DIGITAL POSTCOLONIALISM

Petar Jandrić[1] and Ana Kuzmanić[2]
[1]Polytechnic of Zagreb, Vrbik 8, Zagreb, Croatia
[2]University of Split, Matice hrvatske 15, Split, Croatia

ABSTRACT

This paper explores theoretical and practical opportunities for describing human expansion into the digital worlds – the so-called 'information revolution' – using the wide body of theories and approaches under the common name of postcolonial science and technology studies (PSTC). In order to employ digital postcolonialism as a feasible research methodology, it explores three dialectically related themes: opportunities for creating a new geography of the digital and creating conceptual bridges between geospatial migrations of the past and digital migrations of the present, the relationships between the digital territories and the digital settlers, and situating the current stage of (post)colonialist developments into a wider historical context. On that basis, it shows that digital postcolonialism might provide a fresh insight into human relationships with information and communication technologies, and explores the main methodological challenges. Finally, it warns that the material base of digital postcolonialism is much more elusive than material base of geographical migration, and points towards further research directions.

KEYWORDS

Postcolonial science and technology studies, digital postcolonialism, critical geography, technology as ideology.

1. INTRODUCTION

Social impacts of information and communication technologies are often discussed using familiar colonial discourse. Founding fathers such as Bill Gates and late Steve Jobs have created brave new *virtual worlds* populated by *digital immigrants* – few decades after, the logic of historical development has created the new *digital natives* (Prensky, 2001). This list of references could be expanded almost indefinitely. Once our attention has been set in an appropriate direction, we have started to notice traces of colonial thinking about information and communication technologies in diverse places from everyday language to prestigious artistic talks and academic journals. Inspired by such traces, this paper explores opportunities for describing human expansion into the digital worlds – the so-called 'information revolution' – using the wide body of theories and approaches under the common name of postcolonial science and technology studies.

Technology and colonialism are dialectically intertwined – one cannot be thought of without the other. However, their relationship can be understood in various ways. According to Itty Abraham, "'postcolonial techno-science' as a way of doing science studies may not be commensurable with 'postcolonial techno-science' as a way of thinking about alternative and local knowledges" (2006: 211). In order to build our theory from ground up, we will try and develop digital postcolonialism as a way of doing science. However, digital postcolonialism could also be used as a way of exploring alternatives to mainstream information and communication technologies, and will do our best to explore that line of reasoning in our future research. Similarly, Warwick Anderson asserts that

> [t]oo often the 'postcolonial' seems to imply yet another global theory, or simply a celebration of the end of colonialism. But it may also be viewed as a signpost pointing to contemporary phenomena in need of new modes of analysis and requiring new critiques. (…) The term 'postcolonial' thus refers both to new configurations of technoscience and to the critical modes of analysis that identify them. (2002: 643)

Deeply immersed in the field of critical theory, this research implies its active role within the society. Digital worlds created by the internet are definitely amongst the most important developments of our times – it goes without saying that they require new research approaches and new critiques. Borrowing one more

sentence from Warwick Anderson, therefore, we can say that our take on digital postcolonialism is an attempt to develop "a means of writing a 'history of the present', of coming to terms with the turbulence and uncertainty of contemporary global flows of knowledge and practice" (ibid: 644).

2. GEOGRAPHY OF THE DIGITAL

In *Culture and Imperialism* Edward Said leaves no trace of doubt that geography is the very heart and soul of imperialism.

> Underlying social space are territories, lands, geographical domains, the actual geographical underpinnings of the imperial, and also the cultural contest. To think about distant places, to colonize them, to populate or depopulate them: all of this occurs on, about, or because of land. The actual geographical possession of land is what empire in the final analysis is all about. (…) The geographical sense makes projections – imaginative, cartographic, military, economic, historical, or in a general sense cultural. It also makes possible the construction of various kinds of knowledge, all of them in one way or another dependent upon the perceived character and destiny of a particular geography. (Said, 1993: 78)

Following Said's argument, it is appropriate to start analysis of digital postcolonialism from inquiry into opportunities for geographical thinking in the digital worlds. In 1974, Henri Lefebvre published the highly influential book *The production of space* (1991). He claims that every society produces own spaces, and that such production is prerequisite for (re)production of social relationships. The contemporary society has produced the digital worlds that consist of two main components: the material space of the internet and the non-material space of the World Wide Web. Gradually, their dialectical mix in the form of digital worlds has become essential for maintenance and (re)production of the contemporary network society. Mechanisms of social reproduction are deeply rooted in human nature. Therefore, the (re)production of the new digital spaces is undertaken by the dominating classes as a tool for (re)production of the existing hegemonic social relationships. In this sense, digital worlds are true Lefebvre's social spaces as described in the following oft-used quotation: "(social) space is a (social) product (...) the space thus produced also serves as a tool of thought and of action (...) in addition to being a means of production it is also a means of control, and hence of domination, of power" (1991: 20).

Obviously, the digital spaces are not physical in the same sense as Madeira. Digital grass cannot be felt on bare feet, digital potatoes will never feed people, and – most importantly – digital artefacts cannot (re)produce life. In spite of being intangible, however, this article on our screens is just as real as coffee mugs placed next to our keyboards. Its production requires intellectual and physical effort. During the process of (re)production, it utilizes physical resources such as plastic, silicon and electricity. Its transport through the network requires energy, and its acceptance by the research community will contribute to tenure appointments of its authors. While the nature of the digital is clearly different from the nature of the physical, those differences do not impede opportunities for spatial thinking in the digital worlds – at least on the abstract level required by digital postcolonialism. In words of David Harvey, "different concepts of space may be appropriate for different theoretical purposes. It may be realistic to regard the concept of space, therefore, as a 'multidimensional' concept in the sense that the concept has a different meaning according to cultural background, perceptual ability, and scientific purpose" (Harvey, 1973: 197). Based on Lefebvre's concept of production of space, therefore, digital worlds can be considered as fully developed physical, social, economic, cultural and linguistic territories.

The task of science is to survey and map the new territories. In general, the territory is an entity that is being described; the map is a description which represents human knowledge of the territory. The map covers the same space as the territory, but in less detail. Therefore, the map forever remains representation of the territory and never reaches the full accuracy. In this way, map-making is inextricably linked to epistemology. In order to build maps smaller than territories, map-makers must inevitably exclude and simplify – political maps are focused to physical borders between countries, while meteorological maps are focused to the dynamics of water and air. Furthermore, map-makers are always at least indirectly immersed in the mapped territories: it is hard to find a truly apolitical geographer, or a meteorologist who does not care about accuracy of own forecasts. Therefore, maps are never objective or neutral, and the act of map-making is always

political. This understanding gives rise to the field of critical geography. Based in the dialectic between theory and practice, action and reflection, critical geography assumes that "maps are active; they actively construct knowledge, they exercise power and they can be a powerful means of promoting social change" (Crampton and Krygier, 2006: 15).

In the field of postcolonial studies, "the scholarly trend in recent decades has been to view scientific activities such as surveying and mapmaking as two cogs in an imperial machine – a 'scopic regime' – grinding across far-flung colonies and distant landscapes" (Craib, 2009: 481). In this context, cartography is dialectically intertwined with discourses of power as the technology of plunder and control. Imperialist cartography always excludes indigenous knowledges, languages and worldviews. In order to challenge the imperial routines, however, it is not enough to include bits and pieces of indigenous knowledge in the current maps. Instead, we need to "more fully historicize the practices, categories and narratives themselves by not artificially bounding – geographically or socially – the subjects of study in the first place" (ibid). In cyberspace, subjects of study cannot be easily bounded according to any particular criterion – more often than not, it is next to impossible to know who is on the other end of the network. Therefore, Craib's conclusion that "the history of cartographic practice needs to take a social, not solely cultural, turn" (ibid: 487) gains particular relevance in the context of digital postcolonialism.

According to McKenzie Wark, subjectivity may be "formed within two sets of exterior relations, both external to individual subjects and their "consciousness", both equally real. Those two relationships are the map and the territory upon which people locate themselves and form their sense of place." (1994: 62) In this context, the nature of digital territories raises at least two important consequences for critical geography of the digital. First, as Jaron Lanier clearly shows in his analyses of virtual reality, digital worlds provide us with the powerful illusion of detachment from their physical origins (2011). Therefore, mapping the digital is even more susceptible to politics – and requires even more grounding in critical theory. Second, geography of the digital directly influences human decisions about the physical (the internet) and the logical (the World Wide Web) structure of the described territories. Therefore, the map of the digital is just as real as the physical optical fibre that enables its virtual existence.

3. THE DIGITAL SETTLER AND THE PRE-DIGITAL SAVAGE

Digital worlds created by the internet arrive into existence only through interaction with human beings. Therefore, further inquiry into colonization of the digital should be conducted in dialectical relation with the settler. In his analyses of traditional colonial conquests, Frantz Fanon describes this relationship as follows:

> The settler makes history and is conscious of making it. And because he constantly refers to the history of his mother country, he clearly indicates that he himself is the extension of that mother country. Thus the history which he writes is not the history of the country which he plunders but the history of his own nation in regard to all that she skins off, all that she violates and starves. (Fanon, 2001: 40)

Digital colonialism transfers the existing social relationships into another territory, and the very act of settlement irreversibly changes the emitting and the receiving territories and their inhabitants. Certainly, the digital worlds cannot be 'plundered', 'skinned off', 'violated' and 'starved' in any traditional sense. Therefore, differences between geography of Earthly territories and geography of digital territories cause profound differences in the dynamics of settlement. Geographical structure of Earthly territories is given: as powerful as they were, the British could never cause snow in Mumbai. Faced with staggering heat, therefore, the best thing they could do was adapt: re-organise activities in order to avoid the warmest periods of the day, install air-conditioning, eat low-fat foods. This kind of attitude, known as environmental determinism, reflects the view that "environmental features directly determine aspects of human behavior and society" (Encyclopedia Britannica, 2014). Faced with familiar problems, people often instinctively resort to familiar solutions: in the digital worlds, environmental determinism transforms into technological determinism.

However, information and communication technologies are not 'natural' in the same sense as the weather. The structure of the internet – or any other human creation, as Ivan Illich has clearly shown in *Tools for conviviality* (1973) – results from negotiation of various influences that contribute to its design and development. The British in India had the power to conquer territories and introduce new customs. However,

Tim Berners Lee and the creators of the internet had the power to design new territories and customs from the scratch. Naturally, their designs were taken from what Frantz Fanon calls their 'mother country' or the existing social relationships in their environments. However, the digital settlers have much more power over the new territories than their traditional counterparts – therefore, digital postcolonialism rejects technological determinism and replaces it by more nuanced approaches to human agency thus corresponding to theoretical achievements of the third generation of Frankfurt School theorists (Kellner, 2003; Feenberg, 2002).

In early 2000s, Marc Prensky's article *Digital natives, digital immigrants* has become "a commonly-accepted trope within higher education and its broader cultural contexts, as a way of mapping and understanding the rapid technological changes which are re-forming our learning spaces, and ourselves as subjects in the digital age" (Bayne and Ross, 2011: 159). While this trope has recently been heavily contested (ibid), it does not take much to realize its potentials for explorations of digital colonialism. Transferred into the new digital territories, however, the concepts of native and immigrant require a bit of good old-fashioned conceptual analysis. For Edward Said, Frantz Fanon and other postcolonial authors, the first immigrants – known by various names such as colonizers and conquistadores – are curious adventurers, mighty soldiers, zealous missionaries, cold-blooded mercenaries, heartless murderers, savage rapists, true oppressors, male, white machistas who plunder the colonized territories and extract their riches for the benefit of themselves and their crowns. During colonization of the digital, however, the likes of Christopher Columbus, Vasco da Gama and Amerigo Vespucci have been replaced by people such as Tim Berners Lee, Steve Jobs and Mark Elliot Zuckerberg.

So what are the digital colonists like? Without any doubt, they are also curious, adventurous, brave, bold, organized, white, middle class, and male; many amongst this colorful lot made even larger fortunes than their ancient counterparts. However, their strategies of domination are very different from those employed in the age of geographic discoveries, as historical forms of legalized crime such as murder and rape have been replaced by the global system that consistently turns a blind eye to unhuman conditions in factories throughout the global South. Conceptually and geographically, new forms of oppression closely follow geographic, racial, economic and other lines of traditional colonial relationships. This interesting parallel requires more fundamental research which lies out of scope of this paper. For the purpose of the presented argument, it is enough to recognize that – while digital colonists cannot be literally paired with their ancient counterparts – Fanon's concept of colonists as creators of the colonized territories is even truer in the context of the digital. Prior to arrival of the digital settlers, the digital worlds were lifeless, empty, non-existent – it is only through their creative interaction with physical infrastructure, that the digital worlds came into the current form of being.

Speaking of natives, things are obviously different. In the context of traditional colonialism, natives are the original inhabitants of the colonized territories, recipients of other nations' colonial ambitions, sufferers of territorial conquest, slaves to colonial masters, infidels who dearly hold on to their backward religions, lazy savages who need to be put into service of civilized peoples. As Syed Hussein Alatas masterfully explains in *The myth of the lazy native* (1997), this image is a social construction designed and developed by colonial masters in order to serve their political and economic interests. Following a similar pattern, digital conquistadores have also created own class of savages. Obviously, empty digital worlds which arrive into existence only through interaction with the settlers do not have own pre-existing natives. Instead, the new savages are sought for and created elsewhere – from the population that did not follow digital conquistadores into the digital worlds, or people residing on the non-privileged side of the digital divide. In this way, the age-old principle of creating the savage has merely shifted direction: instead of creating the savage from peoples found in the new territories, digital colonialism has modelled the savage from peoples who are left behind in the old territories. Simultaneously, digital colonialism has created own class of digital natives – people who were born into the world of information and communication technologies, their most able users, the true citizens of the network society. The concept of the digital native does not have an exact counterpart in traditional postcolonial theory. However, their main features are roughly the opposite from traditional colonial natives. In order to remain within postcolonial discourse and avoid terminological confusion, therefore, we paired traditional natives with digital savages. While this linguistic acrobatics adequately serves requirements of this article, further developments in digital postcolonialism will inevitably have to develop a more nuanced jargon.

In order to (re)produce superiority, the settler needs the inferior other, the primitive, the savage. While critical theory clearly recognizes that 'inferior' features of savage peoples result from objective conditions in their surroundings, traditional colonialism had to create the savage (Harding, 2011). Similarly, the supposed superiority of the digital arrives into existence only through juxtaposition with the pre-digital. Up to very recently, there was nothing wrong with traditional face to face communication, education or business. It is only through introduction of information and communication technologies that traditional activities have been digitalized and 'improved', while their prior versions have been proclaimed 'primitive'. As soon as the command of information and communication technologies has become necessary for full participation in the society, digital colonialism has evoked the familiar discourse of personal responsibility for structural inequalities. In ancient times, the savage was guilty of being poor, dirty and ill; contemporary pre-digital savage (at least in good part) is guilty of being unable to use computers. Thus, digital postcolonialism has created own version of 'the myth of the lazy [pre-digital] native' (Hussein Alatas, 1997) that needs to be saved from ignorance, poverty and the sin of failing to catch up with the 'inevitable' logic of technological development. In spite of all advances brought by information and communication technologies, the relationship between the digital settler and the pre-digital savage has remained one of exploitation, violation, and oppression.

4. DIGITAL POSTCOLONIALISM

When first sailors embarked on new lands, their large ships and fair skin impressed the savages. They made peace and traded: knives for food, mirrors for gold, glass pearls for ebony. In the early days of colonization this exchange was conducted on more or less equal grounds, because the sailors were still mere visitors – received and treated just like any other foreigners. Soon after, however, the sailors had been followed by the settlers, and it became clear that the white man was here to stay. The settlers brought their ways of living, working and organizing daily affairs, and the traditional ways of functioning slowly but surely became out of date. The settler economy was blooming, and vast open pastures that once belonged to savages gave way to organized plantations, mines and manufacture. Naturally, the savage did not let go easily – however, the logic of techno-social development has inevitably pushed once free hunters, gatherers, shamans and many other occupations into one or another form of slavery. Centuries later, the most stubborn savages have exiled into reservation sites, where they still trade their 'original way of life' for a modest living in the modern society.

When first people embarked into the digital worlds, chess-playing machines and immersive worlds of virtual reality impressed the pre-digital savages. They lived in peace and traded: algorithms for scholarships, network protocols for PhDs, computer programs for wages. In the early days of digital technologies this exchange was conducted on more or less equal grounds, because computers were still just tools – handled and developed just like any other machinery. Soon after, however, more people settled into the digital worlds. Digital technologies entered homes, offices and factories, and the traditional ways of functioning slowly but surely became out of date. The settler economy was blooming, and vast open pastures that once belonged to pre-digital savages had been narrowed down to sporadic niche jobs and hobbies. Naturally, the savage did not let go easily – however, the logic of techno-social development has inevitably transformed professors, tradespeople, artists and many other occupations into operators of various digital machines. Decades later, the most stubborn savages have exiled into the small niche of manual occupations, where they still trade their 'pre-digital way of life' for a modest living in the modern society.

The dynamics of early settlement is obviously very different from the dynamics of late colonialism and/or postcolonialism. Early settlers plunder using brute weaponry and strong colonial administration; postcolonialism exploits through politics of knowledge, representation and cultural perception of the colonizer and the colonized, human relationships within the colonial nations, and ideology. Therefore, the current dynamics of human settlement into the digital should be placed into an appropriate historical context. During the past few decades, the digital worlds had been created and conquered. Their founding fathers such as late Steve Jobs are slowly but surely entering history. Recent critiques of Prensky's digital natives and digital immigrants "argue against the reduction of our understanding of these issues to a simplistic binary" (Bayne and Ross, 2011: 169). Recent research of the digital divide is oriented towards alternative formulations "which take into account the hybrid, scattered, ordered and individualized nature of cyberspaces" (Graham, 2011). Important social changes such as the development of the global class-in-the-

making, the precariat, reflect a multiplicity of tensions between the global North and the global South, the industry and the environment, the digital and the pre-digital (Standing, 2011). Profound global impacts of digital colonialism have reached all the way to worldwide acceptance of evolution from the mass society to the network society (van Dijk, 1999; Castells, 2001).

Temporal aspects of this evolution are obvious – we are witnessing the period of fastest technological development in human history. However, it is (again) the geographical aspects that are particularly relevant for the current dynamics of settlement into the digital. At the end of 2013, 34.3% of world population was online. This percent vastly varies amongst countries: from 92.9% in the Netherlands, 83% in Germany and 78,1% in the USA to 1.1% in Ethiopia and 1.2%, in Congo (Internetworldstats, 2014). In order to analyze the current stage of colonization of the internet, we shall draw a brief comparison with its geographical counterpart. In 2014, the global North has a decent network of roads and railways (internet infrastructure) as well as legal institutions (data protection laws, international treaties, technical standards). Slavery had recently been abolished (internet access has transformed from commodity into social category), but the unequal social relationships resulting from colonialism cannot be stronger (the digital divide still strictly follows the poverty line) (van Dijk and Hacker, 2003). In the global North, therefore, digital colonialism has already transformed into early stages of digital postcolonialism. The global South, however, still anticipates the sweeping wave of digital colonialism. Its internet infrastructure is yet to be built, its technology-related laws are yet to be adopted, and pre-digital slavery is still the stark reality. Naturally, it is hard to expect that the global South will re-invent digital technologies from the scratch. Instead, it is likely to buy Northern technologies, re-write Northern laws, and adopt Northern social inclusion policies – and it is even more likely to pay for these services by exporting natural goods in various forms from oil and minerals to human labour. Powered by globalization, uneven development is dialectically intertwined with usage, design and production of information and communication technologies (Smith and Harvey, 2008: 147).

Using its upper hand in the fields of science and technology, the global North utilizes (its knowledge of) information and communication technologies to maintain its borders and inculcate superiority. In this way, we arrive directly to Michel Foucault's concept of power-knowledge (1980) and to the notion of technology as ideology. Few centuries ago, colonists set out to 'civilize' the savage by introducing Christian missionary schools that taught basic skills such as reading, writing and calculus – all soaked up in the Holy Scriptures. In this way they inculcated knowledge, values, representations, and ideology of the colonial powers, only occasionally allowing minor cosmetic adjustments such the Black Madonna. They preached that every government is divine, and that only the meek will inherit the Kingdom of God, thus employing religion directly into the political and economic service of colonialism. Throughout the twentieth century, Frankfurt School theorists have repeatedly shown that modern technology has become the new (colonial) ideology – information and communication technologies are considered as humanity's inevitable destiny, and only their meek adopters will inherit the network society.

Evidence of the colonial nature of information and communication technologies is all around us. For instance, two short sentences in the back panels of our smartphones – 'Designed by XXX in California. Produced in China' – say conceptually the same thing as our complex analyses. Global IT companies will happily map Nigerian streets for those who can afford their geographic information systems. During the process, Nigerian precariat will spend long hours driving smart cars designed in California and produced in China for a meagre wage and no social security. Powered by information and communication technologies, traditional colonial relationships have gained new wind in their sails. For instance, our Nigerian precarious workers might 'subjectivate' (Foucault, 1980) their 'inferiority' to the Western 'digital masters', and be proud to work in the lowest ranks of a successful global corporation. Their Californian employers might evoke the myth of the lazy pre-digital savage and complain about bad performance of digital immigrant workers. Opportunities for drawing such analogies are numerous, and we are strongly convinced that they might significantly contribute to our understanding of the network society. In this way, digital postcolonialism might graduate from a mere description of the contemporary reality to the powerful tool for scientific inquiry.

5. DISCUSSION

This paper stablishes opportunities for using postcolonial thinking for analyzing the relationships between information and communication technologies and the society. Digital postcolonialism reveals economic and social relationships between the users and the non-users of information and communication technologies, between the global North and the global South, between the rich and the poor, between the oppressor and the oppressed. Once again, missionaries from 'civilized' countries bring 'enlightenment' to the 'savage' – this time, in the form of creating material and educational preconditions for 'informatization'. At the one hand, the return to the familiar terrain of economic, cultural and military domination gives some confidence in accuracy of digital postcolonialism. For instance, its elegant explanation of technological determinism can be interpreted as a powerful confirmation of the developed theories. At the other hand, however, it still remains to be answered whether digital postcolonialism is a mere coincidence – a curious, but unimportant consequence of universality of human nature – or it can be used as a research methodology. In the worst case scenario, this paper will represent just another description of the current reality. In the best case scenario, it will start a new, exciting research adventure.

Cyberspace was born and raised in fully artificial laboratory conditions. With the advent of participatory web, however, digital colonists have quickly built up own communities, customs and even vernaculars, while research methods such as internet ethnography have quickly gained popularity. Local knowledges and languages are rising in importance, and researching contemporary phenomena on the World Wide Web strongly resembles the phase of epistemic primitive accumulation (Hess, 2011: 429). 'Hard' sciences such as physics and electronics have created the digital worlds of the internet – in turn, our experiences from these worlds have started to question the primacy of 'hard' sciences. This inversion is an essential feature of postcolonial science and technology studies, and might be used as another argument in favor of developing digital postcolonialism. However, the developed perspective is burdened with profound methodological challenges. Digital postcolonialism is based on the idea of human expansion into new digital territories. While our analyses introduce some theoretical opportunity for geographical thinking in cyberspace, such expansion is clearly metaphoric. Therefore, theoretical opportunities for digital postcolonialism are deeply rooted in fundamental, unanswered questions about the nature of relationships between the analog and the digital.

Last but not least, the rise of the network society cannot be further from the smooth curve of technology development envisioned by technological determinists – instead, it is a battlefield of various world-views, cultures, interests and social forces. Certainly, we could try and align digital postcolonialism with traditional anthropological approaches. Moving towards postmodernism, we might also follow Edward Said and examine the impacts of digital postcolonialism through the lens of Michel Foucault's discourse. In a recent paper, however, Warwick Anderson has clearly showed that the mentioned approaches do not provide the best fit for postcolonial science and technology studies (2002: 646-650). Looking into the existing body of research, it is fairly obvious which theories should not be used to place digital postcolonialism into a historical perspective. However, there will be a lot of water under the bridge before digital postcolonialism manages to develop a theory that would situate its 'history of the present' (ibid: 644) in the context of past and future.

6. CONCLUSION

Faced with numerous opportunities offered by information and communication technologies we dream, hope, fear and anticipate. Sometimes, such as in the embarrassing case of the Millennium Bug, we develop unjustified collective fears. Other times, such as in the unfulfilled vision of the paperless office, we expect too much from technologies. Some people try and replace real-life relationships with online social networking, while 'cyborgs' go as far as replacing physical parts of their bodies. To each their own – our expectations often say more about us than they say about our technologies. However, it cannot be denied that we live in exciting times. Immersed in the spirit of the moment, it is often hard to see wood from trees. In order to achieve a balanced view of our present relationships with information and communication technologies, therefore, they need to be placed in relation with the past and the future.

Digital postcolonialism is an attempt to create a historical framework for our understanding of human relationships to information and communication technologies. It starts from the deep human need to migrate from one space to another, and ends in the vast open fields of postmodernism. Based in the research framework of postcolonial science and technology studies, digital colonialism might absorb wide bodies of research in various fields including but not limited to technologies, postcolonial studies, philosophy, education, economy and arts. Therefore, it could contribute to diverse debates from global trade to citizenship. However, it should be remembered that the material base of digital postcolonialism is much more elusive than the material base of geographical migration. After all, digital postcolonialism is merely another lens for viewing our reality, and it is only with great caution that it might be transformed into a research methodology. At the current state of development, digital postcolonialism is just another attempt in the ancient quest for scientific unification – and the one in serious need of deeper evaluation.

REFERENCES

Abraham, I., 2006. The Contradictory Spaces of Postcolonial Techno-Science. *Economic and Political Weekly, 41(3),* pp. 210-217.

Anderson, W., 2002, Postcolonial Technoscience. *Social Studies of Science,* 32(5/6), pp. 643-658.

Bayne, S. and Ross, J., 2011. 'Digital native' and 'digital immigrant' discourses: a critique. In Land, R. and Bayne, S. (Eds). *Digital Difference: Perspectives on Online Learning*. Sense Publishers, London, pp.159–169.

Castells, M., 2001. *The Internet galaxy: reflections on the Internet, business, and society*. Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Crampton, J. W. and Krygier, J., 2006. An Introduction to Critical Cartography. *ACME: An International E-Journal for Critical Geographies,* 4 (1), pp. 11-33.

Encyclopædia Britannica (2014) Environmental determinism. Available at: http://www.britannica.com/EBchecked/topic/189178/environmental-determinism (accessed 10 August 2014).

Fanon, F., 2001. *The wretched of the Earth*. Penguin, London.

Feenberg, A., 2002. *Transforming Technology: A Critical Theory Revisited*. Oxford University Press, New York.

Foucault, M., 1980. Truth and Power. In Gordon, C. (Ed), *Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Essays, 1972-1977.* Pantheon Books, New York, pp.109-134.

Graham, M., 2011. Time machines and virtual portals: the spatialities of the digital divide. *Progress in development studies*, 11(3), pp. 211-227.

Harding, S., 2011. (Ed). *The Postcolonial Science and Technology Studies Reader*. Duke University Press, Durham and London.

Hardt, M. and Negri, A., 2001. *Empire.* Harvard University Press, Harvard.

Harvey, D., 1973. *Explanation in Geography.* Edward Arnold Publishers, London.

Hess, D. J., 2011. Science in an Era of Globalization: Alternative Pathways. In Harding, S., 2011. (Ed). *The Postcolonial Science and Technology Studies Reader*. Duke University Press, Durham and London, pp.419-439.

Hussein Alatas, S., 1997. *The Myth of the Lazy Native*. Frank Cass, London.

Illich, I., 1973. *Tools for Conviviality*. Marion Boyars Publishers Ltd, London.

Internetworldstats, 2014. World Internet Users and Population Stats. Available at: http://www.internetworldstats.com/ (accessed 10 August 2014).

Kellner, D., 2003. *Media spectacle.* Routledge, London.

Lanier, J., 2011. *You Are Not A Gadget: A Manifesto*. Penguin, London.

Lefebvre, H., 1991[1974]. *The Production of Space*. Blackwell, London.

Prensky, M., 2001. Digital natives, digital immigrants. *On the horizon,* 9(5).

Said, E. W., 1993. *Culture and imperialism.* Vintage Books, New York.

Seth, S., 2009. Putting knowledge in its place: science, colonialism, and the postcolonial. *Postcolonial Studies,* 12(4), pp. 373-388.

Smith, N. and Harvey, D., 2008. *Uneven Development: Nature, Capital, and the Production of Space*. University of Georgia Press, Athens and London.

Van Dijk, J. and Hacker, K., 2003. The Digital Divide as a Complex and Dynamic Phenomenon. *The Information Society,* 19, pp. 315-326.

Van Dijk, J., 1999. *The Network Society*. SAGE, London.

Wark, M., 1994. Virtual geography. Indiana University Press, Bloomington and Indianapolis.