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Chapter 2

VERNACULAR COSMOPOLITANS

This chapter examines some cultural texts of cosmopolitanism, these explorations in sociality and hospitality (Derrida 2002, 156) that juxtapose claims to humanity with the constraints of subaltern abjection and with the caution that imagining the stranger differs from imagining oneself as stranger and from being interpellated as stranger in the place one considers home. The phrase “vernacular cosmopolitanism” sounds like an oxymoron and reflects this contradictory dynamics. In anthropologist Prima Weber’s explanation:

Vernacular cosmopolitanism [...] is at the crux of current debates on cosmopolitanism. These pose the question whether the local, parochial, rooted, culturally specific and denomic may co-exist with the translocal, transnational, transcendent, elitist, enlighted, universalist and modernist—whether boundary-crossing demotic migrations may be compared to the globe trotting travel, sophisticated cultural knowledge and moral world-view of deracinated intellectuals. (2006, 496)

As stated in the introduction, Sheldon Pollock notes the ways in which it references the privileged world of the Greek polis as well as the Roman servus or house-born slave (2002). Likewise, Homi Bhabha’s invention of the phrase also drew attention to its contradictory nature (2002, 25) and to the idea that it was marked by repetition rather than ideology (1996). It is a dynamics present as well in Paul Gilroy’s tracing of cosmopolitanism back to Montesquieu’s eighteenth-century satiric text Persian Letters (Gilroy 2005). Because it draws attention to the singular within the plural (Nancy 2000) and to the dynamics of inclusion and exclusion, the concept of vernacular cosmopolitanism is, I believe, a useful approach in this transnational, globalized age.1

For example, many current debates on cosmopolitanism revolve around the tendency to view universal human rights as being in tension with the sovereignty of nation-states, and Immanuel Kant is, for example, invoked on both sides of this argument. In Another Cosmopolitanism, Seyla Benhabib
argues that Kant's significance lies not so much in his doctrine of universal hospitality (which never includes rights to citizenship) as in the ways in which his three articles on definitive peace are articulated together (2096, 146). In consequence, "The discourse of hospitality moves from the language of morals to that of juridical rights [...] legal cosmopolitanism, according to which the individual is not only a moral being who is a member of a universal moral community but is also a person entitled to a certain status in a world civil society" (149). While Benhabib recognizes the claims of the state and the fact that we act politically from within bounded communities (169), these "state borders and frontiers, require moral justification" (151). Furthermore, when it comes to articulating the "democratic people" in relation to the nation, those who are excluded from the nation (on whose behalf these debates concerning morality occur) are precisely not permitted to participate in legislation concerning human rights. "Citizenship and naturalization are sites where the disjunctions between nationhood and democratic peoples become most apparent" (168). From this, her argument is that naturalized European Union citizens should have the same rights as all other European Union citizens (173). In her vision of a "cosmopolitanism to come," Benhabib reinforces the need for solidarities beyond borders and the recognition of universal rights to hospitality (177). In relation to this last point, it is important to recall that in Derrida's interpretation, there is recognition that hospitality is always permeated by hostility; hence his neologism:*)*(*hostipality*(2002, 156).

** Allegories of Cosmopolitanism: "Eastern" Europe

The subheading deliberately echoes Fredric Jameson's much-critiqued essay "Third World Literature in the Era of Multinational Capitalism," where he argues that all so-called third-world texts necessarily function as national allegories (1985, 69). In parallel ways, many contemporary texts dealing with Eastern Europe are read as (and to some degree written as) allegories of post-Soviet cosmopolitanism in both their utopian and dystopian variants. But what is the meaning of the Eastern Europe of my subtitle? Dubravka Ugresic suggests the following:

The problem of orientation in Europe comes from the fantasies of its inhabitants about themselves and others. Tourist guides of dusty rhetoric have tried to convince us that their countries, regions or cities have served through their whole history as a bulwark against the Other; the Other invariably, of course, coming from the East. It turns out that all the inhabitants of Europe would rather see themselves as part of its western than its eastern end. To be at its western end gives Europeans the feeling that they are on the right side of life.

The other keyword of national fantasies is *crossroads*. If they have nothing else, at least these peoples, countries and cities experience themselves as being at crucial junctions.

The bulwark and the crossroads are the most widely held fantasies of small peoples as they construct a positive image of themselves. ("Europe, Europe," 2007, 111–112)

Such phantasmatic investments occur both in the center and on the peripheries. So let us begin with some attempts to capture what constitutes "Europe."

** Imagining the Stranger: Olivia Manning, Rose Tremain and Rana Dasgupta**

Olivia Manning's Balkan trilogy was first published in 1960 and explores the adventures of a group of young British cosmopolitans (in the old meaning of a certain class of world traveler) associated with the "soft" diplomacy of the British Council in the Balkans in the early days of the Second World War. Manning skilfully exposes their sense of an entitlement that is undergirded by a firm belief in their own modernity and their access to a civilized subjectivity based on the right to designate others as beyond the pale, in this case, that very territory of the Balkans. Here is a characteristic passage set in Bucharest: "A peasant had brought a handsome lady with melons into the town and tipped them out at the park gates. [...] Repelled by their profusion, she had an odd fancy that, gathered there in a flashing mass of yellow and gold, the melons were not really inert, but hiding a pulsating craftiness that might, if unchecked, one day take over the world" (1974, 63).

In her influential study *Imaging the Balkans*, Maria Todorova has mapped out such "Balkanism" in ways that are homologous to (but different from) Said's well-known concept of orientalism. She discerns what she terms a "nested orientalism" within Balkanism itself, particularly in the nationalist discourses surrounding the demise of the former Yugoslavia. Todorova's more recent work analyzes the "belatedness" associated with the Balkans that will be familiar to postcolonial theorists. Such tropes are very visible in Olivia Manning's Balkans, which are peopled by venal aristocrats and primitive peasants, and it is instructive to see how the corruption of Rumania is juxtaposed with the inherent "nobility" of Greece in the final volume (comprising Byronic English Hellenophollism); here the classical portraits of warrior sacrifices remain exemplary reference points for representing the Allied forces in the Second World
War. In addition, the figure of the “cosmopolitan Jew” makes an interesting and troubling appearance.²

But have such perspectives of the “English eclecticism of belonging” (Gilroy’s inspired phrase, 2004, 83) changed in current British writing by those who are imagining the stranger? For example, despite its many moving evocations of what it means to be a stranger in Britain, Rose Tremain’s The Road Home (2006) effectively denies a homeland to the protagonist, Lev, by embedding him in a homogenized terrain. As Neal Ascherson’s perceptive review dryly puts it, “there is no such place as ‘Eastern Europe’” (2009, 38).³ Lev remains a generic device primarily to expose the text’s real subject, the shallowness and corruption of London. This is how the novel’s logic runs: England is currently a capitalist promised land for economic immigrants from “Eastern Europe” whose recent mobility is ensured by the European Union. Yes they suffer, but eventually they return to their homelands and set up entrepreneurial projects that start them down the road to a better life. The “civilizing mission” that haunted colonial texts is also not far away, as in the following passage, where Lev is talking to a compatriot who is also a translator:

“What did you say?” said Lev.
“Ah, just quoting from Hamlet.”
“Hamlet is talking to the grave-maker, yes?”
“Yes. Absolutely. Where did you learn that, Lev?”

Lev, standing in the sunlight, knew there was a smile on his face. Not only had he recognized the line, but now he felt as if he’d suddenly understood why Lydya had given him the play to read. She wanted to show him that words written long, long ago could travel beside you and help you at moments when you could no longer see the road. (2006, 313–314)

Clearly Lev’s knowledge of Shakespeare means that he deserves to be helped to clamber out of social abjection.

A somewhat unexpected final example is an Indian author writing an English text set in Bulgaria. The protagonist of Rana Dasgupta’s Solo is the 100-year-old Ulrich who studied chemistry in Germany and returned to Bulgaria to build the communist dream only to become mired in Todor Zhivkov’s state totalitarianism. Because Ulrich is blind, the text foregrounds acoustic detail—focusing on this sense gives the novel a surprising disorienting dimension. It also paves the way for the second half of the text that moves from rural Bulgaria to New York. The novel also traces the adventures of a musical genius, Boris, who emerges from the unlikely context of a rural ghost town in Bulgaria to be snapped up by a New York entrepreneur who specializes in world music. Eventually Boris’s life converges with those of Khatuna and her brother Ibrail, refugees from the Russian mafia in Tbilisi. Boris encounters Ulrich as the latter daydreams that he has found his lost son, whose mother took him to the United States. Ultimately, however, like Tremain’s Lev, Dasgupta’s characters function predominately to expose the parallel corruptions of the post-Soviet and capitalist worlds. Dasgupta’s corrupt and amorful New York is a mirror image of Tremain’s London. And his tale relies too much on the stereotypes associated with “Eastern Europe”—the fabulously gaudy life style (leavened by “’gypsy’ influences), the Russian and local mafia—rather than dwelling on the small negotiations of everyday sociality that appeared to be its promise in the text’s first half.⁴

**Imagining Oneself as Stranger: Dubravka Ugresic and Herta Müller**

If Amsterdam was a stage, I had a double role: I was both audience and performer, watcher and watched. (Ugresic 2005, 79).

As I’ve mentioned, Dubravka Ugresic is a writer with a compellingly sardonic point of view that serves, among other things, to depict a world that has been pulled away from under her. Her work fiercely satirizes “nostalgia” (Nobody’s Home), in which exile from Eastern Europe recreates small pockets of their former lives in the midst of the affluent West (2007, 27–29), but that also depicts the utopian fantasies of a Yugoslav elementary school primer that no longer has a state to educate (in the Culture of Sas 1998, 13–19). This “yugos-
talgia” acquires more sinister connotations in Ugresic’s novel The Ministry of Pain (2005), where a group of characters indulges in a memory game to recover the everyday textures of a former society only to find that its activities catapult the group members into a violence and trauma that require stringent attempts to exorcise the aftermath. At the same time that she recreates with fidelity a world that no longer exists, Ugresic also uses her estranged standpoint to survey the new globalization. Within the European Union the former Yugoslavs find their place as cleaning ladies. The narrator surveys the new stereotypes, noting that “my cosmopolitan countrywomen are known far and wide as excellent housekeepers in EU apartments, homes and public laundries” (2007, 26). Their newly partitioned countries occupy another set of carefully assigned holding places while they await coveted inclusion into the European Union: “It is no easy matter being a small nation. How does one even know where to begin? That must be why the first thing that occurs to the member is to orientate himself in time. [...] And there, just beyond the impenetrable bulwark, you can hear the snorting of horses and the frustrated howls
of the barbarians trying unsuccessfully to invade from the East” (55). It is also the case that Ugresic could be seen as self-balkanizing in ways that others have mapped self-orientalizing, that is, an internalized objection: “We are the barbarians. We have no writing; we leave our signatures on the wind: we utter sounds, we signal with our calls, our shouts, our screams, our spat. That is how we mark our territory. Our fingers drum on everything they touch: dustbins, windowpanes, pipes. We drum, therefore we are. [...] Our tribe is cursed” (2005, 222–223).

When she is not in her Slavonic register, Ugresic gains pleasure from contemplating the category of hybrid cosmopolitan writer that has been projected onto her. In an essay tellingly titled “What Is European about European Literature?” Ugresic (2007, 163–176) identifies her favorite confounder of categories and canons: Jordeep Roy Bhattacharaya, who steadfastly writes about Hungary (170–171). Presciently she suggests that it might be simplest to rearrange geopolitical entities into corporacies so that one would refer to oneself as hailng from Ikea or Microsoft (182). Such is the nature of subjects who do not choose their displacement but who can offer signposts concerning the “singular” pedagogical reverberations of their narratives.

Herta Müller’s community is an island of German speakers within Romania. While the community itself was discriminated against, according to her its members maintained a certain class confidence or linguistic aplomb in that they had the reassurance of being part of a major global language.” This reaction reminds me of my own experience growing up in Australia with German as my mother tongue. While the designation NESB (non-English-speaking background) was a primary fault line establishing those who belonged and those who did not enjoy full cultural franchise, the many books my impractical parents brought with them attested to a cultural and linguistic substance that belied the low social currency held at the time by non-Anglo postwar immigrants—designated as either laborer or domestic worker (not unlike Ugresic’s cleaning ladies). Like many other displaced persons in the immediate postwar period, my parents were professionals with university training, so we maintained an awareness of cultural capital even though it was not recognized by the national culture at the time, that is, did not correspond to the ways in which they were interrogated. The effect on people like myself was to develop an exile awareness, whether it be the “contrapuntal awareness” analyzed by Said, the double consciousness of Du Bois’s African Americans, the differently split self of Betweensian linguistics (énonciation/énonciation), or that of the Krстаev subject-in-process.

Herta Müller’s essay “Der Fremde Blick” (“The Alien Gaze”) (1999) captures this discrepant consciousness very well. In a manner that recalls Gilroy’s concept of becoming estranged from one’s own culture, she raises profound questions concerning the ways in which an outsider’s or alien’s perspective is increasingly useful in terms of nurturing an analytical awareness from an early age. In response to those who welcomed her (refreshingly disparate) critical perspectives on Germany (the place of her mother tongue), Müller maintains that she brought this gaze with her from Romania rather than acquiring it once she arrived in Germany. As a result of being under surveillance by the Romanian Securitate, she became aware of her everyday domestic reality being displaced in micro ways: “Die Welt baute sich Stück für Stück zusammen gegen den Versuch” (“The world rebuilt itself piece by piece against understanding”). In another phrase she speaks of “niel- tige Einge mit wichtigen Schatten” (“lovely objects with significant shadows”). And “Freund ist für mich nicht das Geflecht von bekannt, sondern das Geflecht von Vertraut” (“Strange to me is not the opposite of known, but the opposite of familiar”). From this context she develops her own estrangement as pedagogy, learns to put herself under surveillance (1999, 13) and weans herself off the idea that seeing is believing. The “intact” people she subsequently encounters (those without this split consciousness) in her new context recognize her contrariness and consider it inherent, like a character flaw, and that, indeed (as they convince themselves), it probably constitutes the reason she was put under surveillance in the first place. And yet, she argues, the alien gaze has emerged from the familiar things whose taken-for-granted aura has been removed (27). The literary territory that we are encountering is familiar from Kafka’s legacy—among the first to show us the model of the world as an alienating corporation governed by institutionalized surveillance.

The split consciousness Müller describes is reminiscent of both Freud’s uncanny where the familiar suddenly becomes monstrous (1919/1985) and the Lacanian symbolic split when one enters language (1986). However, in Müller’s case this consciousness does not come primarily via the psyche, but from the outside—from material reality. It consists of the inability to trust the everyday (much less see it as a refuge); there is no stability to anchor even one’s waking conscious moments. This dimension is also explored in Müller’s early novels such as The Land of Green Plums (1998). But here already we see a problem with translation. Müller’s German is deceptively simple, but is rendered dense by complex wordplay. As Jean Boase-Beier suggests, her writing is “semantically complex in proportion to its syntactic simplicity [...] By writing in a syntactically reduced way, she places the burden on the reader to supply the feelings, the fears, the interpretation, the complexity. [...]” This transfer of power to the reader, in a literary playing-out of the transfer of power between the state and the individual that is at the heart of her politics, would seem a
crucial effect for the translator to maintain: to lose it is to lose both Müller’s peotics and her politics” (2013, 197).

The title in German, *Herzstück*, was not used for the English title and appears to be her invention (Haines and Litder 1998, 21). The ubiquitous Google translator suggests “warm animal,” whereas, literally, it is “heart beast” (used throughout the English translation). Characteristically, Müller refuses to pin down this epigrammatic phrase. It can mean a sense of moral compass—perhaps a type of affective sensation—but it can also refer to what destroys you (22). In other words, the nuances of what she is playing with are for the most part extremely difficult to translate.

*The Land of Green Plums* deals with a group of dissident friends, three men and a woman (the narrator), who try to maintain their sanity in Ceausescu’s Romania. Under the surveillance of the sinister Capt. Pjele (complete with dog—a familiar also named Pjele), who tells each one of them that they are lucky to have him as interrogator, they are all serially undone, even when they have succeeded in escaping the country. In order to communicate with each other, the group develops an elaborate code that includes sending a hair with each letter: “The word nail-clippers in a sentence will mean interrogation, said Kurt, shoes will mean a search, a sentence about having a cold will mean you are being followed. After the greeting always an exclamation point, but a comma if your life is in danger” (1998, 81). The rationale for the title is that the trope of green plums functions in ways that parallel the toxic contamination of the surveillance state: “Father says: You can’t eat green plums, their pits are still soft, and you’ll swallow your death. No one can help then—you just die. The child eats and thinks, This will kill me” (15). Of the four friends, only two survive. The other two ostensibly commit suicide, but it is never clear whether their deaths are in fact due to the long and vengeful reach of Capt. Pjele, even outside the country. As for the two survivors, they are left bereft of any beliefs in the redeeming power of friendship or, indeed, that any hopeful human qualities remain. This too is cosmopolitan allegory, but in its most dystopian form.30

In *We, the People of Europe: Reflections on Transnational Citizenship*, Etienne Balibar ponders whether the essential function of Europe might be as “interpreter of the world,” drawing on its repository of very diverse intellectuals. Consider the following: “The idea of the vanishing mediator is probably not so different from the idea of the translator, the intermedial, or the traveller that I have associated with the essential function of the intellectual” (2004, 234).

It is an attractive thought, and certainly the writers assembled in this chapter are both translators and intellectuals, but are not necessarily recognized for being so, and their pedagogical dimension is often ignored. The last example is another conspicuous case in point.

Interpellated as Stranger (Imagining Home): Antigone Kefala

Born of Greek parents in Romania, Antigone Kefala has resided in Australia for more than 40 years and made her living as an arts administrator. She has also written in English all this time, but is consistently regarded, like many other non-Anglo-Celts, as an eternal foreigner. Here is an extract from her recent book, *Sydney Journals*, to illustrate the point:

The long haul. We are already somewhere near Tashkent, where Akmatova and Nadezhda Mandelstam lived during the war.

Food is being served. Across the aisle we smile at each other. “Are you holidaying in Sydney?” she asks.

“No, I am going home,” A slight surprise in her face.

“Home to Sydney?”

When we finally arrive, we fly over the Opera

House, the Bridge. I am very pleased. I am pleased with the blueness of the sky. I am pleased as if I had a hand in making the place. (2008, 57)

Kefala’s book is divided into 10 sections that comprise aphoristic comments on travels that take place as much in the mind as across different geographies. The dynamic for the book, like all of Kefala’s work, is to transform what her immediate Anglophone Australian readers perceive as an isolated idiolect, characterized repeatedly as those of an “alien,” into a sociolinguist—the gift of an erudite sensibility writing to expand the cultural horizons of her companions. While Kefala’s voice is indisputably particular, the cultural grammar it invokes should be more familiar in Australia than has, to date, been the case, given the extent of non-Anglo-Celtic elements (including many languages other than English) that have long been part of the country.

Kefala’s narrative eye links Australia and Europe in the kinds of affective psycho-geographies that are only just beginning to be explored.31 The narrative voice converses with writers, artists, family friends who are part of a continuing dialogue that is completely present and embodied even when they are encountered as part of literary and cultural traditions. Thus the Mandelstams, Akmatova and Seferis populate the text as substantively as friends and family. Just as it is sometimes hard to know whether the meditations and dialogues take place in Australia or Europe, so it is difficult to place them precisely in a temporal sense. The effect is dreamlike.
and, indeed, dreams punctuate the entries and are as viscerally felt as other experiences, a characteristic of all Kefala’s work. The resultant palimpsest is both there and here, unsettlingly both familiar and strange with the added dimension of making readers see and feel what we thought we knew, differently—estrangement as pedagogy. The Europe that inhabits Kefala’s Australia is a melancholic and layered set of densely interlaced interlocutors, aesthetic categories and unsettling artists, very different from the “dead Europe” theme park conceptuallyized by Christos Tsiolkas. Citing another passage in Sydney Journal: “it seemed that none of them had heard someone with a different accent for some time. They were listening to me politely, with an increased amount of attention, as if I were an invalid, so that the air became charged while I spoke” (Kefala 2008, 6).

Europe is mapped onto Australia, as one would expect, given that there has been a “European” presence (and not just in Anglo-Celtic terms) for many decades. It also takes the form of being made to feel that she is not entitled to use the language of the country. “Trying to write, one needs so much confidence in oneself to carry even a sentence. The moment the level goes down one realizes the futility of all things, the thin nature of the enterprise and language that refuses to work” (9). A Europeanness that is idiosyncratically conceived by all those who are linked to its varied histories is the necessarily differentiated versions produced by vernacular cosmopolitans.

In conclusion, another subtly illuminating passage from Kefala’s Sydney Journal: “I realised how environments form us [...] all these European landmarks that totally lose their meaning in another culture, personalities we were brought up with, writers that have no resonance at all in this culture, no one knows these things except us, a secret knowledge meaningless to people outside the old culture. And all this illusion of universalities, internationalism” (225).

The illusion that one may claim universalities and internationalisms, and have access to this conceptual economy, is currency available to some and not others. Vernacular cosmopolitans have the ability to combine the universal with the minuscule of the local when in the hands of Balibar’s mediating intellectuals— Müller’s Swabian Germans in Romania, haunted by the uncanny shards of totalitarianism; Ugresic’s former Yugoslavs scattered across the globe cradling a discarded socialist utopia; Kefala’s “Europeans” at odds with the Anglo-Celtic models of Europeanness that monopolize Australia’s settler culture. All help construct the estrangement from one’s own culture identified as one of the necessary symptoms or attributes of contemporary cosmopolitanism.

**Eur/Asian Vernacular Cosmopolitans**

The globe is not the world. (Feng Gleich 2008, 30)

I have always tried to imagine what the world would look like without this dominating paradigm of East and West, which all too often implies East versus West. [...] I also find it ironic that my work as an artist is still pigeonholed, filed away in the post-colonial box, whilst the idea of the whole debate was to do away with such categorization and the need to categorize at all. (Fiona Tan 2009, 24)

These quotations serve to remind us of the metaphors that constrain our imaginations. In ways similar to “Europe,” “Asia” as a concept, metaphor or taxonomic framework has always been both enabling and disabling. This section will explore the somewhat arbitrary nature of such classificatory systems. For example, Gayatri Spivak points out in *Other Asia:* “there is no original unity to the name ‘Asia.’ [...] But what is Asia? Should we train our imagination to allow ‘Asia’ to emerge as a continent? The word ‘Asia’ reflects Europe’s eastward trajectory. It is as impossible to fix the precise moment when ‘Europe’ first used the term Asia” (2008, 208–209). As mentioned in the introduction, Kuan-Hsing Chen and Chua Beng Huat describe their project as contributing to “try to integrate an imagined Asia at the level of knowledge production” (2007, 1) in which this imagined field escapes from its historical definitions by the West. In their volume, Sun Ge’s essay “How Does Asia Mean?” begins: “Asia is not only a political concept, but also a cultural concept; it is not only a geographical location, but also a matter of value judgment” (9). Confining himself to the framework of intellectual history in modern Japan, Sun Ge alerts us to the somewhat controversial work of philosopher Watsuji Tetsuro (1889–1960), who situated mankind in terms of natural contexts, and Asia was classified according to three regions: monsoon, desert and pasture (2007, 19). The dryness of the desert, for example, “naturally” produced the major religions of Christianity, Judaism and Islam.

Such a readjustment of hierarchic categories can certainly function to liberate one’s imagination. Another example of arbitrary but generative classification occurs in the critical evaluation of Fiona Tan, one of the artists whose work is explored later in this chapter. On several occasions critics have cited (via Foucault) a short narrative by Borges, who evoked the classificatory system of a mythical “Chinese encyclopedia entitled The Celestial Emporium of Benevolent Knowledge. In its remote pages it is written that the animals are divided
into: belonging to the Emperor; embalmed; trained; piglets; sirens; fabulous; stray dogs; included in this classification; trembling like crazy; innumerable; drawn with a very fine camel hair brush; et cetera; just broke the vase; from a distance look like flies” (1984).13

Using this example as a way into the discussion of neo-cosmopolitanism resonates with Paul Gilroy’s contention cited earlier that cosmopolitanism should include the “cultivation of a degree of estrangement from one’s own culture and history” (2004, 75). Invoking race as the way to make visible some of the ruling agendas, Gilroy draws our attention to the fact that “the foundational investment that the West has made in the idea of rights is not itself a neutral or universal gesture” (66). Gilroy prefers what he terms “demotic cosmopolitanism” (73). In a talk given when he was invested as the first recipient of the Treaty of Utrecht Clair, Gilroy drew attention to the ways in which “Racial discourse can be thought of as contributing to a system for making meaning that feeds the tendency to create exceptional spaces and populate them with vulnerable, infra-human beings” (2009, 24).

As discussed previously, I would like to expand this idea to include considerations of “estrangement as pedagogy” since it is precisely something that is cultivated, something one must learn (as distinct from race or even class—attributes that are thrust upon one) and it is a feature I discern in the artists and writers I examine in this section: Kyo Maclear, Fiona Taa, Ann Marie Fleming.

**Cosmopolitanism and World Literature**

Just as cosmopolitanism is receiving renewed attention, we note as well the growing interest in redefining the category of world literature, as signaled by the opening quotation from Pheng Cheah’s essay. To situate it more precisely: “The world is a form of relating or being-with. The globe, on the other hand, the totality produced by processes of globalization, is a bounded object or entity in Mercatorian space. When we say ‘map of the world,’ we really mean ‘map of the globe.’ It is assumed that the spatial diffusion and extendiveness achieved through global media and markets give rise to a sense of belonging to a shared world, when one might argue that such developments lead instead to greater polarization and division of nations and regions. The globe is not the world” (Cheah 2008, 30). Cheah argues in relation to the category of world literature: “In this imaginative process that generates cosmopolitan feeling, we can discern three moments. First, one must surrender the identification of oneself with the world and breach and transcend the limits of this particularistic perspective. Second, one must imagine a universal community includes all existing human beings. Third, one must place oneself within this imagined world as a mere member of it, subordinating one’s egoistic interests to that of the whole?” (27).

What world literature should not become is an adjunct to area studies, as Spivak argues in Death of a Discipline (2003). Bearing these cautions in mind, this section examines some vernacular cosmopolitan cultural texts whose explorations in sociality and hospitality juxtapose claims to humanity with the constraints of subsaharan abjection, with the proviso I mentioned earlier: imagining the stranger differs from imagining oneself as stranger and from being interpellated as stranger in the place one considers home. The concept of abjection underpins some of the discussion. Abjection resides on that borderline that decays into the ambiguous slinky dimension between solid and liquid, between human and inhuman, and meaning and non-meaning, hence its potency within cultural theory because it overcomes absolute binaries: thus neither/nor, both/and. The minute abjection becomes linked with supposedly solid concepts such as the human, language, nation and so forth, it generates a penumbra, including affective anxiety, but this ambiguity may also hold potential for other futures. These dynamics are exacerbated by the ways mobility is conceived.16

**Imagining the Stranger: Kyo Maclear**

Canadian writer Kyo Maclear comes to these discussions via the Writing Thru Race debates in Canada, a landmark event in terms that put cultural appropriation on the map (Miki 2004, 14ff). Who had the right to tell certain stories when these stories concerned marginalized groups who, arguably, did not as yet have a cultural franchise within the framework of the nation? An unexpected outcome of raising these issues was the generation of a kind of essentialist identification where the work was automatically judged in relation to surmises about the artists’ origins and the extent to which they could claim a kind of racialized genealogy. In her critical study Bedouin Vision: Hiroshima-Nagasaki and the Art of Witness, an analysis of trauma, public mourning and traumatic historical events such as Hiroshima-Nagasaki and the Holocaust, Maclear (1999) explores visibility in relation to a kind of planetary ethics. What are the responsibilities of those who engage with representations of these events when they tread the line between acknowledgment and appropriation? How do we mourn the losses of unknown others? Judith Butler, via Derrida, has made us aware of what constitutes a grievable life (2004). Maclear reminds us that Freud’s idly individualized mourning as processing the loss and letting it go cannot account for the different model of mourning required by massive losses in the wake of world wars and technologized contemporary warfare: “Freud’s central characterization
Imagine Oneself as Stranger from Ian

In her novel The Last Letter (2002), Nadezda tells the story of a woman who finds herself in a foreign land, struggling to make sense of her new surroundings. As she navigates her way through the unfamiliar terrain, she begins to question her own identity and the meaning of home.

Nadezda's protagonist, a young woman from Romania, finds herself in Japan after a series of unexpected events. At first, she is overwhelmed by the unfamiliarity of her new environment, but as she begins to explore her surroundings, she begins to find a sense of belonging.

As she delves deeper into the culture of Japan, Nadezda's protagonist begins to understand the importance of community and the importance of maintaining cultural traditions. She learns to appreciate the subtle nuances of Japanese society and finds a sense of comfort in the familiarity of the food and the customs.

In her writing, Nadezda explores the idea of belonging and the importance of community. She writes about the challenges of adapting to a new culture and the importance of finding one's place in the world.

As she continues her journey in Japan, Nadezda's protagonist begins to understand the complexity of the world around her. She learns to appreciate the beauty of the natural world and the importance of finding balance in one's life.

Through her writing, Nadezda offers a glimpse into the world of Romania and Japan, and the challenges of adapting to a new culture. Her novels offer a powerful reminder of the importance of finding one's place in the world and the beauty of the human experience.
international sites, and plotted a pathway through them. The idea is to use the concept of taxonomy to break open assumptions concerning what we recognize as life, as meaningful existence. At the same time she has explored (and the categories of travelers and explorers punctuate her work) a range of archives. As she puts it, “I’ve started to love archives. Looking through an archive is like discovering an unknown continent, a small universe in which the explorer can keep on undertaking new expeditions” (2000, 118). Arguably, her dominant archive comprises European itself, as exemplified in Provenance, where the tradition of Dutch seventeenth-century portraiture (portre, from the old Dutch word for “face”) undergirds the grammar of the piece. The animated portraits, both static and mobile static if one considers their slow movements in cinematic terms and mobile if one considers the immobility of the photograph or portrait, are not family photos but do deal with subjects who are known to the artist. So there is a familial connection, but there is also a distance. As she puts it in the catalogue accompanying the exhibition, “I prefer images that are free of the baggage of the media, public relations, the film industry and big business” (2007a, 16). The repetitions construct a certain sense of time—both animation and meditation—since photos, unlike oil paintings, do not encourage the eye to linger over details (52). Thus her method is in a sense synaesthetic in that she projects onto photographs the viewing grammar of an oil painting by means of the mediation of twentieth-century technology—the moving camera. As Thomas Elsaesser states, “The Face, the face-to-face and the close-up in cinema were among the first ways of defining the new medium of mechanical reproduction as an artefact in its own right” (quoted in Tan 2009, 221). The notion of provenance also links with the ambiguity surrounding origins; in the antique market, it also indicates a history that confers value, something Tan alludes to in pursuing the history of Dutch portraiture, where those who commissioned such works did so in part as testimony to their social ranking (2007a).

Fiona Tan’s video A Lap of Memory opens with an object image—the burned-out shell of the old West Pier (Brighton) that hovers into view as though rising from the sea as dawn breaks. It is a shell, but because we see it at a distance and shrouded by mist, we don’t quite realize that, and so when we move to an interior space (actually the Royal Pavilion in Brighton), it is as though we had moved into the spectral and ambiguous space of the Pier—quintessentially heterotopic in the sense of being physically as well as conceptually present. The opening shot of Henry/Eug Lie that brings us into the interior also suggests abjection and linearity. From an overhead shot of his fetal body lying on a blanket on the floor the camera moves to a close-up of his bare feet, whose slight twitch indicate a living being. The space surrounding him is also decayed and unkempt. As Henry wakes up, we localize through his eyes shots of the chinioserie wallpaper and the dimly lit extravagance of the Royal Pavilion’s dragon chandelier menacingly brooding over the scene. The female voice-over begins, but initially refers to the opening shot in a time lag because we are already observing Henry doing his warm-up exercises. The voice-over subsequently speeds up to describe a scene we have not witnessed as yet. Time and space have been destabilized by disconnecting the visual and the audio (a feature of Tan’s work. The Royal Pavilion in Brighton, an orientalist icon completed in 1822, comprises, as Thomas Elsaesser suggests, “an exploration of Orientalism from its European ‘inside’” (2009, 230). The protagonist is an old man of dubious background who is described in the following ways, “He feels lost within his various selves, his possible biographies. They trap him in a scenario which he does not want to live. This place can onlly serve him as a halfway hotel. Henry is waiting for a story he can make his home” (Tan 2007b, 45). He may indeed be an avatar of Marco Polo, stranded in his own orientalist fantasy. The voice-over situates this figure as fading into dementia, reminiscent in his repetitions and uncertainties of a Samuel Beckett character. While the baroque orientalist setting suggests being trapped within a particular ideological context, his own embodied rituals faintly echo Asian cultures, such as when he drinks his morning tea or projects some of the gestures of tai chi exercises. The phenomenological elements of his embodied habits possibly point to a corporeal freedom beyond the interior structures and ideologies that have always caged him. Critics suggest that the Royal Pavilion may be an externalized version of Henry’s interior world, a theatre of memory (Doris van Draten in Tan 2009, 209). Within this world he repetitively performs his daily rituals, occasionally pausing as though he has forgotten his script. When not doing off he reads while wearing double spectacles. The voice-over gives him a romantic plot saturated with colonial desire in which he fell in love with a woman fragile as porcelain, but “the next morning found her smashed to pieces, a disgrace to the village” (Tan 2007b, 45). The materiality of Tan’s voice-over is interesting in its own right, carrying the hint of an Australian accent. Tan has described A Lap of Memory as finishing a sentence begun in May You Live In Interesting Times: “I felt I had left it all—meaning my post-colonial roots/roots—behind me. But here, all of a sudden, was this building, which refused to go away. It felt like full circle, like a way of completing a sentence. Ten years later, I felt that a conclusive explanation was required of me. And I felt a need for closure” (2009, 1, 22). At the end Henry is described enigmatically “Patiently, Henry is waiting for a story which he can make his home. His forgetfulness is perhaps his greatest virtue. His journey is one yet to be taken” (2007b, 45).
Tan’s installation for the Venice Biennale 2009, titled Divided, revisits Marco Polo, this time using extracts from his own journal as voice-over.22 Referring to the earlier quotation, Tan infuses the work with the anomalies created by the taxonomic eye that is, as we know from postcolonial studies, also a prescriptive eye animated by the civilized mission that imposes the assessing slide rule of “progress.” The installation involves two screens that use exactly the same audio script but differ visually. Marco Polo, the quintessential merchant who paved the way for the colonizer, is an emissary from Venice, a city that, like the Western Pier, is an ambiguous entity where it is difficult to distinguish between land and water. Watching the two screens simultaneously as one is meant to do, a powerful dynamics is set up between them, but not, as Tan tells us, “a simple dialectical juxtaposition of rich and poor, positive and negative” (2009, 1.27). In the first screen, the dim lighting makes it hard to distinguish individual objects. The camera pans across shelves of stuff, including an old television set and other clearly modern artifacts. We view a stuffed (dried out) elephant in Screen #1 just after we see a living one walking in Screen #2. As well, we observe a monitor showing silent archival footage of apparently Chinese men heaving along a canal. Somewhere, a screen or fabric with kangaroo is inserted. The collection is reminiscent of the indiscernite Victorian cabinet of curiosities—collecting with no clear rationale (these days we might call it hoarding, and the parallels are worth investigating), and this contrasts with the self-confidence of the male voice-over from Marco Polo’s journals.

Screen #2 depicts footage of the places mentioned in Marco Polo’s journal in their modern incarnation, for example, there is footage of Baghdad during the war with US occupying forces.23 Footage includes a man being hooded and led off, presumably to be executed, while his distressed wife and children are stirred against a wall. People look directly into the camera, conveying no clear affect. The net effect is to render the Marco Polo voice-over ludicrous in its content taxonomizing, for example, when Marco Polo speaks of great wealth and how all the inhabitants wear silk, we see modern footage of people laboring in terrible conditions (shoveling at mountains of white powder with inadequate protection) or evidence of pollution when he describes the ideal scenery the traveler encounters.

Tan’s work has received renewed attention in response to the European crisis in migration and multiculturalism. As Jacqueline Lo suggests, “Tan’s artworks can be read as acts of citizenship that engage with archives in ways that offer new insights into contemporary notions of subaltern Agency” (2014, 59).
Chapter 3

THE SERIAL ACCOMMODATIONS OF DIASTORA WRITINGS

"Remember, it's an in-between space. Neither here nor there. It is dangerous." (Badani 2006, 110)

Always becoming, will never be
Always arriving, must never land
Between back home and home unfathomable, is me—
By definition: immigrant (Mootoo 2001, "Mantra for Migrants")

"And now," Tsunami went on, "what about Sinhala being declared the official language? Isn't that discrimination against everyone who doesn't speak and write Sinhala? Tamil? Muslims? Burghers—everyone who communicates in English. When you practise wholesale discrimination against people, the result is war." (Gooneratne 2006, The Sweet and Simple Kind, 312)

The Dubious Consolations of Diaspora Criticism

As stated in the introduction, diaspora criticism has changed from the days when migration meant that one stayed put. Now that return journeys are part of the pattern, the dynamics of belonging have changed between diasporic groups, individuals and nation-states. Questions remain concerning the extent and duration to which writers are pressured to convey diasporic histories or represent diasporic communities, as well as how these demands affect women in particular. As well, without invoking the full range of complexities associated with the Sapir-Whorf theory, how does one convey another language-meaning system within the monolingualism of English-language writing? While this chapter cannot provide definitive answers to such questions, they do animate the analyses of the writers discussed here. To support the contention that diaspora criticism needs to be anchored in temporal and spatial specificities, this chapter will focus on three diasporic women writers who are linked by being “South Asian” in complex ways. Anita Rau Badami was born
their minds to other possibilities. The old nineteenth-century colonial civilizing mission was lurking in the wings. The whole postcolonial enterprise of creating colonial “mimic-men” encapsulated by Macaulay’s Minute on Indian education thundered in the background, but then the Dalit example cited in the notes to this chapter (Lahiri 2010) suggests that a revised interpretation (yet another meaning for English) lurks on that postcolonial horizon. The other aspect of the Southeast Asian assessment that made me ponder is that experts in this field of English as a second language routinely grade their students in terms of a metric (Intercultural Development Inventory: IDI) that rated whether they had reached the preferred state of “a worldview that highlights cultural commonality and universal values” (Jackson 2010, 61). In other words, this comprises a functioning “cosmopolitan metric” and as such deserves scrutiny.

Chapter 6

ACOUSTIC COSMOPOLITANISM: ECHOES OF MULTILINGUALISM

Acoustic Palimpsests

My proposition in this chapter is that Australian letters and “scenes of reading” (Dixon and Rooney 2013) are not just those produced in English and that, moreover, like many Englishes within global English, Australian English is haunted by the accents of other languages.1 Derridean deconstruction privileged the authority of “presence,” whereas writing was designated as a type of second-order, mediated communication where stable meaning receded ever further. As cited in the previous chapter, Derrida’s later work (Monolingualism and the Prosthesis of Origin) accentuated the fact that the enumerative split precluded the claim to own language, to fully control its meaning (“the hegemony of the homogeneous”). However, while emphasizing the instability of language and meaning, Derrida, an Algerian Jew, confessed to his intolerance of accents in relation to his own French monolingualism. So in the realm of voice, orality and presence there was another order of authority. He points out that such accents are not generally detectable in writing. In her recent perceptive book, Not Like a Native Speaker, Rey Chow (2014) takes up Derrida’s claims to demonstrate that if one looks at language in relation to colonialism, an argument could be made that the colonized, in their linguistic subjugation, understood far more consciously than the colonizers that the hegemony of the homogeneous does not exist. So this chapter will examine the oral dimensions of multilingualism in Australia but, perversely, situate these elements textually. To what extent does this hum or “presence” of other languages (Indigenous as well as others) fundamentally destabilize the authority that English appears to enjoy within a national culture that strenuously perpetuates its colonial monolingualism? To what extent do these other languages merely create accents that reinsert a yearning for homogeneous origins in the dominant groups?

The topic may also have been inflected, or performatively engaged, by the skepticism that people express in Canada when I tell them that I am Australian and they tell me (occasionally somewhat indignantly) they had not heard the
of an eloquent new instrument. He also characterized this process as one primarily of voice, of an embodied speech that was indeed animated by the unique intonations of the whole body. Orature is another way of referring to this phenomenon and draws attention to the long tradition of oral literatures (including epics) in many parts of the world. It is the element of “orature” that is part of what I am analyzing in Australian writing—that combination within the performative of both the typological and the unique. Arguably, the embrace of Englishes happens unevenly, depending on the settler colony’s specific history (Canadian as distinct from Australian or New Zealand). Examples proliferate in anthologies such as Debra Ahmad’s Rotten English (2007) or Evelyn Nien-Ming Ch’ien’s study Weird English (2004). To quote from the latter: “Weird English wants to do more with English than communicate what the subject is; it also wants to show who the speaker is and how the speaker can appropriate the language” (Ch’ien 2004, 8). Reverse appropriation in relation to a colonial history is at the core of this process.

If we consider these questions through a deconstructive lens, Derrida reminds us that writing was often seen as a displaced form of speech—the latter providing the authority of the voice and presence. How does one invest writing with such a presence—of individuals as well as larger collectives that require authorizing, such as the national? A legislated authoritative language is one way—a mother tongue that supposedly guarantees origins. Languages in their plurality engender many anxieties that, in turn, spawn policies to discipline their manifestation. Growing up in Australia in the 1950s and 1960s, I was certainly aware that once I left the multilingual environs of the western suburbs in Melbourne, care needed to be taken in publicly speaking a language other than English, on trams, for example, where there was often not much tolerance for “foreign tongues.” These languages intruded not just as noise, but as nuisance. Now with the dissemination of mobile phones and the proliferation of multilingual conversations in public spaces the old dynamics have changed. Those public spaces might be described as “non-places,” a concept developed by Marc Augé, and I will return to this later. Do the conversations in Languages—other-than-English (LOTE) catapult listeners instantly off shore as in virtual travel, or do they still constitute a betrayal of imagined national cohesion as they did in the past? To what degree has there been a shift in designating public/private spaces and what has happened to tolerance for the “noise” of other languages within a predominantly English monolingualism? Consider musical theorist Martin Daughtry’s notion of “acoustic palimpsest”:

“To imagine the unheard as the barely heard and strain to listen past the acoustic foreground down to the ghostly echo, the faint trace of obscured selves that lie on or just beyond the periphery of audibility” (Daughtry 2013, 9–10).
writing, then poets such as L. O. and Anita Walzow come to mind: L. O.'s tour de force, 24 Hours (1996), is set in Melbourne's inner city Fitzroy (with echoes of Joyce's Ulysses). It is hard to extract a quotation because the effect is cumulative and mostly the languages are a version of phonetically transcribed Greek and evocation of other accents:

Back inside (the shop) the Boss's wife is yelling, at a kid
to get away from the sauce-potable,
icase one of the rod
pokes him in the "eye."
The kid starts "crying."
She goes round (the
counter), sits down on a chair, picks
him up, and lets him ride up'n'down
on her slipper—"lay kih oorsh" (1996, 25)

The sound of the writing ghosted by other languages is central to the poem. Walzow's work, in turn, uses the eloquence of "broken English" to articulate subtext and nuances as in "New World" from her collection Writing:


What about the specific role of English or as Australian-based scholar Anna Wierzbicka calls her latest book: Impressed in English: The Hazards of English as a Default Language? (2014)? In the postcolonial mix English's role is complex. For example, within global English meanings rely on the geopolitical positions from which one speaks English. As noted earlier, Derrida's work and that of other poststructuralists have taught us that we are all strangers within a language, any language. Language does not provide an inherently stable foundation for identity. "No, an identity is never given, received, or obtained; only the interminable and indefinitely phantasmatic process of identification exists" (Derrida 1999, 28). So then what are the implications of being asked to take up one's place precariously in another language, a language that always comes with historical (including ideological) baggage? As I pointed out in the previous chapter, the answers depend on the investment in "monolingualism" of the culture (39-40). In her recent study, Yasemin Yildiz points out that multilingualism has to concord consistently with the monolingual paradigm (2012, 6). World English can function as a quintessential example of such a paradigm, as example of "homo-hegemony." It is also more difficult to assert the importance and legitimacy of other versions of English associated with multilingual writing within cultures that strenuously reiterate their monolingualism, such as Australia, than in officially bilingual nations such as Canada.

As stated earlier, Rey Chow's argument is that the colonized understood far more consciously than the colonizers that the homo-hegemony does not exist. Chow makes the further point that multilinguals are more conscious of revealing the split nature of relationships to language. It is more difficult to imagine one language as the "natural" articulation of interiority if one has access to more than one language. Australian English is thus split or fragmented in ways that deserve further analysis beyond the caricature of dialect to an acknowledgment of the prevalence of heteroglottism. To acknowledge the hollowness of other languages within and beyond English might facilitate a necessary expansion of sonority in relation to Brathwaite's "nation language"—as a transnational continuum as well as more localized specificity. As Yildiz points out with respect to German, "This view of German as a lingua franca—rather than as a purely national language could be a curative to the proprietorial, exclusionary claims made on the language today. Instead of coloring the tongues of minorities in national colors, it would mean bringing out the new colors the language takes on through its multitudes of new speakers" (2014, 14).

Chow, in turn, poses the disconcerting question that redresses emphasis in Derrida's "Monolingualism of the Other or the Prosthesis of Origin: if we consider language itself as inherently prosthetic "imposed from without" (2014, 14) rather than as articulating inhardenable and organic interiority, what other questions arise? If language is always an add-on rather than a "natural" emanation of the subject coming into articulation, what follows, for example, in relation to a national culture? One direction Chow explores is to plot the concept of "tradition" in relation to language in terms of Foucault's différence as constituting neither instrumentality (language as communication) nor idealism (language reflective of one's inner being), but as the resonances, connotations, associations, and memories [...] that having been uttered and heard many times, cling to or hover around even the most simple individual speech acts, like the aura that Benjamin analogizes to traces of the potter's hand" (54). The last comment refers to Benjamin's well-known concept of the "aura" as akin to the cumulative imprint of the craftsman's particular shaping. If we consider this schema, then it follows that the cumulative imprint of usage, the construction of the prosthetic edifice of Australian English, might look somewhat different if it were to encompass all its usages to include both Indigenous languages and all those other tongues and resonant bodies that have entered Australia. Here is Chow again raising questions concerning the concept of the native speaker. "A native speaker becomes audible or discernible only when there
are nonnative speakers present, when more than one language is already in play, explicitly or implicitly, as a murmur and an interference. This condition of more-than-one, this multiplicity of accents that undergirds any claim to the oneness of native speaking, suggests that the presumed unity and contingency of the native speaker’s speech already bears within it what Deleuze calls an ‘inherent variation’—a variation that is [...] consistently suppressed through the misrecognition that the native speaker is there first, before all the foreigners with their unfortunate accents” (58–59).

We are brought back to the multilingual noise in public places. And it brings up consideration of not only other languages, but of accents; what more can one say concerning these accents? Given Derrida’s systematic destabilization of the relations between speech and writing in Of Grammatology, it is surprising to find the following passage (one that Chow analyzes in detail) where Derrida has the following to say concerning accents:

One entered French literature only by losing one’s accent. [...] I do not believe that anyone can detect by reading [...] that I am a “French Algerian.” [...] I am not proud of it, I make no doctrine of it, but so it is; an accent—any French accent [...] seems incompatible to me with the intellectual dignity of public speech. [...] Incompatible [...] with the vocation of a poetic speech. [...] The accent indicates a hand-to-hand combat with language in general. [...] Its symptomatology invades writing. [...] I cannot bear or admire anything other than pure French. (1998, 45–46)

Tsiolkas: Barracuda

What are the implications for sharing or not sharing that accent in writing, in making that accent visible in writing? In Christos Tsiolkas’s most recent novel Barracuda (2013), there are ways in which the writing conjures up the speech that emanates from specific bodies, including their accents. The protagonist begins his evocation of interiority with breath and breathing—words betray him, but breathing as an elemental force is akin to water itself, before speech, and is authorized by a body in its starkest form. The Dan/Danny Kelly of the novel is in this instance, unlike other Tsiolkas protagonists, not Greek, but a mix of Scots and Greek. However, he inhabits the “wog” body recognizable from other Tsiolkas texts—unlike his Anglo friends or Scottish lover, he is (in his own eyes) excessively hirsute and he sweats. Dan/Danny is a working-class, half-wog boy (one drop of wog is sufficient in that racist logic) who wins a swimming scholarship to a private college in Melbourne, named with Tsiolkas’s signature old-world courtesy—Cunts College. In the first (to my knowledge) book-length study of Tsiolkas, Andrew McCann (2015) takes his analytical bearings primarily from the ways in which class is a dominant reference point, and this idea is supported by an interview Tsiolkas gave in Canada’s national paper, the Globe & Mail, where he states in relation to Barracuda that, ”I felt it was time to deal with the C-word, that it was time to write about class. Class shapes everything: language, desire and consciousness. But, of course, what class means keeps shifting and changing, churning us” (Tsiolkas 2014). McCann focuses as well on Queer themes, for example, linking Tsiolkas’s aesthetics with the filmmaker Pasolini, calling attention to the violence and abjection imbricated in Pasolini’s Queer eroticism (2015). However, for some readers, Tsiolkas’s work is as much about the exploration of ethnic fault lines in Australia and their imbrication in class striations. And it is in part through the evocation of accent that this element of ethnicity is marked. Notably in Barracuda ethnicity is not so much an issue for the protagonist as for swim coach Frank Torma:

“Why do you take their shit?”

You could hear his accent in the way he pronounced the word, “shit.” (Tsiolkas 2013, 11).

While the Coach and his accent do not appear all that often, he is there as a guiding presence throughout for Dan (“without Torma, without his training, he was stuck in the in-between” (51)). Torma surreptitiously takes up and shelters the outsiders in the school, constituting a causal logic that may lie in the fact that he is himself marked as an outsider within the “golden” world of national sports (154–165). As part of conjuring this world of insiders and outsiders (via class, but equally, I would argue, in relation to deviations from the dominant and therefore unmarked Anglo-Celtic ethnicity), the idea of any shared language is constantly interrogated. For example, attending a party at his rich school friend’s home, Dan finds himself unable to communicate with his friend’s father.

He nodded to Danny but didn’t speak to him. It wasn’t that Mr. Taylor didn’t like him—Martin had assured him that that wasn’t the case. But they could not speak to one another, it was as if their shared language did not have the words in it for them to understand one another. So Mr. Taylor nodded and Danny muttered an also for hello and a te that would do for thanks. (114)

As a contrast to the coach’s accent, there is the beguiling accent of Danny’s Scottish boyfriend, whose lil charms rather than alienates his listeners (398,
Not all accents are created equal. In an exorcism of his earlier life and perceived failures, Danny works with intellectually and physically disabled men who are often victims of racist violence, to some extent linking ethnicity with social abjection. In the course of the novel, Dan needs to make the language his own just as, for a time at least, he had made water his element:

Dan had discovered that books did not exist outside of the body and only in the mind, but that words were breath, that they were experienced and understood through the inseparability of mind and body that words were water and reading was swimming. Just as he had in water, he could lose himself in reading: mind and body became one. (341)

McCann’s study makes a case for Tsolkas becoming reconciled to the form of the (predominantly British canonical) Bildungsroman as a mature acknowledgment of his literary precursors. I think one could debate the significance of this interpretation, but it might be useful to focus instead on McCann’s reference (2015, 115) to Tsolkas’s introduction of amophētē a foreign (Greek) term in an essay on asylum seekers from 2013 (Tsolkas 2013a). In McCann’s reading, this term gives non-Greek readers access to a “foreign” sensibility, opening up a trove of meaning within English (amophētē being given the meaning, in Tsolkas’s essay, of the natural civility possessed by those not formally educated) that does not quite translate into English. An excess is indicated here, a linguistic resource (with all the potential for exploitation that the term implies) that cannot quite be contained within English. It would be interesting to see the extent to which Tsolkas incorporates such Greek terms directly into his writing and what they signify in each instance. It is also the case, perhaps, that the written foreign tongue is somehow more acceptable than either the spoken or the notion of an “accent” that infuses Australian English.10 The reception of Tsolkas’s work within Australia and through him (though I don’t wish to be too prescriptive about this) of the work of other “ethnic” writers is that the accent is usually unheard—the degree to which class is set in opposition to ethnicity rather than often being fused together continues to bemuse me.11 That the reception of Tsolkas’s work is skewed in this manner is also indicated in a review of Tsolkas’s most recent short story collection published in the Sydney Morning Herald.

Merciless Gods is as traditional as a story by Somerset Maugham or Henry James. [...] It will leave you breathless with admiration. [...] It is, in the end, quite extraordinary that Tsolkas—the Greek gay boy who used to brawl and brag about his sexuality and his ethnicity with such clamour and self-regard—should have stuck to his guns [...] produced fiction of such power and compositional grace with its hand so sure of its sense of the pulse of the world. (Craven 2014)

The condescension of this review is breathtaking, but also starkly revealing of prevailing attitudes.

Castro: The Garden Book

In an attempt, perhaps, to qualify his prejudice concerning accents, Derrida refers in Monolingualism to the work of Abdelkebir Khatibi’s Amour bilingue, translated as Love in Two Languages. Critics Rédé Bensmâna analyzes Khatibi’s work as attempting to create a “‘rhizosphere’ to counter the logosphere” and furthermore evoking a “grating” noise in the French that destabilizes its monolingualism, or the supposed purity Derrida so adores, “putting French in the position of the supplement, that is, by giving it a dual movement that definitively tears it away from any metaphysical or expressive cooptation, first by pulling the French language towards calligraphy, the graphene, the interval [...] and second by making us see and hear the other language (Arabic) in the between-two-languages, in the breach created by this very separation, without ever bringing about a simple return to origins” (2002, 167–168).

In this account we have an illuminating model for another way to consider the multilingual within the monolingual. The reference to the graphene is also a signal to move to another text, Brian Castro’s The Garden Book (2005). The novel is largely within the register of the visual, but the acoustic dimension intrudes in pronounced ways. Castro’s novel is set between the two world wars and explores class and race, including the racism leveled at Chinese Australians. One of the characters, Swan Hay (or Shuang He), for example, is born in Australia, but, based on her racialized features, she is unable to travel during the interwar years because she has no proof of Australian citizenship.12 Swan (echoing Proust’s Swann’s Way) is emblematic of the narrowness of options in that period for both women in general and a racialized woman in particular. Haunted by her own evanescence (in part because of being trapped by the racist stereotypes projected on her), Swan symptomatically writes her poems on leaves that she scatters between the pages of “penny dreadfuls,” among the used books collected by her increasingly white supremacist husband (119). Moreover she executes these poems in Chinese calligraphy—a language she has had to learn since it was not in fact her mother tongue. Rey Chow makes the point that the Chinese script bestows comprehensible legibility in the face of spoken Mandarin and Cantonese that are incomprehensible to each other (2014, 108). Unlike spoken Chinese, the calligraphic,
the second-order writing, in fact unites those divided by the acoustic (embodied) dimensions. When questioned later by her American lover, Jasper, Swan explains:

Why aren't these in English?
It's impossible to write in English.
But Chinese ain't your first language.
That's the reason I have no interest in communication. (Castro 2005, 195)

What does having “no interest in communication” convey? Living in the Dandenongs where she collects her “tree skins” (127), Swan hears the ghosts who inhabit the Indigenous burial grounds near her house, one of the few intrusions on her increasingly reclusive life. Her leaf poems gradually disintegrate but some are saved by Jasper, who translates them and has them published in Paris. As their success grows, they are increasingly attributed to him and the prevailing belief is that Swan is a tantalizing myth he has invented to authenticate his own centre. In other words, there are all kinds of ways in which Swan does not communicate. However, it is Swan’s son, Norman Shah, whose narrative frames the novel. Adopted by others, since she is not perceived as a fit mother, Norman, who is employed by the Rare Book Department in Melbourne University, gradually reassembles the fragments of Swan’s work. He locates a mother, if not a mother tongue nor a guaranteed origin:

Her leafy analects do not exist anymore. They were only meant to last a leaf’s lifetime. The rest was up to nature. Like Moses’ shattered tablets, her work would have to be recalled in memory and to speak it would be to lie. There were so many lies it is impossible to point to any original. She had finally written the book that caused her disappearance. (271)

Norman renames himself after an eighteenth-century Chinese scholar and poet and in turn becomes a recluse who reclains an edenic garden in the wilderness, walled off from the world. It is interesting here to cite Castro’s earlier essay “Writing Asia”:

The polyglot is a freer person, a person capable of living in words and worlds other than the narrow and confined one of unimaginable reality: When we translate from one language to another we not only reinvent ourselves but we free up the sclerotic restrictions of our own language. [...] Other cultures and languages reinforce and enrich us by powerfully affecting and destabilizing our familiar tongue. (1999, 153)

The quotation is an example of how multilingualism in Australia still requires special pleading instead of being able to be taken for granted.

Clarke: “The Stilt Fishermen of Kathalauna”

Finally, Maxine Beneba Clarke presents another evocation of the acoustic palimpsest in her story “The Stilt Fishermen of Kathalauna” from her collection Foreign Soil (2014). The story conjures up a young Sri Lankan asylum seeker’s voice as he encounters a well-meaning lawyer in a detention center. Sound is central in shaping his world. Haunted by his imprisonment in a potato chest nailed shut by the Tamil Tigers who forcibly recruited him, Asanka has an acute proprioceptive awareness of his surroundings. He knows the exact dimensions of his room and is aware of the precise meanings of his environment through the sounds he hears every morning after 42 days in detention (235). Asanka’s obsessive keeping of time via a digital watch given to him by a clarity worker functions as an attempt to control what he can in an otherwise uncontrollable context. The world he inhabits is reminiscent of the “no-place” coined by anthropologist Marc Augé. Augé differentiates “place” and “space” where the latter is converted into the former by being permeated by social relations—space turns into place because of the affective relationships we form with others: “If a place can be defined as relational, historical and concerned with identity, then a space which cannot be defined as relational, historical or concerned with identity will be a non-place” (1995, 17–8). Augé goes on to identify these non-places as proliferating in our times since they are mostly geared around transit and mobility and are measured primarily in terms of time (104).

In the detention center Asanka is unable to situate the space as a place so falls back on calibrating it in terms of time—the micro-seconds it takes him to get through the day so that he will not have to confront the millenia that measure his incarceration—comprising a timescale with no end-point.

Asanka knows every sound in this section of the Centre. Every creak, footsteps, drawer slide, cupboard slam, groan, furniture scrape and murmur. Every door clang. Every sigh. (Clarke 2014, 206)

Each sound is calibrated in relation to the seconds that pass because he fears that if he stops counting he will be back with the Tigers and the nailed-up potato chest. In terms of sight, the specular dimension, his surroundings are drenched in blood. When their asylum boat is halted by the Australian authorities, Asanka begins to wail. “The sound is not coming from his own body, but through it. Something is howling through him, through his mouth” (294). On
one hand, he is a vehicle for the suffering of countless others, but this typology is in balance with his individualism. In the course of the story he becomes an individual but not one who is actually permitted to publicly express his individuality. “They keep coming, the Immigration,” he says. “They are asking me the same questions. They don’t listen. It is like I have no tongue.” (236). As a result of not being heard, Assanka ingeniously uses the hobby pin and dental floss he was permitted to take from the lawyer’s handbag to sew up his lips. It is not too much of a stretch to suggest that having no tongue is equivalent to the status of those whose tongues voice other languages. The other stories in Clarke’s collection often invoke the Caribbean accents of her background—a reminder of the legacies of those who brought a certain kind of sound and animation to English. It is also noteworthy that, like Ania Walwicz and [I.O, she is a performance poet.

**Post-Multiculturalism**

These kinds of perspectives that minoritize modernity emerge from those diasporic figures who have been designated “multicultural” in some national contexts and lead to the question: What are the intersections of neocosmopolitanism and post-multiculturalism? With their rhizomatic roots in diaspora, post-multicultural writers/artists connect the post-nation-state to the global in new ways; they redefine the nation as well as critiquing the global by helping to dislodge the sense of entitlement held by dominant groups. As Nicolas Bourriaud suggests in his concept of a radicant aesthetics:

> And yet the immigrant, the exile, the tourist, and the urban wanderer are the dominant figures of contemporary culture […] one might say that the individual of those early years of the twenty-first century resembles those plants that do not depend on a single root but advance in all direction on whatever surfaces present themselves […] It translates itself into the terms of the space in which it moves […] caught between the need for a connection with its environment and the forces of uprooting, between globalization and singularity, between identity and opening to the other. It defines the subject as an object of negotiation. (2009, 51)

As I set out in the introduction, we move from the old dynamics of state multiculturalism to new conceptualizations of post-multicultural by referring to the “post” in Lyotard’s manner of going “back to the future” (so to speak) to ask what was left out in the various constructions of multiculturalism in its first usages: as a way for states to manage difference and second, the attempts by various groups and individuals who felt excluded from national formations to argue for their own supplementary inclusions. Lyotard’s logic of the “post” becomes not simply a future orientation so much as the future anterior (the future in the past or back to the future) structured by amnesia, a recollection or going back that discovers other possibilities for alternatives. I am suggesting that inside these vernaculars we need to expose the cosmopolitan dimensions that connect us to a world that should not remain fully mediated by the nation-state or by globalization. My argument is that what was left out of the multiculturalism we know was the immanent cosmopolitan element, something that draws us into the world via the perspectives of those “minority ethnic,” finding the cosmopolitan in the vernacular that comes to us from the spaces we used to call multicultural.

All of these debates have at their core attempts to imagine fully the contradictory tensions that inhabit considerations of the one and the many; Homi Bhabha’s statement that adding to does not equal adding up. Critical cosmopolitanism enables this tension to exist constructively by harnessing a logic of the oxymoron contained in a term such as neocosmopolitanism and, not surprisingly, writers and artists have presented us with ways of imaging and imagining this dynamic. The new cosmopolitan cultural texts that elaborate and animate statistical data reach out to us from those cages (as Ghassan Hage terms them) that too often comprise the ethnic and racialized dimensions of multiculturalism. A critical methodology of neocosmopolitan literature would deal both with post-multicultural writers who translate between very local and global sites and those international writers who often write from metropolitan locations and offer a grammar to other cultures in terms of much-needed transnational cultural literacies that help undermine the current increasing polarization of belief systems across the world.

Robert Dixon (2004) has suggested that Australian critics required a “situated cosmopolitanism” in order to move beyond the nation; others have argued for an embodied cosmopolitanism, and it appears clear that the presence of multilingualism is part of recognizing this embodiment. It is present in the work, for example, of Arabic Australian writers such as Michael Mohammed Ahmad and Omar Musa. The title of Abis Azeizi’s memoir nicely encapsulates much of what this study is about: *Leave to Remain*. As he explains the title, “I had found the British word for a visa, ‘leave to remain’ a little obtuse—why not ‘permission to stay’ or just ‘visa’?—I had failed to notice the reluctance subtly evoked by the words ‘leave’ and ‘remain’” (2009, 126).

In a succinct and alarmingly acute analysis of the post-Soviet failure to bring about an intellectual revolution in Eastern Europe, Bulgarian critic Miglena Nikolova reminisces on the attempt to institute the perpetual “seminar” as a model to forge something new. Citing the work of philosopher
Marmadashvili, she notes his refusal to read a text he had already written (we are brought back to one of the earlier questions as to why we read our written papers at academic conferences).

What matters in writing or talking, is “the movement of thought.” Reading to an audience a text that has already been written makes no sense because it would arrest this movement. For the unfolding of these thoughts one does not need to stand in awe of finished texts—one might write huge volumes like Kant or Proust but one might very well jot notes, write letters, give lectures, and talk with friends. (2013, 97)

Alertness to acoustic palimpsests, accents and multilingualism may facilitate these new conversations in Australian letters that provide the movement of thought less constrained by the predictability of homo-hegemonies engendered by monolingual ideologies.

Conclusion

BACK TO THE FUTURE AND THE IMMANENT COSMOPOLITANISM OF POST-MULTICULTURAL WRITERS

My Uncle Willy’s memoirs (he was a great-great uncle) are vigorously waiting to be dealt with, so to speak. I have a photocopy of the original handwritten German plus a typescript in English, both of which (the typing and the translation) were undertaken by Willy’s wife, Lena, and they are a foundational text for what has animated my career for many decades—a kind of windmill I insist on tilting at. But first a detour.

In her recent book In Other Worlds, written in Italian, Jhumpa Lahiri says, “How is it possible to feel exiled from a language that isn’t mine? That I don’t know? Maybe because I’m a writer who doesn’t belong completely to any language” (2015). I too attempted to learn Italian during my undergraduate years at Melbourne University, and not any Italian but Renaissance Italian so that I could read Machiavelli in the original. I was pursuing a double major in history and English and was inspired by Max Crawford to wonder whether Machiavelli was a closet idealist who was much more centrally wedded to his lengthy Discorsi (on Livy) than the infamous Il Principe (The Prince) and that the latter, rather than being a handbook, was a warning to the world about the consequences of unbridled dictatorship. Since German was my first language, I already knew that languages produced very different interior worlds and I was curious about acquiring these tools of perception. While on one hand, our immediate context in the outer western suburbs of Melbourne was made up of many different languages, I was also aware from our induction into the society of the 1960s—through school, newspapers and television—that the Australian mainstream was not particularly receptive to multilingualism. Nevertheless, in my pursuit of other languages I had already gone for several years to Saturday classes in Russian since this was the closest I could get to Bulgarian (my father’s language) and, indeed, reached a level where I could take dictation in Russian but didn’t continue with it at university and so it has subsided again, lurking somewhere in my memory theatre (I like to think that
I only have to open that door and...). Lahiri describes her move into Italian as a metamorphosis and alludes to Ovid's De Amore. She describes her relation to the English she has abandoned.

For practically my whole life, English has represented a consuming struggle, a wrenching conflict, a continuous sense of failure that is the source of almost all my anxiety. It has represented a culture that had to be mastered, interpreted. I was afraid that it meant a break between me and my parents. English denotes a heavy, burdensome aspect of my past. I'm tired of it. (166–167)

I can definitely relate to that burden of affect, though parsing it into precise emotions—namely these—is more difficult. In her recent novel What We All Long For (2005) Canadian writer Dionne Brand has a character, Tuyen, a Vietnamese Canadian artist living in Toronto, who is creating a luhai—a signpost made up of examples of people's longings. Brand wrote a brilliant essay/meditation called A Map to the Door of No Return (2001) that considers the ways in which slavery disrupts family ties and memories down through the generations.

Places like this are dotted along the coast of Africa. These places become known as the Door of No Return. Does all terror become literary? These are the places that made everyone who went through forget their names. Here walls ate the skin, footsteps took the mind. [...] It was a gift. Forgetting. [...] A map, then, is only a life conversation about a forgotten list of irretrievable selves. (2001, 223–224)

The luhai in her later book is a signpost rather than a map to amnesia and opens up both space and time in ways comparable to Pheng Cheah's (2016) analysis of cosmopolitan postcolonial literatures in his recent book.

My own relationship to English is complex. What I do recall is that it is accompanied by moments of pure affect (in retrospect after studying affect theory), in the sense that I am overpowered by sensations that have as yet to be named, and it led (on occasion) to intense performative moments. For example, as a part of a panel (in the 1980s) looking at the influence of "migrant writers" (as they were referred to then) on Australian letters, I stepped down into the audience and turned on the panel of well-intentioned members of the Australian literary establishment and demanded of them what they thought their role was in these discussions. It might not have been the most productive of moves, but there were many similar moments, including the attack on my work (and those of others) by Robert Dessaix in the 1990s (1991). It isn't entirely coincidental that I seized the opportunity shortly afterward to continue my work in Canada for the next 25 years.

But where did my obsessions with marginalized texts and writers begin? This brings me back to Uncle Willy's memoirs. I have provided a kind of history in a book now out of print (Gunew 1994), and so summarize some of it here. The context was an interdisciplinary first-year distance education course on narratology in which students were exposed to various forms of narrative, including film and visual material. Within the framework of an Australian oral history project, they were asked to research the Depression era, using family and friends for interviews. Realizing that people like myself would not find such an enterprise easy, it struck me that a comparable and more appropriate task for students from non-Anglo-Celtic families would be research into Australian postwar migration, but it was difficult to find appropriate teaching material. From this simple idea, I produced course material (to my knowledge the first of its kind). It comprised making two videos and an anthology called Displacements: Migrant Writers (Gunew 1981), which incorporated a wide variety of narratives dealing with the experience of migration, ranging from relatively unmediated first-person accounts to complex texts that use unreliable narrators and multiple levels of irony.

The second anthology was titled Displacements 2: Multicultural Storytelling (Gunew 1987), and the changed subtitle illustrated the historical shift in approach over six years. It became clear that my project of "making an absence visible" needed to distinguish between immigrants writing about the experience of migration, and works by non-Anglo-Celtic writers (often second- and third-generation) that were characterized by their intimate links to linguistic and literary traditions other than those deriving from Britain or Ireland. The term migrant, as I pointed out at the time, conjured up subjects whose presence in the dominant culture was perceived as temporary, and this precariousness was further signaled by such widely used bureaucratic terms as NESB (non-English-speaking background), an exclusionary and misleading acronym that privileged a fixed background over language abilities that could vary from individual to individual and in individuals over time. Thus "Anglo-Celtic," or simply "Anglo," was employed to differentiate between the cultural contributions of those whose linguistic and cultural traditions derived from Britain or Ireland, and those linked to the 60 or more other language groups that formed part of the linguistic fabric of colonial Australia.

In that earlier narrative I cited The Oxford History of Australian Literature (1981), where the editor offered the following: "The diversification of personal histories that one would expect to result from the influx of migrants from many countries of the world has not yet become a marked feature of Australian writing" (Kramer 1981, 8).
such a statement since such personal histories had indeed existed since colonization began in 1788. Presumably the editor meant that postwar migrants in particular should or would contribute to the founding narratives of migration as well as offering different perspectives of "Australia." This was certainly my devout wish. But had this changed over 35 years? In some cases, but not others, I concluded, since more recent compilations of Australian literature gestured toward a further recognition of these other perspectives, but not unreservedly so.

While the term "migrant writing" was occasionally used in the 1970s and 1980s to designate those writers born overseas, it was overtaken by related expressions such as "ethnic or multicultural writer." In the development of more precise analytical concepts for Australia's national literature, it was eventually acknowledged that it was more useful to distinguish between writers who were overseas-born, and thus might be expected to be overtly concerned with the experience of migration and its attendant cultural and linguistic dislocations, and those writers who had intimate access to languages and cultures that did not derive from England or Ireland and who might or might not write in English. Current bibliographical work collected in the AusLit database focuses on "multicultural writers" reveals that if one takes into account the second and third generations, roughly one-third of Australians derive from other than Anglophone cultural traditions. In Australia these writers had currency first as "migrant writing," then as "ethnic writing," and subsequently as "multicultural writing," and, as I've been endeavoring to argue, as post-multicultural writers. Each of these terms is highly contested, not least because they continue to signal the entrenched allegory of various writings produced within Australia but perceived as deviating from the Anglo-Celtic norm (Hage 1993, Huggan 2007). Describing a comparable history, Canadian critic Francesco Loriggio aptly summarizes the range of work that faces those involved in mapping such minority writings: "One of the most interesting aspects of ethnic literature as a field of study is the obligations it entails. The critic is forced to work on many levels simultaneously: s/he must name the texts, disseminate them, and, at the same time, at this particular stage of the game, define them, situate them within the literary agenda of the century and the debate it has fostered. Editing, translating, the journalistic piece or the one-page review are not beyond his/her ken. And neither are the more ethereal spheres of his/her discipline. In short, s/he must document the existence of the corpus, of the tradition, while grappling with the criteria that establish them" (1990, 21).

In other words, such critics needed to discover relevant creative work from often ephemeral publications at the same time as they were assembling appropriate analytical conceptual tools (Gunew and Longley 1992). The difference between the Canadian and Australian experiences, for example, is in sheer critical mass; more people have always been working on these issues in Canada, and the Canadian critic had accomplished much more detailed studies on the histories and writings of specific cultural groups (Gunew 2004). Comparable work in Australia was sporadic and ad hoc, and accompanied by different obstacles and prejudices that included the resolute monolingualism of the dominant Australian ethos.

Until the 1990s, the general shorthand term for minority ethnic writings in Australia was "migrant literature." In other words, it was seen as transitory and not really rooted in the place at all. It was often talked about in the marketplace as a literature that dealt with themes, characters and events situated "outside" Australia. To rectify these misleading generalizations, a small group of academics labored to change this picture and align it more closely with comparable international models (Corkhill 1994; Delanuelle and Karakostas-Soda 1984; Gunew and Longley 1992; Mycek and Sarval 2010; Sarval and Sarval 2009). Roughly five kinds of activity were involved in setting up multicultural literary studies in Australia: the production of anthologies and bibliographies; the establishment of material collections of multicultural literature; the framing of theoretical structures for the study of such materials; including the setting up of academic courses; reviewing and publishing multicultural writing; and working with government funding agencies such as the Australia Council to produce appropriate multicultural policies. All involved making an absence visible.

Thinking about cultural difference in the Australian context began around 1979, which was also a period when Australian culture itself was being institutionalized. During the 1970s multiculturalism was consolidated as government policy (Jupp 2007). The dominant emphasis was on questions of social justice, such as access and equity; and a welfare model of lack or disadvantage, referred to as a "deficit model" (Gunew and Rizvi 1994). In other words, Australians were asked to think in terms of a migrant/ethnic "problem," which often led to the construction of migrants or ethnic "as the problem." Rather than assuming that these newcomers would contribute to the national culture through their different cultures and languages, it was often presented as a question of what had to be sliced off the national funding cake in order to lend credibility to the image of Australia as a democratically equitable nation: "In the 1970s 'Australian literature' was itself a relatively recent category within literary studies, yet to develop a strong scholarly and historical tradition. What soon became clear to teachers and researchers interested in cultural diversity was that the nation's literary tradition, as it was then known, was in no way representative of the diverse linguistic, ethnic, and cultural composition of the Australian population. Where were the writers of non-Anglo origin, and
where were the stories reflecting their experience and cultures?” (Ommundsen 2007, 75–76).

It was also crucial to distinguish here between those government policies and institutions that were designed to manage cultural diversity and the claims for cultural enfranchisement that emanated from the various ethnic groups themselves (Ahmed 2012). The politics of these two areas are quite different, and often in conflict, but opponents of multiculturalism invariably merged them, and indicted both for dividing the nation (Appadurai 2010).

Multiculturalism intersects, but is not synonymous with immigration. As has often been pointed out, if immigration were to stop tomorrow, there would still be multiculturalism—the co-presence of many different cultural traditions and languages. In order to understand the contexts within which migrant or multicultural literature operates, it is useful to familiarize oneself with the history of the immigration of culturally diverse groups into Australia (Castes et al. 1998; Jupp 1991; Lopez 2000). The National Agenda for a Multicultural Australia, which the Office of Multicultural Affairs published in 1989, provided a definition of state multiculturalism, and in addition the encyclopedia of Australian peoples reveals the diversity of the nation (Jupp 2001). But it is not only the state or official policy makers who define these social realities.

Once immigrants and their descendants became interested in the whole field of “migrant writing,” it was a matter of sifting through old journals and anthologies in order simply to come up with the names of writers and examples of their work. In my own case, it resulted in the editing and coediting of four pioneering anthologies of multicultural writing (Gouani and Guenew 1988; Guenew 1961, 1967; Guenew and Malyyudin 1988). Curriculum work on what were then known simply as “migrant writers” was grounded more easily in interdisciplinary cultural studies than traditional literary studies, because this writing made sense only within the history and politics of postwar migration.

By the time the second anthology was produced (Guenew 1987), there was a much greater mix of first- and second-generation non-Anglo-Celtic writers. Concerns were conspicuously no longer limited to the experience of migration. In popular culture, a viable counter-discourse was beginning to emanate from inner-city Melbourne and Sydney; youths of non-Anglo-Celtic background and prevailing stereotypes of the national culture were already being interrogated by second-generation writers perched strategically between cultures. Second-generation Southern Europeans became relatively famous: for example, the performance poetry pieces of I.O. and the writings of Angelo Loukakis and George Papaelias, Ania-Maria DelFonso and Zeny Giles (Guenew and Longley 1992). More recently and in the wake of this legacy of gritty urbanism, Christos Tsiolkas has arguably become one of the best-known contemporary writers who both exemplifies and transcends the palpable presence of a “multicultural” legacy.

The appearance in the mid-1980s of Manfred Jungersen’s journal *Outside* indicated a different perception of multicultural literature by linking it with notions of world literature. Within the ambit of the “best of world literature”, the journal incorporated overseas writers and Anglo-Celtic as well as non-Anglo-Celtic Australian writers. This represented another tactic for integrating multicultural productions with Australian literature. In the midst of these concerns, the third anthology, *Beyond the Echo: Multicultural Women’s Writing* (Gouani and Guenew 1988), proclaimed in the introduction: “This is not a collection of migrant women writers, since some of the contributors are second or third generation Australians. The voices of those labeled ‘migrant’ have long echoed in Australia but have been confined to sociology and oral history. In other words, they have functioned as case studies or as ‘evidence’ for what has been perceived as the ‘problem’ of being a migrant, that is, not being a product of an Anglo-Celtic culture” (xiv). It signaled a desire to be considered as part of literature rather than sociology. The primary function of both this volume and the fourth anthology, *Telling Ways: Australian Women’s Experimental Writing* (Gouani and Guenew 1998), was to insert the writings of non-Anglo-Celtic women into the mushrooming domain of women’s writing. By this stage Australian feminist debates were increasingly concerned with using sexual differences as a way to dismantle a universalist cultural politics. The anthology questioned various generic expectations of women’s writing: that it be confessional or autobiographical; that it was automatically authentic and immediated by literary conventions; that “NESB” meant linguistic deficiency and so on. Many writers first published in *Beyond the Echo* went on to produce books of their own, thus vindicating the production of anthologies as a visibility strategy. In the past decade, most anthologies of Australian literature now include multicultural writers, but there is still controversy about the appropriate percentage and their function (Indyk 2009).

In 1992 the first comprehensive bibliography of multicultural writers in Australia was compiled (Gouani, Houbein, Karakostas-Seda and Malyyudin 1992), which contained around 900 authors and numbered 300 pages of double-column entries. Based on earlier works by Loló Houbein and Alexandra Karakostas-Seda, it deliberately included second- and even third-generation writers. The project was immersed in the politics of taxonomies and categorization. The presence of second- and third-generation writers emphasized the continuing necessity to move beyond the category of the “migrant” so that questions of diverse cultural differences would infiltrate all future considerations of the national literature. The bibliography included some listings of the critical reception of these writers, together with information concerning
translators. It was clear that about 33 percent published in English, 32 percent in English and other languages, and 35 percent in languages other than English. It included well-known Australian writers such as David Malouf and Elizabeth Jolley, as well as Henry Lawson, iconic example of the origins of Australian literature, in order to point out the need to reassess all Australia’s literature in terms of the whole range of cultural influences and languages that have gone into its production. The object was both to facilitate analyses of ethnic writers in Australia and to raise the question of ethnicity and multilingualism in all Australian literature, including the ethnicities of Anglophone groups. The information collected as part of this project was mainstreamed into the AusLit database through the subsequent continuing work of Wenche Ommundsen and others.10 What was not part of the official record were the many letters and papers that we received when we contacted as many writers as we could. I still have some of those letters, but they are difficult to read with scholarly equanimity. It has also been difficult to find a place for this archive.11

In order for the designations “ethnic” or “multicultural” to have any robust intellectual purchase, they needed to include the specific cultural traditions of those whose ethnicity often remained invisible, that is, the British (including the Welsh, Scots, etc.) and the Irish. 12 Certain conventions were reiterated in analyses of migrant writing. Under this rubric, writers, particularly those who drew attention to their awareness of languages other than English, were often perceived as dealing simply with their own life-stories, as providing material primarily of interest to sociologists or oral historians. The playfulness or reflexivity manifested, for example, in the work of Rosa Cappiello and Ania Waliczek, was often overlooked. Those few writers who were generally recognized to constitute the initial field of “migrant writing” were restricted to a social realism mode established by the first writer to be thus considered, Judah Waten, whose Alien Son was seen as a paradigmatic text.

As for setting up appropriate critical frameworks, in 1992 the first anthology of critical essays on multicultural literature was published under the title Striking Chords: Multicultural Literary Interpretations (Gusen and Longley 1992) and celebrated an informal network of scholars who were interested in the field. This anthology contained bibliographical information on critical studies in the area of Australian ethnic minority literatures. It included approaches ranging from special-author studies to thematic analyses and those that used poststructuralist theoretical perspectives. The book also contained statements by writers on how they positioned themselves in the migrant and multicultural writing debates. Quite often, writers objected to the special pleading they perceived as inherent in the labels “migrant,” “ethnic” or “multicultural” writer. Understandably, they wished to be considered simply as Australian writers.

When they described themselves in those terms, they assumed that their ethnicity was accepted as part of that designation. 13 To bring forward these issues into the public cultural arena still results in major cultural wars (Indyk 2009). 14 But the work of intervention in mainstream journals remains a central part of the enterprise, as is editing new anthologies, publishing essays or contributing to conferences and professional gatherings. The work is spread over a wide arena, and is very dependent on intersecting networks of patronage (Gusen and Longley 1992; Gusen and Rizvi 1994; Papastergiadis 2012). Publishing in Australia remains modest and this increased the difficulties for marginal writers. However, the rise of small publishers using the new technologies is encouraging. Some of these have links to specific ethnic communities, but others do not. 15 Literature, like many other art forms, is not simply an extension of or coterminous with any community, ethnic or otherwise. A related consideration is that systematic attempts to assess the related role of ethnic media either in giving a forum to ethnic minority writers or in airing cultural matters to both minority and majority audiences have only appeared sporadically (Aug, Hawkins and Dabbonnes 2008). It is also clear that curiosity concerning and research into the long history of multilingual community newspapers is helping fuel future research and is appearing in important outlets such as Journal of the Association for Studies in Australian Literature: Huang and Ommundsen 2015; Jacklin 2015; Seaton 2015.

Being marginalized cannot be reduced simply to a struggle between oppressor and oppressed in which the latter remains utterly passive. In their spatially conceived representation of exclusionary gestures, margins have always been ambiguous elements that have served to frame the center in terms of indictment as well as approbation. This point is raised in all its complexity in Derrida’s essay “The Parchment,” which examines aesthetic judgment by reading Immanuel Kant’s Critique of Judgment through Heidegger. After pondering the nature of parchment (ornamentation), and specifically the drapery surrounding statues, Derrida moves to consider the columns adjacent to buildings, and from there to the concept of the border or frame. This process raises fundamental questions about what is excluded and what included in the operation of aesthetic judgment. First, how is the object defined in terms of its relevant constituent elements, and then how is it evaluated? As Derrida puts it: “No ‘theory,’ no ‘practice,’ no ‘theoretical practice’ can be effective here if it does not rest on the frame, the invisible limit of (between) the interiority of meaning (protected by the entire hermeneutic, semiotic, phenomenological, and formalist tradition) and of all the extrinsic emblems which, blind and illogical, dodge the question. [...] Every analytic of aesthetic judgment presupposes that we can rigorously distinguish between the intrinsic and the extrinsic” (1979, 24-26). Later he refers to the “violence of framing.” The
rationale for this procedure is precisely the underlying logic of classic deconstruction, which posits that the elements excluded in the analytical process form the conditions of its possibilities. Thus the exclusions or marginalization of certain writings in fact frame the conditions of existence of those other writings that are included or endorsed by the analytical process. "Framing always sustains and contains that which, by itself, collapses forthwith" (35). In this sense "ethnic minority writing" might be said to "frame" Australian literature (hence the title of my 1994 book). The discussion of the frame might be perceived as a variation on (or adjacent to) the concept of the supplement, which had proved helpful for those interested in theorizing a legitimate space and role for marginalized or minority cultural productions (Guiney 1994). But what is also clear is that the emphasis on spatial metaphors excluded considerations of the temporal, and this issue has to some degree been addressed in this book.

To return to the statement by Leonie Kramer, have these immigrants and their descendants made a lasting impact on the institutionalization of Australian literature? Laurie Hergenhan's bicentennial publication The Penguin New Literary History of Australia carried several entries under "migrant writing" (but did not employ the term multicultural substantively), and Bruce Bennett's chapter included discussion of the phenomenon. The Cambridge Companion to Australian Literature (Webby) published in 2000 considered immigrants and ethnic minority writings, but nine years later in The Cambridge History of Australian Literature (Perce 2009), these elements had disappeared. In that same year Nicholas Jose produced the Macquarie PEN Anthology of Australian Literature (plus DVD) that included quite a few contemporary Indigenous writers but surprisingly few non-Anglo-Celtic ones (Indeks 2009). It is difficult to know how to assess this history. Some might argue that national literatures have receded in the face of a new internationalism or transnationalism (Ashcroft 2011; Deacon, Russell and Woolacott 2008) produced by globalization. Within literary theory in general we have seen the rise of new frameworks to do with transculturalism (as in Sissy Heff's essay in Mvck and Sarwal 2010) and new versions of cosmopolitanism (Papastergiadis 2012). In relation to multilingualism, attention is being paid in the burgeoning field of life writing in particular (Deacon, Russell and Woolacott 2008; Pajalic and Divarore 2014; Pung 2008) and, as well, in the anthologies of Australian studies being produced outside Australia (Mvck and Sarwal 2010; Sarwal and Sarwal 2009; Wang and Carrier 2010).

This book has attempted to argue, using examples from across the world (but all in English or available in English translation), that neo-cosmopolitan discussion that includes the interventions of all those from "outside"—immigrants, asylum seekers, Indigenous peoples—have distanced the Anglophone sphere so that it is no longer recognizable as a monolingual paradigm without considerable effort and obfuscation. Arguing for such proliferations supports as well the notion of literature as a proactive force within globalization and is central to Pong Chua's new book: "The world is not an indivisible whole, a closed totality. It is divided into at least three, simultaneously: audience, subject of a story, and teller. What narrates or gives the world's story to itself is the gift of time. The gift, however, does not come from a presence beyond but inheres in the world. It constitutes the world by repeatedly dividing and opening it up. [...] It is transformed and transforms itself in the telling precisely because it is fractured by the gift of time and cannot enclose itself as a sovereign whole [...] postcolonial world literature's normative task is to enact the unending opening of a world as a condition for the emergence of new subjects in spite of capitalist globalization. Its non-utopian promise is that we can belong otherwise" (2016, 308–309).

I have also found it helpful to compare the situation in Canada and Australia, the two settler colonies that have been my home for 45 years of teaching. Canadian post-multicultural writing is thriving within the fields of Black Canadian, Asian Canadian and Indigenous Canadian literary studies, and a great deal of discussion and publication has augmented what Canadian literature is seen to encompass now. As I've argued throughout this study, it helps to invoke the future anterior.

**Backwards we turn**

**we turn backwards**

**measure our failures**

**with infinite patience**

**re-imagine the times.** (Kefala 2016, 74)

Uncle Willy was from my mother's side of the family and ended up in Australia at the turn of the twentieth century. His memoirs and many other papers glower at me in a corner of my study. Having recently read Tim Bondyady's evocation of his family in Vienna, I worry that my own family's narratives (when I come to assemble them) would perhaps have a more abject form (there are no precious objects and artifacts to anchor those remembered lives—as alas) but the idea that they, alongside many others, could pierce the monoculturalism and monolingualism of Australian letters continues to animate my work.
1. Who Counts as Human Within (European) Modernity?

1 See, for example, the development of such useful concepts as "object cosmopolitanism" coined by Peter Nyers (2005) in this study of the possibilities for agency associated with refugees and asylum seekers, influenced by Giorgio Agamben's concept of disposable people.


3 See the special issue 1 edited of Feminist Theory 8.2 on "Rethinking Whiteness" (Gewertz 2007).

As exemplified by the contemporary razor wire fences Hungary has constructed to keep out Syrian (and other) refugees.

5 Ulrich Beck warns against this in his "Cosmopolitan Manicidae." As he states, "the more neo-liberal politics on a global level succeeds [...] the more likely a cosmopolitan façade arises which legitimates western military incursions (1996, 3).

6 The text was first published in 1916 and revised in 1831.

7 It is not simply a term that can be consigned to the past. See, for example, Kynicki (2007).

8 See Chapters 2 and 3.

9 This differs in various parts of the work. For example, Will Kynicki's 2007 book argues once again for the importance to Canada of acknowledging the celebratory aspects of a long history of multiculturalism, including its state-managed versions.

10 As Ajay Appadurai puts it, "the use of these words by political actors and their audiences may be subject to very different sets of contextual conventions that mediate their translation into public politics" (1996, 35).

11 In Canada, Bonnie Lawrence and Enakshi Dua (2003) have developed and extended comparable arguments.

12 What has been called the "unfinished business" with the Australian Aborigines continues to surface in the wake of the Mabo and Wik High Court decisions recognizing native title (Bartlett 1993; Perrin 1998) and following a report on the "stolen generations" (the tragedy of Aboriginal children removed from their families).

13 This is also very much the line Himani Banerji (2000) takes in her critique of Canadian multiculturalism as a direct legacy of the colonial struggle between the English and French.

14 See also Alastair Pennycook (1998), particularly the last chapter.

15 This topic has been explored in Canadian fiction, for example, SKY Lee's Disappearing Moon Cafe where Chinese and First Nations relationships are represented. More recently, such concerns are also being addressed in Australian material: see the work of Peta Stephenson (2003) and Helen Gilbert and Jacqueline Loo's (2003) work on Australasian theatre and cosmopolitanism.

16 See, for example, Fee (2013).

17 In the Canadian case, "English" would include the Scots, though not the Irish, at least initially. See Driedger (1967).

18 These speculations pertain as well an her account of traveling through Eastern Europe in the 1980s before the fall of the Soviet Empire. Note in particular the section "where does Europe end?" (Kostas 1993, 298).

19 The term NESB (non-English-speaking background) is peculiar to the Australian context and appears in many policy documents. There is also the newer Australian acronym CALD (Culturally and Linguistically Diverse).

20 Another contemporary exploration of Australia's entrenched monolingualism and multiculturalism is Berens and Wierzbicka (2007), particularly their introduction.

21 See also Daniel Coleman (2006).

22 For the very different response of two writers to this debate, see Slavenska Drakulić's Cafe Europa (1998) and Eva Hoffman's "The New Nomads" (1999).

23 The recent Brexit vote confirms that this is a two-way street.

24 In relation to whiteness debates in Australia, see Moreton-Robinson (2004).

25 Numerous commentators have stated that thinking of IS as representing Islam is like saying the Ka Khluu clan represents Christianity.

26 I am referring here to my argument in Haunted Nations where I contend that "European" and "white" acquire meanings within specific histories of colonial settlement (Gewertz 2004).

27 This history is also a dominant motif in Elizabeth's Kostova's wonderful rewriting of the Dracula story in The Historian.


29 See also the important work of Lebanese Canadian film critic and video artist Jalal Toufic (2002). My thanks to Mireille Astor for introducing me to his work.

30 It might be productive to see this work in terms of recent studies on joining and melanoindia (e.g., Ahn Young-Cheng's The Melancholy of Race, 2001), as well as the "transmission of affect" (Teresa Brennan 2004) in relation to intergenerational shame.


32 While there has been some work regarding "everyday multiculturalism" (Wise and Velatywoman 2008), it has been more difficult to find that concept extended to "everyday cosmopolitanism," although this may be changing. See, for example, Robert Dixon's notion of a "situated cosmopolitanism" (2004).

2. Vernacular Cosmopolitans

1 Sec also Ong and Kecskes (2005) who distinguishes between the vernacular and metropolitan purposes of cosmopolitanism.

2 Even though she wrote after the devastations of the Holocaust were well known, Manning displays vestiges of a uniquely British version of anti-Semitism.

3 See also Williams (2013, 20-26), for a discussion of the term.

4 There is a fascinating reversal of an Indian writer imagining Bulgaria in German Bulgarian author Illya Trayanov, whose novel The Collector of Words, based on the travels of Richard Burton, constructs an image of India, among other places in the world.

5 See Williams (2013, 104-106). My thanks to Mike Hulme (University of Auckland) for letting me know about Williams's fine study.

6 Such confidence resonates one of Deleuze and Guattari's (1989) study of Kafka's German in Prague—constituting a minor literature.

7 Kristeva's influential text Strangers to Ourselves (1991) has been called to task for its lack of historical specificity (e.g., Bjelic), but the structures of psychoanalysis Kristeva invokes work quite well when applied to specific periods and places, for example, her timely reminder that cosmopolitanism can be either libertarian or totalitarian (1991, 61). See also Banov's concept of the nomad in which she distinguishes among exile (sense of loss, migration (caught in between) and nomad (resisting assimilation) (1994, 24-25).

8 My translation, as are subsequent passages unless otherwise indicated.
3. The Serial Accommodations of Diaspora Writings

1. The Sapir-Whorf theory is usually wrongly oversimplified to convey the idea that deep-structure language produces and governs thought—thus linguistic determinism. However, it also encompasses the idea of linguistic relativity, i.e., the relationship between language and thought varies in different language systems (Payne 1997, 562ff).


4. For an excellent discussion of how "cultural capital" works in cultural theory, see Frow (1995).


7. Another example: the international Chinese students in various countries who formed a diaspora after the Tiananmen Square massacre in 1989.

8. See Chapter 4.

9. The balling of a subject is undertaken by an authoritative figure supported by institutional power, for example, a policeman or someone carrying out an official task such as a judge, or a doctor or a teacher (Althusser 1984, 48ff). Althusserian interpellation is central, for example, to Canadian critic Ely Cohn's (2007) analysis of diaspora.

10. The last two categories represent further attempts to overlook the privileged position assigned to the nation-state. Such distinction also occurs in the virtual dimension, and the penumbra of virtual networking is now a considerable presence in sustaining diasporic communities. My thanks to Terri Tomsly for alerting me to this element.

11. See Geunow (2014), for a discussion of these dynamics. It is also a reminder that Kant spoke about Bevölkerung (visiting rights) as being distinct from Weltbürgerschaft (world citizen rights).


13. See Geunow (2016) for a discussion of how these mechanisms work.

14. For example, there is a popular and much-screened television series (beloved by teachers) titled A Scattering of Seeds (52 episodes) that draws attention to the "success stories" of Canadian multiculturalism. See: www.whipoorwillpictures.com/seeds/index.html (accessed January 6, 2016).

15. See Kandiyoti (1994) and Yiva-Davis (1997) for further discussion of these complex issues.


17. Affect theory could be described as an attempt to analyze and theorize the complex field of emotions and the ways in which they shuttle between private and public realms, between biology and abstract philosophical categories. See, for example, book-length studies of affect by Ahmed (2004), Brennan (2004), Coughal (2007), Massumi (2002). See also Geunow (2010).


20. I have written about Fleming in relation to another film, see Geunow 2009.

21. In a reversal of Tan's lineage, Fleming's father is an Anglo-Celtic Australian, whereas her mother is one of the daughters of Long Tack Sam.
with expertise in English and exhibit a glaring lack of interest in learning her language. My thanks to Magery Fee for sharing us to this term.

Weneke Guus van de Meede (2008) has made a case for interpreting Gau's text in light of the genre of Chicks Lit that was dominant in the first decade of the new millennium, but it is debatable whether this term carries continuing heuristic value.

This reminds me of the prevailing belief during my own schooling in the 1960s in Australia that the children of postwar immigrants were encouraged to diverge themselves as rapidly as possible of their distracting knowledge of other languages and to settle for monolingualism—English alone.

6. Acoustic Cosmopolitanism: Echoes of Multilingualism

1 My interest in the role of the acoustic was also a topic in my earlier book. See Gunew (2004), chapter 4.

2 Related to this, I have often wondered why people read out quotations in PowerPoint presentations.

3 Shades of John O'Grady writing as Nino Cucotta's 'We're a Weird Mob', the quintessential example of the stage migrant in Australian literature, a stereotype satirized in the work of performance poets such as J.O. (1996) and Ania Walwicz's (1981, 1989).

4 See, for example, my discussion of Mochto's work in chapter 3.

5 For more on Chinook or Wawa, see Lang (2014).

6 For parallel examples in relation to German and Turkish, see Yildiz (2012).

7 See the excellent analysis of multilingualism and performance in Trenzeau (2011).

8 Or is it more a case of specific languages spanning anxiety as in the fear generated by (supposed) Arabic?

9 See, for example, the discussion of philoherm/hospitality in the conversation Tsillas has with Nikos Papastergiadis in the Journal of Intercultural Studies (Papastergiadis 2001).

10 In relation to this point, see Yildiz's discussion of German Turkish writer Feridun Zaimoglu in relation to the idea of resisting the use of supposedly mother-tongue work in writings by second- and third-generation ethnic writers (2012, 163f).

11 For another example of the continuing blindness to ethnicity see Lanoue (2013).

12 Remarkedly the approach reminds me of Steven Kelman's discussion of the "elusive," "thinking in one language but employing the locations of another" (2006, 10).

13 Carson explains the historical basis for this plot device—that it was part of an attempt to "ethnically cleanse" Australia of Chinese (Brun 2011, 29).

14 Ghasan Hage's prescriptive image of "ethnic caging" in Australian culture is pertinent here (1993).

15 See Ghasan Hage's review (2014) of this debate novel.

Conclusion: Back to the Future and the Immanent Cosmopolitanism of Post-Multicultural Writers

1 The videos (Gunew 1981a, 1982). This has further implications for the extent self-reflexive examinations of the so-called authenticity of two formats, the interview and the documentary. Since then, many films, ranging from the realists to the experimental, have dealt with multicultural hybridity (Błonski, 1993).


3 Anglo-Celtic is a controversial compound in Australia, given the ways in which the bridging between England and Ireland have been fought out symbolically in the Australian arena. Britain itself is divided culturally as a union in which Welsh and Scottish claims need to be separated out (Nairn 1977). The designation Anglo-Celtic indicates not only a British-derived culture based on the use of the English language, but also certain political and cultural institutions, and especially a tradition of education in "English studies." Those who simply use the term . . . Anglo-Celtic leave out the crucial Celtic component in Australian culture. Indeed, in Australia, disunion has been synonymous to some degree with Irish working-class and Catholic groups as in the case of the folk hero "Ned Kelly." Anglo-Celtic indicates a prevailing cultural nostalgia that images toward an old country that is always either Britain or Ireland, and that characterizes the dominant ethnic groups. Indeed, the Celtic portion of the term indicates an efficient hijacking of Australian culture by the Irish, and much of what we think of as quintessentially Australian culture—the locoond humor, the folk music and many canonical Australian writers—derives from Ireland.

4 Initially even a third-generation writer like Anna Cossins was labeled a migrant writer because her name signaled her descent from Greek and Polthis forebears.


6 This is akin to repeated pronouncements by European leaders that "multiculturalism has failed." See for example, the review of recent work by J.C. (2016).

7 See the discussions in the Introduction and Chapter 6.

8 Outsides appeared between 1984 and 1996.


10 While the bibliography was being compiled—a funded by the Australian Bicentennial Multicultural Foundation—it formed the basis for the first comprehensive collection of multicultural literature in Australia. Work on the bibliography raised awareness that irreplaceable papers and manuscripts were being lost because there was no adequately coordinated institutional interest in them. The multicultural literature collection at Deakin University, in conjunction with the bibliography, was set up to form the base for future research into the different linguistic and cultural groups in Australia, particularly those originating in the nineteenth century. However, although I had set up a considerable fund ($30,000) to maintain this collection, I recently discovered that it is now no longer being made accessible and there appears to be scant information about what happened to this archive.

11 For further clarification, see Robert Young (2000).

12 Illustrating comparisons with Canada may be made with statements by writers in Hutcheon and Richmond (1998) and Kambouris (1997).

13 The Demoulas debacle is often cited as a significant moment in the Australian culture wars. See Gunew (2004); Huggan (2007); Ounass (2007).

14 An example of the first is Owl Publishing, whose publisher, Helen Nickels, serves mostly the large Greek-Australian community, whereas Ivar Nudel's imprint, Gironnido, is interested more widely in contemporary and experimental writing.

15 See Błonski (1992) and Gunew and Rizvi (2004) for the importance of the federal arts funding institution the Australia Council for the Arts.

16 Bonduelle’s Australian text is in the tradition of Edmund de Waal’s texts (2010, 2015), which have acquired an international following.