postcolonial fiction, colonial violence, polyphonic narration, magical realism

Introduction

There is nothing neutral about writing colonial violence. Every decision a writer makes — whose perspective anchors the narrative, what gets rendered in close detail, what stays unshown, how much distance the prose maintains from the events it is moving through — is a moral decision as much as an aesthetic one. To narrate historical trauma is to make claims: about what happened, about culpability, about

what the present owes those who suffered in the past. These are not comfortable abstractions safely housed in seminar rooms. They are live, often fiercely contested arguments, playing out in courts and legislative chambers and op-ed columns and around dinner tables, and postcolonial fiction has been entangled in them for decades. The best of it does not pretend to resolve these arguments. What sets it apart is the refusal to pretend they are simpler than they are.Colonialism was never reducible to land seizure or labour extraction, though it was certainly those things. It was also — deliberately, systematically — an assault on memory. European colonial frameworks dismissed, distorted, or destroyed indigenous histories, oral traditions, and ways of knowing that fell outside the categories they recognised (Bhabha 2). Postcolonial writers are not simply telling stories about something that happened a long time ago. They are frequently attempting to give literary shape to experiences that powerful institutions spent generations rendering officially invisible, recovering what was buried while knowing that full recovery is not on offer — that some of what was lost is gone, that the archives were partial to begin with, and that any reconstruction, however careful, carries the distortions of the present back into the past it is trying to reach.

The argument this paper makes is fairly direct: writers who are genuinely serious about this territory do not set aside their awareness of what representation cannot do. They build that awareness into the texture of the work itself. And this is not timidity or bad faith. It is the most ethically honest position available.

Trauma Theory and Its Postcolonial Extensions

Trauma theory took shape as a scholarly discipline in the 1990s, with Cathy Caruth, Shoshana Felman, and Dori Laub among its central figures. What made their work so useful for literary criticism was a clinically grounded observation: trauma does not operate the way ordinary memory does. It cannot be filed away and retrieved when wanted. It comes back without being summoned — in nightmares, in flashbacks, in repetitions that erupt into the surface of daily life without warning (Caruth 4). For someone living with trauma, the past is not safely past. It keeps pressing into the present with the urgency of something unresolved.

Importing trauma theory into postcolonial studies was not, however, a clean operation. The framework had been built primarily around the Holocaust and around Western clinical models oriented toward individual psychological suffering. Colonial

violence is a different thing: collective rather than individual, transmitting its effects across generations through social and cultural mechanisms that Western psychological models were not designed to account for (Craps 3). Applying the framework wholesale risks reproducing the very move colonialism made — imposing a template developed elsewhere onto experiences that simply do not fit it.

What strikes me about this dynamic is that it mirrors the writer's own situation. The character inside the fiction is trying to grasp an inherited trauma they did not personally live through; the writer outside it is trying to represent histories that can only be partially recovered. The formal and the human problem turn out to be versions of the same problem. The most honest work in this tradition makes that convergence visible — puts it on the table rather than concealing it behind a narrator who seems to know more than anyone plausibly could.

The Ethics of Witnessing

Witnessing is something you do before it becomes a concept. To witness is a commitment: I will not look away from this. That commitment carries real political weight in the context of colonial atrocity, because perpetrators almost universally worked to manage or destroy the record of what they had done. Archives were controlled. Testimony was discredited. Official narrative was deployed systematically to bury what Felman and Laub describe as a structure of legitimised forgetting (5). Bearing witness insisting, against institutional denial, that what happened actually happened is a form of solidarity with the people who suffered. It is also a precondition for any serious reckoning: you cannot confront what you refuse to acknowledge.

None of which makes the act of witnessing straightforward, and the postcolonial writers worth taking seriously know this. The specific difficulty for writers is that they are almost always bearing witness to suffering they did not personally experience. This creates a genuine ethical hazard: how do you represent someone else's pain without flattening or sentimentalising it, without bending it to serve your own narrative needs? The risk of exploitation is not hypothetical. It shows up in postcolonial fiction that treats historical violence with an aesthetic relish that sits badly with its subject, or in work that seems more interested in the writer's own moral seriousness than in the people whose experiences it claims to recover. I do not think this problem can be solved. But the best writers work with it honestly, building their awareness of it into the form rather than leaving it as unexamined residue.

The question of audience adds another complication. Colonial histories were written by and for readers shaped by colonial culture — readers trained, sometimes quite deliberately, to filter out certain testimonies or absorb them in ways that blunt their political force. Postcolonial fiction has to work against that conditioning without being able to assume it has succeeded. Getting the tone right matters enormously here: too angry and readers who occupy positions of relative privilege disengage; too elegiac and the violence gets aestheticized into something manageable; too detached and the ethical stakes dissolve into irony. There is no formula. Different writers handle it differently. Some do not handle it well.

Dominick LaCapra identifies one risk with particular precision: representing atrocity always threatens to aestheticize it — to convert horror into something beautiful that a reader can receive and move past (LaCapra 40). What the best postcolonial fiction does, and what makes it genuinely demanding to read, is build friction against that aestheticization into the form itself. Irony, deliberate gaps, narrators who foreground their own uncertainty and their own complicity, scenes that refuse to resolve — these create resistance against the reader's desire for emotional closure. The self-consciousness is not postmodern decoration. It is an ethical refusal to let the act of reading become too comfortable for the people doing it.

Narrative Strategies of Postcolonial Witnessing

Among the formal strategies postcolonial fiction has developed, non-linear chronology is probably the most pervasive and the most frequently misread. When a narrative's timeline breaks apart — when the past intrudes into the present without announcement, when causes arrive after effects, when events keep resurfacing from different angles — this is not pacing variation for aesthetic effect. It is an argument about how historical trauma actually works.

Polyphony — building a narrative from multiple, sometimes contradictory voices, none of which has access to the complete picture — is a formal challenge to the way empire wrote history. Colonial historiography was characteristically monological: one authoritative perspective, one archive, one account that counted as real, against which everything else was measured as deviation. Spivak's point that all testimony is partial and socially positioned (275) gets enacted at the level of form when no single narrator is granted access to a truth that supersedes the others, and when the gaps between different accounts carry as much meaning as the accounts

themselves. The incompleteness is not a failure. It is a claim about the nature of historical knowledge.

Silence and indirection tend to be undervalued by readers trained to treat gaps as problems to be filled. Some experiences resist direct narration — not because the facts are unavailable, but because rendering them in clean causal sequence already domesticates them, makes them more manageable than they were. Leaving things unsaid, or said only at an angle, can preserve something of the actual texture of extreme experience — its excess, its resistance to being narrated at all.

Collective Memory and Counter-History

Collective memory is not simply what a community happens to remember. It is what a community relies on to understand itself — where it came from, who it is, what claims it can legitimately make. Colonial regimes were often systematic about destroying the historical record. Archives were burned. School curricula were rewritten. Oral traditions were pushed to the margins of official culture. Legal and epistemological frameworks were constructed that classified indigenous knowledge as superstition or anecdote rather than evidence (Fanon 210). Postcolonial writers work against that erasure: they reconstruct suppressed histories, give literary form to experiences that were denied the status of events, and make claims about what happened that official narratives tried to foreclose. This is a genuine cultural contribution, and not only to academic discourse.

The more careful writers are not naive about what the recovery project can become. Collective memory has its own distorting pressures: toward mythologisation, toward smoothing over internal conflicts in the service of a unified national story, toward appropriating specific suffering for political ends that the sufferers themselves might not have recognised or endorsed. A community organised around a shared history of victimisation can become, paradoxically, one that enforces its own silences about those who collaborated, about internal hierarchies of suffering, about the ways postcolonial states have sometimes reproduced the very structures of the regimes they replaced. James Young's work on memorialisation pushes exactly here: the problem is not simply whether to remember, but how, and in whose interest (Young 2).

Michael Rothberg's concept of multidirectional memory is one of the more genuinely useful frameworks I have encountered for navigating this, because it

refuses the assumption that attending to different histories of suffering must be a zero-sum exercise (Rothberg 5). Public discourse tends to treat memory as a fixed resource as though acknowledging one history of violence somehow diminishes another, as though comparison automatically equals relativisation. Rothberg's argument is that this is simply false: placing different histories of suffering in conversation can amplify rather than diminish the force of each, can open up rather than close down the connections and obligations they share. Postcolonial fiction that takes this seriously does not try to adjudicate between histories. It holds the difficult questions in productive tension which is uncomfortable, but considerably more honest than any resolution it could offer.

Mbembe adds a layer that fiction cannot afford to ignore: the problem of living in a present still materially structured by colonial hierarchies of race, class, and access, while trying to build political futures out of the rubble of a colonial past that is not, in any meaningful sense, past (Mbembe 14). The question is not only one of memory — how to narrate what happened — but of how to act inside a world that colonialism is still organising. Postcolonial fiction that takes this seriously does not offer consolation.

The Writer's Position

There is a dimension of postcolonial fiction that receives less critical attention than it deserves: where exactly the writer stands in relation to the history they are narrating. Many of the most prominent figures in this tradition occupy genuinely complicated subject positions. They were educated in colonial institutions. They write in colonial languages. They move between communities of origin and the international literary markets that will receive, assess, and ultimately canonise or overlook their work. This complexity is not a problem to be resolved or a disqualification to be managed around. It is part of the material these writers are working with, and the honest ones make it visible rather than assuming a transparency they do not possess.

Writing in English, French, or Portuguese about colonial histories conducted in those very languages is a situation that cannot be resolved — only more or less honestly inhabited. The language imposed as an instrument of domination is also, for many of these writers, the language in which they think most fluently, the language that gives them access to international audiences and critical frameworks, and —

paradoxically — the language in which they are doing the work of cultural recovery. That contradiction is not something to be explained away. It is generative. It produces formal tension, irony, the sense of a split address that runs through much of the best postcolonial writing. But it requires a particular kind of clarity about what can and cannot be claimed from where the writer happens to be standing.

Conclusion

I want to end plainly rather than by summarising. The formal choices in postcolonial fiction — the fractured chronologies, the competing voices, the strategic silences, the incursion of the magical — are not ornamental. They are how writers negotiate the genuine difficulty of bearing witness to violence they did not live through and cannot fully recover. Every formal decision embeds a claim about what can be known, what can honestly be said, and what the act of narration owes to the people whose suffering it is representing.

What fiction can do here that history, law, and politics largely cannot is invite readers to dwell — to stay inside a difficult past long enough to feel its weight, to sit with irresolutions rather than process them toward a conclusion. History establishes facts. Law assigns liability. Politics negotiates terms. Fiction does something different: it keeps the human texture of historical violence present without collapsing into either denial or a guilt that exhausts itself without going anywhere. That is not a substitute for the other forms of reckoning that colonial history demands. But it is something those other forms need alongside them — and something only fiction, with its tolerance for ambiguity and its willingness to remain in a difficult room longer than is quite comfortable, is positioned to provide.

Works Cited

Bhabha, Homi K. The Location of Culture. Routledge, 1994.

Caruth, Cathy. Unclaimed Experience: Trauma, Narrative, and History. Johns Hopkins UP, 1996.

Craps, Stef. Postcolonial Witnessing: Trauma Out of Bounds. Palgrave Macmillan, 2013.

Fanon, Frantz. The Wretched of the Earth. Grove Press, 1963.

Felman, Shoshana, and Dori Laub. Testimony: Crises of Witnessing in Literature,

Psychoanalysis, and History. Routledge, 1992.

LaCapra, Dominick. Writing History, Writing Trauma. Johns Hopkins UP, 2001.

Mbembe, Achille. On the Postcolony. U of California P, 2001.

Rothberg, Michael. Multidirectional Memory: Remembering the Holocaust in the Age of Decolonization. Stanford UP, 2009.

Spivak, Gayatri Chakravorty. "Can the Subaltern Speak?" Marxism and the Interpretation of Culture, edited by Cary Nelson and Lawrence Grossberg, U of Illinois P, 1988, pp. 271–313.

Young, James E. The Texture of Memory: Holocaust Memorials and Meaning. Yale UP, 1993.

How to Cite this article?

Kaushik Deepak. "Postcolonial Trauma, Collective Memory, and the Narrative Ethics of Witnessing in Contemporary Fiction." *Research Journal of English (RJOE)*, vol. 11, no. 1, Jan.–Mar. 2026, Oray's Publications, doi:10.36993/RJOE.2026.11.01.737.