Dr Sarah Lawson Welsh (York St John University, UK: s.lawsonwelsh@ysj.ac.uk)

Editor's Note to *Journal of Postcolonial Writing* 52.6. Print copy December 2016.

See also http://www.tandfonline.com/toc/rjpw20/current

In her keynote speech to the annual Conservative Party Conference in October 2016, British Prime Minster Theresa May spoke in startlingly disparaging terms of a version of cosmopolitanism familiarly recast as "global citizenship". Only a few weeks before, in the wake of the result of the national referendum to decide on whether Britain should remain in the European Union, Sadiq Khan, the newly elected (and first Muslim) Mayor of London, declared London was "still open for business" and, through a series of promotional videos, actively celebrated London as a thoroughly multicultural and polyglot "world city", a place not just *in* the world but *of* the world. These were starkly different readings of cosmopolitanism and "global citizenship". For May, it would seem, cosmopolitanism thus narrowly (re-)defined was, and is, fundamentally antithetical to "the meaning of citizenship". To those who considered themselves "citizens of the world" she retorted: "you are citizens of nowhere. You don't even know the meaning of citizenship". For some commentators, what was disquieting about this statement was the dark spectre of earlier historical uses of the term, as for example, when the term "rootless cosmopolitan" was derogatorily used by Stalin to justify his purge of Jewish intellectuals in 1940s Russia. The "rootless Jew" as a derogatory trope of cosmopolitanism also features in earlier 20th-century anti-Semitic discourse and was adopted by the Nazis in order to justify their annihilation of Jews in the Holocaust as transitory "non-citizens" and, more disturbingly, as "non-persons".[1] For other commentators, May's rejection of any positive framing of cosmopolitanism amounted to the rejection of a foundational enlightenment principle[2] and an endorsement instead of a thinly veiled British nationalism; this was, it would seem, the "acceptable" face of nationalism in the Brave New World of post-Brexit Britain.

Although, written before these events, Lydia Efthymia Roupakia's article, "Cosmopolitanism, religion and ethics in re-reading Monica Ali's *Brick Lane*", anticipates and echoes some of these concerns: the narrow constraints of national borders (chiefly in relation to religion in Roupakia's argument) and a rethinking of the way we approach and interpret cosmopolitanism in relation to religion, ethics and citizenship. Roupakia argues that Stuart Hall's concept of "vernacular cosmopolitanism" is most useful here in providing a theoretical "approach to belonging that is pragmatic as it draws on the complexity of familial relationships and employ's metaphors most people can identify with". Carefully contextualizing some of the critical ruptures and contestatory moments surrounding the reception of *Brick Lane* as a novel and the making of the 2007 film adaptation of Ali's novel directed by Sarah Gavron, Roupakia seeks to rethink critical discussions of the role of religion in "cosmopolitan" writings more widely, in ways which return religion to its transnational and global dimensions (rather than purely personal valencies). In addition, she draws upon Selma Sevenhuijsen's work on the ethics of care in order to rethink the responsibilities of the female characters in the novel.

Elsewhere in this otherwise very diverse general issue, contributors are drawn to a critical consideration of different "excremental visions" and images of contamination, defilement and

abjection in a range of postcolonial contexts. These are examined most fully by Nicole Thiara in her study of the Dalit (Untouchable) characters in Mulk Raj Anan's *Untouchable* (1935) and Amitav Ghosh's *Sea of Poppies* (2009). Despite being published 74 years apart and being set in different centuries, the two texts' use of scatological imagery can be seen as strikingly similar. Mikhail Bakhtin's concept of the carnivalesque is used in order to map the inversion of caste hierarchies in the two focal novels, showing how they often include grotesque imagery of excrement. The key question Thiara asks in this piece is whether such "critical representations of Untouchability and caste in these novels amount to a critique of the caste system *per se*, or whether they are confined to the practices of Untouchability".

In her critical examination of Albert Wendt's classic dystopian text, *Black Rainbow* (1992), Julia A. Boyd shows how the "excremental vision" at the heart of this novel takes the form of waste which is literally and symbolically toxic: Pacific islanders' experience of -- and resistance to -- the social, political and environmental "fallout" of nuclearism as a form of neo-colonialism in the Pacific. Boyd argues that nuclear toxicity is characterized in Wendt's novel as "the intersection between material and spiritual colonialisms, from Aotearoa/ New Zealand landscapes toxified by nuclear violence and colonial erasure, to human bodies dis-eased when radiogenic illness entangles with the products of neo-liberal economics." She examines the wider critical implications of nuclearism for postcolonial literary studies and argues that Wendt's "restorying of Oceanic resistance" in this novel is more relevant than ever, given the disproportionate effects on First Nation peoples of human-made environmental challenges we face today in what many scientists and environmentalists are terming the era of the "Anthropocene". Indeed, the clash between powerful global multinationals, neo-liberal agendas and the needs of First Nation peoples in relation to land, water and other natural resources is still hugely relevant. At the time of writing there is widespread US and worldwide support for Native American and environmentalist-led protests at the Standing Rock Indian Reservation which spans parts of North and South Dakota in the USA. These protests are against the plan to route the vast Dakota Access oil pipeline through sacred ancestral burial grounds and archaeological sites, a project which will also possibly pollute the Sioux's main water source.

Whilst Boyd's focus is very much on the human cost and the unevenness of agency (and lack of agency) at the heart of European nuclear policies and activities in the Pacific region, Jay Rajiva's article takes a very different approach to the human in relation to the non-human. In his article, "'The instant of waking from the nightmare': Emergence Theory and postcolonial experience in *Season of Migration to the North*", his ambition is to "bring […] postcolonial literature into dialog [sic] with the concept of emergence in the field of biological science", drawing in particular on Jeffery Goldstein and Peter Cornins's writing on the theory of downward causation. At the heart of Rajiva's analysis is the idea that there might be "emergent form[s] of postcolonial experience […] in which the centrality of non-human matter's role in shaping human subjectivity resists and exceeds the analytic frameworks of biological determinism and humanist agency". Using Tayeb Salih's 2009 novel *Season of Migration to the North* as his case study, Rajiva looks at the trajectories and "joint decision-making" with non-human elements taken by key characters and argues that Emergence theory allows us to read postcolonial novels such as this in some new and productive ways.

Two contributors to this issue bring postcolonial readings to bear on works by writers not usually read within a postcolonial framework. In "Sexuality, Race and Empire in Alan Hollinghurst's 'A Thieving Boy' (1983)" Ed Dodson draws on Edward Said's influential

notion of "contrapuntal reading"[3] to read against the grain Hollinghurst's early short story set in Egypt. Dodson argues that Hollinghurst's fiction has always engaged with issues of race and sexuality in relation to Empire and to narratives of decolonization. However, he suggests, this element has often been overshadowed by dominant, queer readings which are not sufficiently attuned to "the postimperial politics at stake" in the ways in which Hollinghurst's fictions represent race and nation. Dodson turns to Hollinghurst's non-fictional writing as well as his complex intertextual relationships with earlier queer "writers of empire" such as E.M. Forster and Ronald Firbank, in order to argue that the story can be read as a "postimperial rewriting of E.M. Forster's (homo)sexual awakening". He concludes by considering the category of the 'postimperial in relation to postcolonial writing" and some of the wider implications of his rereading.

Molly E. Ferguson's "Killing Them Softly: Pillowmen Assassins in the works of Martin McDonagh and Salman Rushdie" looks at selected writing by two "contemporary authors of postmodern satire" whose texts have both dealt with controversial subject matter and which, on reception, have both ignited fierce critical debate. Ferguson starts from the curious fact that Rushdie's 1999 text, *The Ground Beneath her Feet* and McDonagh's 1994 play *The Pillowman* (first staged in 2003) both share independently-created fictional assassins called Pillowman. However, rather than tracing the intertextual links between the two writers Ferguson is more interested in their deployment of the pillowman as a trope, as "emasculated male characters who turn to violence out of shame", performing an "aggressive masculinity" which, she argues, is a "vestigial by-product of the colonial power structure".

Power is also at the heart of Edmund Chapman's article "Nature, Religion and Freedom in Aimé Césaire's *Une Tempête"* which inverts readings of Caliban as symbolic of the colonial subject dispossessed from their own (is)land by suggesting that "freedom based on the potential for movement, [is] achieved through a radical relinquishing of ties to land […] a rejection of rootedness". Chapman's sensitive and important reading of Césaire's classic anticolonial text of negritude directs us back to the specificity of the appearance of the African trickster god, Eshu, in the play and argues that Césaire's meditation on the nature of freedom in *Une Tempête* is altogether more complex than is often assumed. Rather than representing some nativist notion of African "authenticity" or purity as some critics maintain, Eshu represents instead an unfixity and hybridity which is ultimately liberating.

Finally, Md. Mahmudul Hasan's article "Muslim Bengal Writes back: a study of Royeka's encounter with and representations of Europe" adds to the growing scholarship on early Muslim writers within Postcolonial Studies by focusing on one of the most prominent 20th-century Muslim women writers from what is now Bangladesh: Royeka Sakhawat Hossain (1880-1932). Hasan traces Hossain's important role as an early women's activist, educator and writer in Muslim Bengal and assesses her important scholarly contribution to the intercultural exchange (including in some cases translations) of European ideas, texts and culture *within* a pre-Independence Indian context.

Sarah Lawson Welsh
York St John University, UK

Notes

[1] Rob Sykes, in a comment in response to the online publication of the full transcript of May's speech, published by the *The Guardian*, notes that "Theresa May's assertion of the need to tax "citizens of the world and of

nowhere", presumably referring to foreign investors in the UK, may have been "felicitous" as Simon Jenkins says (May has the party's adoration for now. That won't last, 6 October). Curiously, however, a Google search (deleting the second "of") suggests that the phrase originated as an epithet for the Roma people, albeit not intrinsically a pejorative one. It also bears a striking similarity to the more sinister term "rootless cosmopolitans", deployed by Stalin to justify his late 1940s purge of Jewish intellectuals" (Sykes 2016).

[2] Jeremy Adler, Emeritus Professor of German at Kings College, London, commented: "In attacking world citizenship in her dictum, 'If you believe you are a citizen of the world, you're a citizen of nowhere', Theresa May is in effect repudiating enlightenment values as a whole, for cosmopolitanism is the apex and indeed the glory of enlightenment philosophy, encompassing liberty, equality, fraternity, and all our human rights. The greatest of all enlightenment thinkers, Immanuel Kant, proposed the ideal of world citizenship as a means to achieve perpetual peace. In the 20th century, his views underwrote the founding of the United Nations, an organisation which invokes world citizenship as a means to attain world peace. The very different, pejorative sense of cosmopolitanism adopted by Ms May, however, originates in German anti-Semitic discourse. It emerged in the 19th century: the "rootless Jew" was seen as a "cosmopolitan" citizen from "nowhere". This view is echoed in that most vile of all anti-Semitic texts, "The Protocols of the Elders of Zion" (1903). Subsequently, the prejudice was adopted by the Nazis, and used to justify the slaughter of the Jewish people as "non-citizens" and "non-persons" in the Holocaust" (Adler 2016).

[2] This term is used by Edward Said in *Culture and Imperialism* (1993, 73-81)to describe reading practices which set out to reveal the relationship between (often canonical) texts set in the dominant colonial nations such as England and France, and the colonies upon which the great powers depended for their wealth. Said's most famous contrapuntal reading is of Jane Austen's novel, *Mansfield Park*.

References

Adler, Jeremy. 2016. Letter to *The Guardian*, October 9.
https://www.theguardian.com/politics/2016/oct/09/theresa-may-rejection-of-enlightenment-values
Said, Edward. 1993. *Culture and Imperialism.* London: Chatto & Windus.
Sykes, Rob. 2016. Letter to *The Guardian*, October 9.
https://www.theguardian.com/politics/2016/oct/09/theresa-may-rejection-of-enlightenment-values