

out of **context**
Thinking Cultural Studies
Diasporically | GRANT FARRED

By itself, out of context—but a context, always, remains open, thus fallible and insufficient.

Jacques Derrida, *Specters of Marx*¹

The singular claim of Cultural Studies is that there can be no project of the political, no thinking of the political, without culture, without the study of culture at its core. More precisely, there can be no thinking of the political without the serious consideration of that confluence between the political and the popular, and the complicated relationship that always exists, in their different articulations at specific conjunctures, amongst politics, ‘culture,’ and popular culture. So central is culture and popular culture to the thinking of the political, in fact, that several Cultural Studies scholars—many of whom have turned to the business of intervening in the process of state policy-making—have suggested that the preoccupation with popular culture has displaced politics as the discipline’s primary project.²

However, because the history of Cultural Studies is—and has been since its founding in the ideological, intellectual and ethical crises of the mid-1950s³—the history of intervention into the particularities of successive political moments, Cultural Studies is perforce the discipline of necessary, which is to say, generative, insufficiency. Because it has no one methodology, in fact it can be said to have either several methodologies or none at all, Cultural Studies cannot address every political event in the same way; one mode of intervention is, in all likelihood, insufficient for another. This ‘inherent insufficiency’, the political and disciplinary response to the specificity of the event, has created in Cultural Studies not only the possibility for thinking particularity but the imperative to think ‘out of context’: to think outside, outside an orthodoxy, outside a discipline that no history of orthodoxy.

Cultural Studies has established itself through thinking outside the available paradigms with which it has long been associated (literature, history and sociology, to name but three), through a disregard for disciplinary boundaries and purity (even as it retains strong links to literary studies, a connection that remains too strong for many within Cultural Studies). Cultural Studies derives its critical force from its ability to think both within and outside the immediate conjuncture, inside, outside and beyond the demands of the particular moment. Cultural Studies compels a thinking of the political despite the potential for fallibility—for being wrong—and despite the insufficiencies at hand—conceptual, political, practical—that are constitutive of any event. Cultural Studies demands, in that most difficult of negotiations, the simultaneity of dis-articulation and re-articulation of context. It engenders a thinking ‘out of context’, against the prevailing logic, and an imagining of how that context might be differently named, politically. We might then say that Cultural Studies represents a perpetually dislocated, or, diasporic, thinking. This is not the same, however, as suggesting that Cultural Studies—especially in the United States—always directly addresses the issue of the diaspora. There are, however, traditions, among which the Centre for Contemporary Cultural Studies (CCCS) at the University of Birmingham is preeminent, where the diaspora can, in critical moments, be said to have been pivotal in politically reorienting Cultural Studies—both these tendencies will be engaged more fully later. Not only is the work of (Jamaican-born, Oxford-educated) Stuart Hall especially crucial here, but in a text such as *Policing The Crisis*⁴ (*PTC*)—the CCCS study of the ‘moral crisis’ that arose in response to the ‘epidemic’ of (racialised) ‘muggings’ in Britain in the 1970s—demonstrates how foundational the issue of the diaspora has been to Cultural Studies. All of the ‘muggers’ in the Handsworth event (Handsworth was then a run-down, racially mixed neighborhood in the city of Birmingham) had diasporic backgrounds—Irish, Caribbean, Turkish.

Writing about the experience of an author entering a language from the outside, Kafka as a ‘Czech writing in German, and Beckett an Irishman (often) writing in French’, Gilles Deleuze argues that this signals a very particular approach to the use of a language that is not the author’s own: ‘What they do ... is invent a *minor use* of the major language within which they express themselves entirely; they *minorize* this language, much as in music, where the minor mode refers to dynamic combinations in perpetual disequilibrium’.⁵ The experience of the diaspora, following Deleuze’s thinking, could be represented as the ‘minorising’ constitutive of human dislocation and deracination. The diaspora ‘minorises’ the experience of the political subject: relocated to the metropolitan centre, the political subject is disenfranchised by the event of occupying the time and space of the other (while being identified as Other); the other who cannot (fully or even partially) acknowledge the time, culture, language and history of the Other. This is the condition of the diaspora: to struggle with, against, in spite of the event of being ‘minorised.’ It is to stake a claim for the right to ‘write’—think, speak,

imagine in a language that is 'outside' of the 'major' language. To be diasporic is to think 'minorisation' while acquiring fluency in the major language that can never be either fully owned—inhabited—or dismissed.

Because Cultural Studies, which exemplifies the complicated experience of disciplinary 'minorisation', is premised upon the recognition that every historical moment is founded upon its own political, that every historical moment produces its own particular articulation of the popular, and that every historical moment demands that Cultural Studies think itself in relation to the specific relations between the political and the popular, every Cultural Studies conjuncture is a 'context' unto itself, outside the context of the event before or after; out of context in relation to every other context. The crises that produced Cultural Studies in the mid-1950s are distinct from the conditions that enabled its institutional location in Britain and the United States in the 1960s and '70s; the demise of the second New Left in the 1970s only partially explains the rise of identity politics in the mid-1980s.

Consequently, in this essay on Cultural Studies and the 'out of context' African diaspora, the only way to think Cultural Studies is as a series of dislocations, a series of 'diasporas'. While the term 'diaspora' designates, broadly speaking, the forced migration of communities or ethnic populations from their traditional homelands, there is the recognition here that diaspora cannot be thought absolutely as a condition or explication of deracination. The diasporic subject recalls the exile; the member of the extensive ethnic community invokes and evokes the individualised exile and self-exile, or, as is pertinent especially in the final section of this essay, the literary expatriate—a type famously familiar to literary scholars, a type that includes Joyce, Conrad and Nabokov.

If the uprooted, displaced fate of the exile is grounded in a lack of choice (where the only choice is to live somewhere else), and the diasporic subject is presumed to act with greater agency (the political capacity to be able to choose to live somewhere else), it is still sometimes difficult to distinguish the diasporic subject from the exile, the diasporised community from its émigré counterpart. Much as the diasporic subject imagines an inalienable right to/of return, so the exile's imagining of the foreclosed possibility might—because it is a fraught condition of being—itself be a politically sustaining affective structure. How, for example, do we think Paul of J. M. Coetzee's novel *Slow Man*? As a literary expatriate or the diasporic subject who cannot conceive of a return?

It is for this reason that 'deracination' is so paradigmatic for thinking the incompatibility, the complex linkage, between diaspora and exile: deracination returns both these experiences to their foundations: the condition of removal, of living, always with psychic and (often) physical difficulty, elsewhere, the condition of being ungrounded. In this way the diaspora and exile enunciate the political as the history of *différance*. There can be, as long as there

is the event of the diaspora (or exile), no political without diaspora: the diaspora is the national political which extends beyond (one) sovereignty into (another) sovereignty.

While acknowledging the value of the longstanding Cultural Studies tradition of always thinking contextually, from its origins with the deeply rooted work of Raymond Williams (from his groundbreaking essay 'Culture is Ordinary' to his autobiographical novel *Border Country*) to Richard Hoggart's *The Uses of Literacy*, the argument here is for a different, counter-vailing recognition: to think out of context, to think against and sometimes despite the pressures of context, to complicate the understanding of how context might work, to think the insufficiencies of 'context'. Cultural Studies, it could be argued, has not in the past and cannot now presume that it needs only repeat itself in order to do its political work; in fact, the discipline has always been politically singular but contextually 'sovereign', simultaneously composed of contiguous events and practices but also political sites and moments outside and particular to itself. Nowhere is this intervention for 'out of contextness' more evident than the final section of this essay, 'The African Diaspora in the Antipodes'. Thinking the African diaspora from outside can produce, as in the work of white diasporic (South) African author J. M. Coetzee, a connection—a thinking—with other diasporas and indigenities—as in the work of literary expatriate Australian writer David Malouf (who writes about Australia, sometimes from Italy, where he spends six months a year, a physical and creative condition of being that can render 'home' a porous, ambivalent term)—that reveals the political necessity of maintaining not only the locality of the 'outside' but retaining in any such reading the tension inherent in producing a 'minorised' political subject.

If all migrants cannot be properly named 'diasporic', and if exiles and the diasporised sometimes bear an uncanny resemblance to each other, then what this essay implicitly argues is both required and enabled because of the complex relationship of race to the history of the diaspora; and, of course, an absolute prerequisite for thinking the African diaspora. Both Coetzee's and Malouf's oeuvres are haunted, perhaps even made possible, by the spectral, ir-removable presence of the Other: the Other as embodied in a blackness that will not be written out, that perpetually demands its writing, and, most saliently (particularly for Malouf in *Remembering Babylon*), insists upon an accounting for an originary blackness violated, by the history of colonialism, by a bio-politically disruptive white settlement.

It is possible to think the diaspora without race, as the experience of several white ethnic communities in Europe so amply demonstrates, but it is unarguable that through any engagement with race the diasporic acquires a distinct critical edge. It is in this way that Coetzee's work proves the political value of the exceptional. It is not that the movement of Africans, of specific African communities, is exceptional. Quite the contrary. However, it is through engaging the issue of the white European diaspora that the white diasporised-exiled South

African author, in his writing of *Slow Man* from Australia, implicitly, tenuously but evocatively, makes white South Africa a part of the (overwhelmingly black history of the) African diaspora. *Slow Man*'s European stands in for a long history of white South African flight from Africa; Paul metonymises those white South Africans who diasporised themselves to the Southern Cone (where the repressive political climate of the 1960s and '70s in Argentina, Paraguay, Uruguay and Chile was more to their liking),⁶ to the Antipodes, and to North America. White South Africans, like Paul Rayment, have a long history of aggressively tracing their genealogies to Europe (like Paul's stepfather Dutch's ancestral homeland); *Slow Man* simultaneously acknowledges that white past while also inaugurating a new diasporic modality: through Coetzee's writing the diaspora, white South Africans are Africanised, made 'unexceptional' yet signal in their movement away from, out of, their homeland—a homeland that they have, of course, always only fitfully claimed as fully theirs.

The African diaspora, Coetzee's (and Malouf's) novel demonstrates, can only be thought in its intimate, historically violent relationship to race. The narrative of the African diaspora is the account of race in, of and for Africa. It is, ironically (or, arguably, appropriately), a story that can only be im-possibly told by a diasporised white South African who is, crucial in moments, indistinguishable from the literary self-exile.

— THE SINGULAR, THE REPETITION OF THE SINGULAR.

The fact remains that any mode of thinking that is the least bit singular reveals itself in saying basically the same thing, which it cannot but hazard every time in the colorful prism of circumstances.

Jacques Rancière, *The Philosopher and His Poor*⁷

Thought as a constitutive outside, Cultural Studies is, following Rancière, 'singular'. It is a particular way of reading the political and yet, even as it refuses repetition, it retains a commitment to intervention. Every event of Cultural Studies thus 'says the same thing' without 'saying the same thing'. Much as, we might suggest, every articulation of the African diaspora is unthinkable without the recognition that saying the 'same thing' is never saying the same thing. It is not simply that every experience of the Africa diaspora is particular, specific to itself as much as it shares key phenomena with other experiences of the diaspora, but that every account of the African diaspora—to say nothing of how those forces are operative for the exile—is 'out of context': it belongs to another place, in another place, a place that is not the place where it is, a place for which the diasporic subject may or may not yearn, a place the diasporic subject may or may not want to return to, if such a return were at all possible. To be diasporised is to be articulated to, disarticulated from and rearticulated through, a context that is outside the place from where the subject speaks.

The fallibilities and insufficiencies inherent to the diaspora emerge out of context beyond the place of speaking. It is not simply that the African diaspora must be thought as a multiple and variegated articulation, but that it must be thought in an external relationship to the place from which it speaks. That precarious, and precariously disadvantaged, position of the outside (that is problematically related to the 'inside'), is the only place from which to speak the diaspora.

Because of its Ranciere-ean 'singularity', Cultural Studies has always been a venerable poacher's practice. It is a 'discipline' that borrows from other forms of thought in order to think itself precisely because it cannot 'say the same thing', even when the political appears to be the 'same'. In order to produce its critiques and interventions, Cultural Studies has drawn from, and continues to draw from, a range of disciplines. These include, but are not limited to, literary studies, sociology, political theory, policy studies, philosophy and anthropology. Cultural Studies has been and remains, in Derrida's sense, 'open' to other disciplines because of its fallibilities and insufficiencies. It is 'open' to other disciplines precisely because it is at once less than its 'disciplinary host' and, by virtue of its political practice, more than that discipline. Critically attentive to its lacks, Cultural Studies understands the imperative to address—and redress—its 'disciplinary' insufficiencies. It is, in this regard, a 'discipline' that cannot be 'closed': it must always be open to that which it is not. Cultural Studies cannot do its work without a singular commitment to—an openness to—the contingencies of the moment; it cannot do its conceptual work without the tools it has culled from those disciplines with which it is dialogically linked. However, the effects of disciplinary openness work both ways. Cultural Studies is both, in Shakespeare's terms, a 'borrower and a lender': it enriches and problematises those other disciplines as much as it utilises them. It has, among other things, infused literary studies with a critical means for incorporating into its orbit strategies for reading the popular; it has lent sociology a keener, more contested notion of how culture functions; and it has made available to anthropologists a more difficult articulation of the role of culture in society.

It is in its dislocation, its disarticulation and rearticulation of itself, that Cultural Studies reveals itself to be, both paradigmatically and philosophically, a diasporic practice. The diaspora is, like Cultural Studies, out of sheer psychic and political necessity, a poacher's modality. This is in large measure because Cultural Studies has, with rare and notable institutional exceptions, the preeminent example being CCCS (now, sadly, no longer in existence), never had the benefit—or, some would argue, the drawbacks—of a permanent institutional location.⁸ Like a diasporic subject, at once in search of a space of respite and insurgent, at once tolerated and made to feel unwelcome, at once the beneficiaries of hospitality and treated with the kind of suspicion reserved only for foreigners, simultaneously aggressive and unsure about this new place in which it finds itself, Cultural Studies has had

to rely on the kindness of institutional—well, if not strangers, then—‘reluctant relatives’ in order to do its work.

Following Derrida, we might think Cultural Studies and the diaspora as an ‘autoimmunity’:⁹ there can be no diaspora without the preparedness to risk death (the literal, psychic and social death of the deracinated subject) and yet it is the very ‘inhospitality’ of home (politically, economically and socially induced inhospitality) that makes the taking of that risk absolutely necessary. To extend this autoimmune logic, there is always a double risk of in/hospitality: the metropolis could result in the repetition of the very inhospitality that is being fled so that Cultural Studies is made to do its work under inhospitable circumstances. Of course, the metropolis could also prove ‘hospitable’, inhabitable in ways that ‘home’ is precisely not so that Cultural Studies is located ‘in’ the hospitality of its (disciplinary) ‘benefactor’. It is in this way that in/hospitality is always, by dint of historical force, central to any discussion of the diaspora. It is for this reason that questions such as, How in/hospitable are political conditions in the place of arrival? How welcome is the foreigner? What form does in/hospitality take? Are all diasporas equal? (How, for example, to think the relationship between African-Americans—the ‘political subjects’ of the Middle Passage—and late-twentieth and early twenty-first century African migrants to the USA? How much, if any, ‘racial solidarity’ can be presumed? In fact, who has the historic right to be named ‘African-American?’ Which African-American is an African-American? Can a white South African be an African-American?) and, What series of political events or what political climate shapes the discourse of in/hospitality? are all pivotal to the diasporic experience. In/hospitality, risk, death (‘suicide’ is Derrida’s more trenchant term), and the language of profound uncertainty are fundamental to writing the diaspora, to writing the encounter of the other with the Other. The postcolonial African diaspora, because its sovereignty rearticulates the relation of Africa to black America, reveals the aporia at the core of these relations. In a hyphenated American society, how does the diasporic African name her- or himself? Does diaspora demand that the very taxonomy of hyphenation be rethought?

Cultural Studies has operated, sometimes furtively, always with a greater or lesser sense of in/hospitality, sometimes with the consent of the institutional authorities, from within language departments, especially English ones, anthropology, and sometimes sociology, political science or comparative literature—or, to use the more precise architectural metaphor, Cultural Studies has had to function under the in/hospitable auspices of these departments. As a consequence, Cultural Studies has both been relieved of the burden of institutional maintenance or institution building and without a base within the academy: without a secure place from which it could do its work so that the possibility of doing work, to say nothing of the conditions of labour, is always understood as a contingent possibility, as the experience of writing in/hospitality.

If there is no one Cultural Studies methodology, an aspect of the 'discipline' many of its practitioners value rather than express any concern about, then it is because it has for more than half a century operated as a diasporic subject of the university—a (barely) acknowledged presence, a sometimes ghostly presence, haunting 'pure' disciplines, spectrally present, but a presence, nevertheless, and almost invariably a political one because it always marks the limits and vulnerabilities attendant to sovereignty. Cultural Studies' propensity for innovative, creative thinking, for working across and often in disregard for disciplinary boundaries is, in part, a consequence of it never being 'disciplined' into a methodology, into a singular way of thinking, into political or cultural one-ness, a 'sovereignty'; it has become the disciplinary sovereign that threatens all other sovereigns. Cultural Studies, we might say at the risk of romanticising diasporic existence, made a virtue out of institutional inhospitable homelessness—or, semi-homelessness, at the very least.

It is the process of living out of context, Cultural Studies has, like the diasporic subject, perfected the Marxist art of necessity, of making—as Marx says in the 'Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte'—history under conditions not of its own choosing. Cultural Studies has, like the diasporic subject, constructed an institutional viability for itself by borrowing from the 'host' culture, determining what can be adapted, retooled and modified from the place of origin and what cannot; it is the act of making do, of experimenting, of sometimes acknowledging the borrowing and sometimes not. It is about recognising that to be out of context occasionally means having access, simultaneously, unequally, to more than one context; conceptually and politically, it is to make poaching a way of life. To be 'out of context' is to ontologise the diaspora: to think from the place of dislocation because no other place will permit its thinking. To think the diaspora is to open up into the condition of autoimmunity—the vulnerability of the displaced subject within the political and therefore the possibility of enfranchisement that will inscribe it differently, less vulnerably, within the political; its out of placeness within the (new) political; its uncertainty before and in relation to the Law, the epistemological insufficiency which means that, because the subject can never fully 'know', the subject can only speculate about what it knows it does not know and therefore does not always know what it is speculating about. It is the autoimmunity, fallibility and the insufficiency of the place of origin that produces the violence of deracination: epistemological, affective and psychic violence, a violence that recalls for many diasporic subjects the 'origin' and the *raison d'être* of the diasporic experience—the flight from the dictatorship, the gulag, genocide or, more 'mundanely', the desperate departure from economic hopelessness, increasingly the narrative of raced diasporic subjects in Europe and the United States of America. That is the narrative of vengeance, the violence that attends to the out of placeness, that is inherent to the experience of the diaspora. The diaspora represents the psychic costs of negation, a cost that not even the logic of autoimmunity can always

ameliorate: the costs of not staying, of having left, of leaving behind—because it a process that is always in process—the place of origin. The diaspora is, reductively phrased, not that which was. It is not the Maghreb for North Africans in Spain, not West Africa for those black traders selling cheap imitation designer goods in New York or Buenos Aires.

The diaspora is always the narrative of the insufficient, that which in itself is never enough to, for, and in and of itself (like autoimmunity, the subject can never protect itself from itself): there can never be an equivalence between the place of origin and the place of contemporary habitation, living permanently, sometimes more uneasily than others, with the condition of in/hospitality so that there is always the recognition that there can never be a diaspora with the greatest risk—life or death, life and death, life in death, death in (deracinated) life.

Above all else, the diaspora articulates the narrative of being out of context: of being historically fallible and insufficient in relation to the psychic and affective logic of place. In taking this un/imaginable risk, there is always the task of political measuring; of ‘evaluating’ the risk, its effects, its consequences, producing the ontological question: is the risk worth the risk? In the stark, almost Darwinian (which, also, strikingly enough, evokes the fiercely ‘survivalist’ rhetoric of Malcolm X) terms of David Malouf’s protagonist Gemmy, from the novel *Remembering Babylon*, ‘Since he had somehow found his way into the world, his object, like any creature’s, was to stay in it and by any means he could’.¹⁰ It is always a violent, autoimmune struggle to ‘stay in it’, this place that is not the site of origin and yet it is now inhabited precisely because it is not that original place; the place of origin is always autoimmunely related to the place in the diaspora.

The diaspora, the desire to ‘stay in it,’ demands, in this way, nothing so much as a thinking ‘out of context’: the historical thinking of the dislocated subject in relation to its out of placeness, its removal from ‘itself’; the diaspora demands a thinking beyond immediate and historic contexts. The diaspora constitutes a necessary affective, political and psychic insufficiency in that it requires the holding together of the contradiction: the ‘dis-articulation’, like the Deleuzian ‘disequilibrium’, of the place of origin and its re-articulation in the place of habitation; and, the re-articulation of the place of inhabitation in the difficult (to translate) terms of the place of origin. The diaspora is not, for this reason, simply a matter of contextual translation—the act of making affective and historical sense of the processes of dislocation and relocation—but the constitutive site of autoimmunity: to live diasporically is to recognise the condition of living without the possibility of a singular context. It is to live with the fallibility of history, the violence that constitutes memory, and the insufficiency of place. Not just the place of habitation or the place of origin, but any place. Not simply, say, the poverty of Morocco but the precarious temporary inhabitation of Andalusia by the ‘boat people’ who cross the straits in the twenty-first century in search of work. Andalusia

is, moreover, a region of Spain haunted by *La Reconquista*,¹¹ the history of Moorish conquest and Catholic Spain's reconquest of the region of centuries gone by; for this reason, the contemporary diaspora is indissolubly linked to the bloody violence of colonialisation and 'liberation' era of the Crusades, of the aggressive march of Islam and the determined resurgence of an imperial, militaristic Catholicism.

To live diasporically is to live 'out of context,' beyond the place of physical occupation or affective imagining. Bound by their mutual 'out of contextness', Cultural Studies and the African diaspora can do more than learn from each other, they can do more than animate each other. Thinking them together demonstrates how these two modes of critical thinking, this poacher's discipline and this political condition that is increasingly crucial to lives of people throughout the world, are conceptually constitutive of each other. There can be no thinking of Cultural Studies without a thinking of the diaspora; there can be no articulation of the diasporic experience without the recognition of the constitutive, supportive, and critically symbiotic and symbolic role that the popular—and culture more generally—plays in the insufficient process of dis- and rearticulation of the deracinated subject. There can be no thinking of the popular and the diasporic without an accounting for race. Located at the core of the history of Cultural Studies in Britain is the narrative of metropolitan disarticulation and rearticulation by the resilient experience of migration.

Less than a decade after the *Empire Windrush* docked on the English coast port of Southampton in 1947, packed to the gills with colonials from the Anglophone Caribbean, Cultural Studies was founded; no sooner had the Ugandan and Kenyan governments expelled its Asian nationals in 1972 than Hall and his colleagues at Birmingham were confronted with the violence of metropolitan racism, producing, in that cotermination the memorable book, *PTC*; a 'crisis', moreover, not simply for diasporic subjects and the British state, but also—in the most dynamic sense—within Cultural Studies. The local and (global) post-imperial conjunctures of 1972 compelled Cultural Studies to think race in its locally diasporic formation. Through their work in *PTC*, the Birmingham scholars recognised how the dissolution of Britain's imperial past was taking place, almost literally, right before their eyes. The now dilapidated, racially diverse neighborhood of Handsworth, where the infamous 'mugging' of an older white man by three youths from the area took place, was only a stone's throw from the University of Birmingham's campus where CCCS was housed; directed, as CCCS then was, by the Jamaican-born Hall, himself a product of this post-war diaspora. (Hall came to England in the early 1950s on a Rhodes Scholarship to Oxford's Merton College.) Out of that historic 1972 conjuncture, out of the critiques developed in *PTC*, out of that 'crisis', a Cultural Studies that attended more closely to the politics of race was born. *PTC* made, for the very first time, race a political category that had to be thought alongside,

and sometimes before class. Before this Handsworth-centered work, the white English working-class experience predominated Cultural Studies, studied as it was across a broad sweep of the discipline's history—from the nineteenth-century dissenters in E. P. Thompson's magisterial writing in *The Making of the English Working Class* to Paul Willis's study of contemporary biker culture.

The history of Cultural Studies can thus be said to coincide with the massive postwar migration of black populations from Africa, the Caribbean and the Asian subcontinent to Europe and the United States. The *Empire Windrush* was merely metonymic of the diaspora and the politics of the diaspora to come: it was simply the first postwar ship to bring black bodies in such large, and mainly masculine, numbers. Coming firstly as gastarbeiters required by a metropolitan economy desperately in need of workers, and then later as workers fleeing either their own devastated economies or simply in search of better financial prospects, these successive waves of black migration substantively remade metropolitan sites through their culture; after Third World independence, events such as the African expulsion of already once-diasporised Asians (the 'kala pani'—'dark waters'—that voyage that displaced Asians from the subcontinent to Africa), 1972 produced a new wave and type of diasporic subject—the diasporised subject dislocated by colonisation now again deracinated by the excesses of Kenyan and Ugandan postcolonial rule. It is precisely this experience and articulation of the violence of dislocation that distinguishes British from North American Cultural Studies. The diaspora has never been constitutive of Cultural Studies in the United States, where the discipline arrived later, and in a very different political form. In North America, it could be said, diasporic studies was less disjoined from Cultural Studies than it was never really constitutive of the discipline. The politics of the diaspora, in the North American academy, was accommodated within language departments, especially those hospitable to the study of postcolonial literature and culture, those institutional redoubts where the novels of V. S. Naipaul and Assia Djebar, Wole Soyinka and Monica Ali, and the poetic verse of Derrick Walcott is read. The literature, culture and the critical theory of the postcolonial found a home, sometimes with the politics of Cultural Studies, often shorn of it, in English, Romance Studies and Spanish or Portuguese departments.

What did not go unremarked upon from the mid-1980s, however, by both Cultural Studies and postcolonial scholars, and on both sides of the Atlantic and in places beyond such as Australia and Taiwan, was how new forms of dress, physical self-representation, and artistic expression—the culture—emerged through the presence of this 'influx' of migrants—sometimes labelled 'diasporic', at other times 'postcolonials', occasionally understood as constitutively similar political subjects. The jazz music that had marked the diasporisation of African-Americans fleeing the racism of the United States during the interwar years, and after (as the fiction of James Baldwin so poignantly and painfully recounts for us), was

supplemented—not displaced—in the 1970s and 1980s by the reggae and Rastafarianism of the Caribbean, the haunting melodies of an Ali Farka Toure.

Through the music of Bob Marley, the narratives of grand return to Africa (from the Caribbean and the United States) voiced so poetically in the early decades of the twentieth century by his countryman Marcus Garvey were recast, made relevant for the Babylonian experience of the late-twentieth century; in the ghostly but seductive tunes of Salif Keita and Angélique Kidjo, there was the recall—and return to popularity—of Baaba Maal and Farka Toure. For later generations there would be the anger, social critiques and bling-bling romance of American hip-hop filtered through the experiences of Brixton, London and the suburbs on the outskirts of Paris, those diasporic locales where the ‘Trinadadians’, ‘West Africans’ and the ‘Arabs’—from North Africa—lived; hip-hop, it should be said, ‘gone native’ and sometimes augmented by a jazz itself long rooted in these rediasporised spaces; or, those metropolitan locales subjected to a fresh dose of diasporic cultural creativity and economic desperation; those metropolitan spaces made, for the first or the umpteenth time, ‘out of place’ to themselves in order to accommodate diasporised subjects, that movement of black and brown bodies that made the ‘natives’ out of place in ‘their’ place by an array of sociopolitical forces that was both global and local in origin. The colonial project, after all, began in newly industrialised places such as the port city of Liverpool and the factories of Manchester, so that the locals were intimately involved in—and, to a large extent, benefited from—the economy of colonialism.

Out of these diasporic and rediasporised cultures, out of the history of poaching and the imprints made by the black subjects of the diaspora on the metropolis, new political identities emerged. Identities, it should be said, that mobilised diasporic communities because they addressed issues of race, black alienation from the political, gender and ethnicity. In remaking the metropolis, diasporic communities from Africa to Asia can also be said to be partly responsible for disarticulating the political pieties of the metropolitan Left and reconfiguring the political landscape of Europe and North America. Recognising that the new claims diasporic communities, as well as women, gays, lesbians and environmentalists, were making on the metropolitan political were creating not only a new language for politics, ‘identity’, but an entirely new way of doing politics, Cultural Studies—ever attentive, especially in the work of theorists such as Hall, to transformed conditions of politics—helped to address this new configuration. Identity politics became, in its very formulation and re-formation of the Left political, a critique of grand political narratives that had long excluded people of colour and those from the diaspora; identity politics did not so much make room or accommodate those who had once been ‘Lonely Londoners’, those who drifted, almost every one of them at the very edge of poverty, in Sam Selvon’s 1950s novel (*The Lonely Londoners*), from one lumpenproletariat mode of existence to another; rather, it was from the

politics of identity produced by constituencies such as the grandchildren of Selvon's black Londoners, now cast as the diasporic 'yardies' of Victor Headley's early 1990s black pulp fiction,¹² that the metropolitan Left and Cultural Studies took its political cue.

Located on the outside of the traditional metropolitan Left, working from a position of historic vulnerability, it was through the act of demanding that their material, political, and cultural insufficiencies be addressed, be redressed, that the experience of the diaspora proved crucial to providing both Cultural Studies and diasporic communities themselves with the critical tools to conduct a different kind of politics; a politics that opened from the position of the diasporised. Having to think their politics from outside the context of the traditional Left, diasporised communities demonstrated the political value of insufficiency. Or, as *Slow Man's* Paul Rayment would have it, it is about the 'out-side'. Reflecting on his own complicated diasporic trajectory, Paul says: "I can pass among Australians. I cannot pass among the French. That, as far as I am concerned, is all there is to it, to the national-identity business: where one passes and where on the contrary one stands out".¹³ It is precisely because diasporic subjects 'stand out' that they reveal their inability to 'pass' as or among the French, Australian or British to be a generative position, a position from which the political could be reconceived, recalibrated and reimagined. To 'stand out' is to make Left politics unrecognisable to itself, to make this 'national-identity business' matter in ways that Paul will have no truck with, requires the act of wrenching the class-based, white, masculinist (with which Paul aligns himself) purveyors of a deeply racist unconscious and sometimes not so unconscious, Left out of its own, historic context. The 'non-Pauline' diasporic subject represents the voice of Deleuzian 'disequilibrium': the inability, like Paul among the French, to pass, to signify a visceral out of contextness, makes outsidership an identity the centrifugal force—or, Edward Said might argue, the 'contrapuntal'¹⁴ force—of a 'minorised' political speaking against a majoritarian political language. If, that is, only for the brief historical moment that has been the two decades or so of the identity politics movement. For this instant, the discourse of 'fallibility and insufficiency' has been displaced from the diasporic communities to the historically dominant ones. Through its insurgent discourses, Cultural Studies and the political ingenuity of the diaspora has—if only briefly—demonstrated how disarticulation can be made to work against dominant constituencies and their narratives.

To speak that place named 'out of context' can, occasionally, disarticulate an entire context—can make it fallible in ways previously unimagined as the violent articulations of the politically enfranchised but culturally and ideologically dispossessed subjects of France's Arab suburbs demonstrated in October 2005. The riots that began in Clichy Dubois, after the murder of two Arab teenagers by the French police, showed how an 'out of place' raced and denigrated constituency in republican France could make an entire country seem

momentarily 'out of place' to itself. Those Arab and Berber communities displaced from North Africa decades before to service, in menial capacities (or, as in the case of Berber footballer Zinedine Zidane, to lead the nation to World Cup triumph in 1998 and to 'infamy' in 2006, thereby making the Algerian diasporic subject the cultural incarnation of an 'inclusive' French republicanism), the needs of the French economy, returned—in the political persons of the children and grandchildren—to disarticulate an entire European nation into a political and psychic out of placeness—if only, that is, for a traumatic few weeks.

If the culture of the black diaspora, from the melancholy, bitter-sweet novels of Sam Selvon (*The Lonely Londoners*), the insistent hybridity of Salman Rushdie (*The Satanic Verses*) and the resilient Bangladeshi underclass of Monica Ali (*Brick Lane*) to the music of a Marley or an Angélique Kidjo or a Nitin Sawhney, pays tribute to the vivacity, linguistic inventiveness and exuberance of the diaspora, the event of Clichy Dubois in the suburbs of Paris in October 2005 demonstrates an important political fact: in a moment of national crisis, especially when the Other body—the diasporised subject, the racialised foreigner, initiates or is seen to initiate the event—becomes again, as if for the first time, unremittingly Other. The Other becomes the foreigner, the unbearable threat to national sovereignty—or, as it is now known, 'national security'.

The diasporic subject lives, in this way, always with the prospect of being made in/hospitable. *Slow Man's* über-diasporic subject, Drago, the confident young Croatian-Australian, may be able to insert his central European ancestors in Paul Rayment's historical photographs of Anglo-Australian settlers. However, in the event of the Cronulla riots (December 2005), Drago's Lebanese-Australian contemporaries encounter with the white Australian state—that event of Lebanese 'provocation' followed by white Australian violence followed by an equally violent Lebanese riposte—makes diaspora-derived vulnerability abundantly clear. Young Lebanese-Australians are made to understand fully their infinitely renewable, infinitely rearticulable, infinitely re-mobilisable Otherness. In the event of national crisis, the Other's otherness is unfailingly recalled for anti-diasporic (or, more precisely, anti-immigrant) duty: the foreigner is ultimately intolerable to the nation, the primary threat to the nation's (racialised) sovereignty. As imaginatively as Drago can impose the Balkans (and, metaphysically, himself) onto and into Australia's history, so Lebanese-Australians can be relentlessly written out of the nation. (Stranded in Lebanon in July–August 2006 during the Israel–Lebanon war, there was—for too long—too little national will to bring the Lebanese citizen back. Which provokes the question: when does the diasporic subject become a citizen? Ever? Never?) To be diasporic or exiled is, in Said's terms, to comprehend fully the condition of 'not-belonging'.¹⁵ Or, more precisely, the threat of 'non-belonging' that girds every diasporic belonging.

— THE AFRICAN DIASPORA IN THE ANTIPODES

Unconditional hospitality exceeds juridical, political, or economic calculation. But no thing and no one happens or arrives without it.

Jacques Derrida, *Rogues*¹⁶

The traces of this unexpected disarticulation, this displacement of the discourse of dislocation from the familiar, the subaltern black body, to the unfamiliar, this rendering of the diaspora as ‘out of context,’ is, as has been suggested, encountered most saliently in the fiction of white, diasporic African novelist J. M. Coetzee. Recently dislocated to Adelaide, Australia, the same city in which his protagonist, Paul Rayment of the novel *Slow Man*, lives, Coetzee has created in this novel the ‘out of contextness’ that marks diasporic life.

Coetzee’s Paul Rayment openly admits to the problematic of diasporic existence. As Paul remarks to his interlocutor, the persistent, white, Irish-Australian, Elizabeth Costello (‘It is’, Paul thinks, ‘the Irish who have always given him trouble, and the Irish strain in Australia.’), the novelist heroine of an earlier Coetzee novel (*Elizabeth Costello*) and herself something of a diasporic figure, now returned to unsettle the ‘slowed man’:

I had three doses of the immigrant experience, not just one, so it imprinted itself quite deeply. First when I was uprooted as a child and brought to Australia; then when I declared my independence and returned to France; then when I gave up France and came back to Australia. *Is this where I belong?* I asked with each move. *Is this my true home?* (SM, 230, 192.)

The deracinations, each movement between North and South, each voyage between France and Australia, reveal the ‘out of contextness’ that is constitutive of diasporic life. The experiences that mark the diaspora preclude an easy, ‘permanent’ answer to the inquiry about ‘home’ and ‘belonging’, so Paul is ‘condemned’ to live fallibly, insufficiently. He is perpetually out of context, out of place, neither fully Australian nor French, at home in neither the old world or the new. *Slow Man* does not only engage the issue of Western European diasporas. Coetzee’s novel also foregrounds the Central European experience—via the Baltic origins of his Croatian nurse Marijana (‘Marijana of the Balkans, giver of care, compelled even more than he to conduct her life in a foreign tongue’)—and the diasporic constitution of Australia, a nation-state inconceivable without the history of several white diasporas, some of whom, of course, were not originally presumed to belong categorically to Australian whiteness (SM, 165).

It is in this way that Paul is forced to recognise that his struggle with the diasporic experience, the disconcerting autoimmunity of his condition, is not singular but prevalent. The facticity of the Australian diaspora is brought home to him with an especial salience

through his interaction with the women who 'interrogate' (Elizabeth Costello) and care for him (Marijana), the Irish Catholic and the Croatian Catholic women who simultaneously enable and disrupt Paul's world after the amputation of his leg (in an accident with a car while Paul is riding his bike). Of the two women, it is Elizabeth, the more historically established of the 'immigrants', who is more easily given to mocking Paul: "A pukka little Catholic boy. I can see that, Paul ... Don't forget, I am a proper Irish Catholic girl myself, a Costello from Northcote in Melbourne" (SM, 156). However, if it is the linguistic intensity and cheek of Elizabeth's questions that unsettle Paul, it is the shared linguistic discomfiture with Marijana that enables Paul, the 'notional Frenchman', to recognise how the diaspora operates to separate the dislocated subject from her or his language (SM, 161).

Elizabeth bluntly declares: "Does it all come down to the English language, to your not being confident enough to act in a language that is not your own?" (SM, 230). He and Marijana, Paul understands, are both 'minorised' by the language they (cannot but) need to, are compelled to, speak: 'she speaks a rapid, approximate Australian English with Slavic liquids and an uncertain command of *a* and *the*, coloured by slang she must pick up from her children, who must pick it up from their classmates. It is a variety of the language he is not familiar with; he rather likes it' (SM, 27). The diaspora demands that the deracinated learn, learn to speak, a language that is not their own. They are, as Deleuze argues, made to inhabit—to live in, awkwardly, with difficulty—a language in which they patently lack facility but in which they develop a 'minorized mastery'. Which is precisely Coetzee's Deleuzian point (Derrida's, too, in *Monolingualism*): any and all 'minorised' encounters with a language not their own is indelibly, perpetually, marked by the scars of political, cultural and psychic struggle. Paul and Marijana, more so than Elizabeth, are 'foreigners in the language' ('HS', 109). It is, for precisely this reason that their foreignness enables them to 'make the language itself scream, stutter, stammer or murmur' ('HS', 110). The language that is, and is decidedly not, theirs, the language that they inhabit so complexly; the language that they can, as it were, diasporise against itself, disarticulate it into a different, strange, French-inflected, Ireland-intonated 'murmur'; with the 'uncertain command' of the definite and the indefinite articles, the very grammatical structure of the language is put under diasporic pressure by a dislocated speaker learning a language third-hand: indirectly from her children who 'pick it up,' directly, 'from their classmates.' The minorised language is the haunted language, the language of the Self haunted by the too proximate 'murmurs'—murmurings—of the Other.

Of course, what haunts Coetzee's 'newly diasporic writing' are the colonial, racially overburdened ghosts that haunt the Australian psyche in much the same way that Paul Rayment is autoimmunely bonded, forever, to the different Europes (France, the Netherlands, England and even Elizabeth Costello's Ireland) of his past:

Not just bush ... Not just blackfellows either, Not zero history. Look, that is where we come from: from the cold and damp and smoke of that wretched cabin, from those women with their helpless black eyes, from that poverty and that grinding labour on hollow stomachs. A people with a story of their own, a past. *Our story, our past* (SM, 52).

In this way, *Slow Man* reveals the traces of an Australia historically haunted by a racialised 'oldness', an Aboriginal culture older than Paul Rayment's French one. Through his engagement with Elizabeth and Marijana, *Slow Man* insists that it is not only Paul who is always burdened with the sense that absolute belonging is inaccessible to him and denied its singularity—even as he insists, sometimes desperately, upon his singularity. So much so, in fact, that any sense of place is always prefaced by the interrogative, 'Is this where I belong?', a question that is pluralised so that it motivates against anything but a contingent understanding of place that rests uneasily, uncannily, upon autoimmunity—the spectre of out of placeness haunts Australia, the Balkans, Europe and Africa, the latter of which Elizabeth visited so indiscriminately in *Elizabeth Costello*. It is precisely because Cultural Studies engenders an 'out of context' thinking that it becomes possible to understand how the African diaspora might be rearticulated—might rearticulate itself—as and in the experience of a white diasporic African writer grappling with the several diasporas Coetzee has encountered since his relocation from South Africa. Read 'out of context', read against both his place of origin and his place of 'resettlement', Coetzee's novel comes to reveal how it becomes possible to locate the diaspora outside itself, outside its historical visage, dislocated from even its racialised diasporic Self.

Coetzee's invocation of the Aboriginal experience, the 'history of the past', which in so many ways recalls the experience of indigenous black South(ern) Africans, the 'chthonic, the ones who stand with their feet planted in their native earth',¹⁷ sets his work in conversation with an Australian such as David Malouf in *Remembering Babylon*, in part because of their shared preoccupation with language (SM, 198). Coming upon the white settlement, the 'white' survivor (of the shipwreck, of parental neglect, of adult abandonment and abuse) Gemmy ('saved', in part through initial indifference, by the Aborigines), is silently and not so subtly ridiculed:

He was a parody of a white man. If you gave him a word for a thing, he could, after a good deal of huffing and blowing, repeat it, but the next time round you had to teach it to him all over again. He was imitation gone wrong, and the mere sight of it put you wrong too, made the whole business somehow foolish and open to doubt. (RB, 39)

While Paul never comes fully to grips with English and Marijana mangles her use of 'a' and 'the', Gemmy Fairley has to relearn the use of a language that he can now never inhabit fully or comfortably again after acquiring not only an Aboriginal tongue but the silent and

'other worldly' form of communication that the Indigenous people count as critical to their engagement with each other and the universe. This is why the white settlers are so afraid of him, so 'open to doubt' not only about Gemmy but about themselves:

It was the mixture of the monstrous strangeness and unwelcome likeness that made Gemmy Fairley so disturbing to them, since at any moment he could show either one face or the other; as if he were always standing there at one of those meetings, but in his case willingly, and the encounter was an embrace (RB, 43).

An 'embrace' with the Other, that was also an embrace with the Self. Gemmy is the incarnation of the 'stutterer', of the once-monolingually fluent but now bilingual (if the Aboriginal tongue can be reduced to a singular linguistic facility) and, as Deleuze says, '*When a language is so strained that it starts to stutter, or to murmur or stammer ... then language in its entirety reaches the limit that marks the outside and makes it confront silence*' ('HS', 113).

Gemmy takes the language of the settler, once his own, and only, language, and stretches its possibilities to its very limits: to that point, for the settlers (so familiar to Coetzee's Southern Africa), where they are haunted by their own outsidership to the land, to Australia (or South Africa), itself. They are definitively not the 'chthonic'. It is because of Gemmy's return, which is also a turning to (the settlers, their language, culture, 'civilisation', their very way of life) that is simultaneously a turning away from (putatively, the Aboriginals, always, potentially, the settlers as well), that the settlers of Malouf's *Remembering Babylon* have to confront their out of contextness, their own (now indisputable) status as diasporic subjects.

Each of them, children, adults, those long settled, those newly arrived, the 'educated' and the unlettered, is haunted by the spectre of outsidership: outside their place of origin (Ireland, Britain), outsiders in land where they (the notional landowners), unlike the Aboriginally conversant Gemmy, do not understand the language of the country in which they live. Gemmy's 'return' was psychically deracinating to the settlers, so much so that it infantilised the settlers: 'It brought you slap up against a terror you thought you had learned, years back, to treat as childish: the Bogey, the Coal Man, Absolute Night' (RB, 42). Like children afraid of the Dark, afraid in the Dark, afraid because of the Dark, they resort to a language frightful in its simplicity: 'the Bogey, the Coal Man, Absolute Night'. Malouf becomes, in this moment, a great Deleuzian author because: 'He makes the language as such stutter: an affective and intensive language, and no longer an affectation of the one who speaks' (RB, 107). The language of the outside is the language produced in and by fear (the 'Bogey' man's language, so to speak): to 'stutter' is not only to demonstrate uncertainty or lack of facility in a language, it marks the struggle against fear toward another command of language. Both Gemmy and the settlers are, in this way, engaged in the same project: they are 'stuttering' their way to language, to linguistically marking their 'minorised' status. Malouf, like Coetzee, makes the

'language as such' diasporic, not the author or Gemmy's own, and yet, autoimmunely, inveterately their own.

Through the theoretical openness of Cultural Studies, the diaspora can be located 'out of context': it can be dislocated to, or located in, the personage of the white European speaking for the white African author, struggling with the condition of out of placeness in Australia, surely amongst the most extreme racially charged sites within the diasporic imaginary. Australia is, moreover, a country in which the history of violence done to the native peoples by successive white diasporas—colonialists, prisoners who later founded a nation in which they, and not the natives, were the dominant subjects of the political, Central and Eastern European immigrants fleeing from their own deracinations; Australia, a nation in which the history of violence turned on the issue of racism, on the issue of the identity and culture—or the supposed lack thereof—of the native peoples. It is only through the critical lens of Cultural Studies' 'out of contextness' that the complexities, the unexpected incarnations and mediations of the African diaspora, suggest how the African diaspora is secretly—or not so secretly, given the difficult political conditions under which Coetzee was 'compelled' into the diaspora—articulated in locales well beyond those one would ordinarily suspect.

Even, that is, in the very heart of South African and Australian whiteness that is conceived by the diasporic white South African novelist recently removed to the Antipodes or the literary expatriate Australian author who, for half the year, writes Australia from Southern Europe. In *Slow Man* (a project in various degrees shared by Malouf, albeit with a very different literary and political sensibility), Australia is figured as the last bastion of the white imperial imaginary that can be thought out of context: as the singular articulation of the African diasporic subject speaking the diaspora in its most 'universal' conception: as stretching from Western Europe to Eastern Europe, from Europe to Australia, written from within—and, arguably, against—the ghostly presence of an Africa that is not named but cannot, will not, be escaped because this mapping emerges from the South African novelist who traces this series of relentless, haphazard, diasporic movement that, despite his best efforts, and because of Elizabeth Costello's presence and the haunting evocative in Malouf's work, will not allow the facticity of black Africa or Aboriginal Australia to be erased.

GRANT FARRED is Professor of Africana Studies and English at Cornell University. He is the general editor of the journal *The South Atlantic Quarterly*. His most recent books include, *What's My Name? Black Vernacular Intellectuals* (2003), *Phantom Calls: Race and the Globalization of the NBA* (2006) and *Long Distance Love: A Passion for Football* (2008). <gaf38@cornell.edu>

I would like to thank Jane Juffer for her, as always, careful reading of the essay. To David Ellison: whose friendship, wit, and perpetual irreverence were in abundant evidence during the writing of this piece. To Elspeth Probyn and Cliff (who provided keen intellectual company at the University of Sydney) and David Rowe (and the wonderful audience at the University of Western Sydney, including Fiona Allon, Ien Ang and Brett Nielson): for being gracious and generous hosts and insistent interlocutors during our 2006 visit to Sydney.

-
1. Jacques Derrida, *Specters of Marx: The State of the Debt, the Work of Mourning and the New International*, trans. Peggy Kamuf, Routledge, New York, 1994, p. xvii.
 2. Nowhere was (and continues to be, some would argue) the turn to policy studies more evident, of course, than among Australian Cultural Studies thinkers such as Tony Bennett, Ien Ang, Ian Hunter and Stuart Cunningham. These scholars have argued against the 'abstraction' of Cultural Studies, against the literary-based analysis that has long held sway in Cultural Studies. The policy thinkers have insisted that the only way to do Cultural Studies with any kind of political efficacy is to intervene at the level of the state: at the level of the political where bureaucratic decisions are made; in those political offices from which the state administers power. Policy studies is, in Foucaultian terms, the recognition that Cultural Studies can only interrupt or impress itself upon the political through articulating itself to—or, as—a critique of 'governmentality'.
 3. See Michael Kenny, *The First New Left: British Intellectuals After Stalin*, Lawrence and Wishart, London, 1995 and Dennis Dworkin, *Cultural Marxism in Postwar Britain: History, the New Left and the Origins of Cultural Studies*, Duke University Press, Durham, 1997 for accounts of the critical events of 1956 that produced the New Left and Cultural Studies: Nikita Krushchev's denunciation of Stalin, the Suez Crisis, and the Soviet Union's invasion of Hungary.
 4. Stuart Hall, Chas Critcher, Tony Jefferson, John Clarke and Brian Roberts, *Policing the Crisis: Mugging, the State, and Law and Order*, Macmillan, London, 1978.
 5. Gilles Deleuze, 'He Stuttered', in *Essays Critical and Clinical*, trans. Daniel W. Smith and Michael A. Greco, University of Minnesota Press, Minneapolis, 1997, p. 109, original emphasis. Further references are included within the text.
 6. See Bruce Chatwin's *Homage to Patagonia* in which he, completely unexpectedly, makes the acquaintance of white Afrikaners who have now settled the Argentine pampas.
 7. Jacques Rancière, *The Philosopher and his Poor*, trans. John Drury, Corinne Oster and Andrew Parker, Duke University Press, Durham, 2005, p. xxviii.
 8. The 'practicality' of the policy studies critique is, arguably, most evident here: the need to not only build sustainable institutions, but to attend to issues such as jobs, both within and outside the academy, for those who graduate, with the necessary skills, from Cultural Studies programs is a concern that has only been addressed directly by policy studies advocates. It is not an issue that has occupied the 'theoretical' and 'literary' wings of Cultural Studies with the same urgency.
 9. Derrida offers his fullest delineation of 'autoimmunity' in *Rogues*: 'For what I call the autoimmune consists not only in harming or ruining oneself, indeed destroying one's own protections, and in doing so oneself, committing suicide or threatening to do so, but, more seriously still, and through this, in threatening the I [*moi*] or the self [*soi*], the *ego* or the *autos*, ipseity itself, compromising the immunity of the *autos* itself: it consists not only in compromising oneself [*s'auto-entaner*] but in compromising the self, the *autos*—and thus ipseity. It consists not only in committing suicide but in compromising *sui-* or *self-*referentiality, the *self* or *sui-* of suicide itself. Autoimmunity is more or less suicidal, but, more seriously still, it threatens always to rob suicide itself of its meaning and supposed integrity' (Jacques Derrida, *Rogues*, trans. Pascale-Anne Brault and Michael Naas, Stanford University Press, Stanford, 2005, p. 45).
 10. David Malouf, *Remembering Babylon*, Vintage Books, New York, 1994, p. 25. Further references are included within the text.
 11. See John Hooper, *The New Spaniards*, Penguin Books, London, 1995 and Mark R. Williams, *The Story of Spain*, Golden Era Books, San Mateo, CA, 2004 for an account of the *La Reconquista*.
 12. See Victor Headley's novel, *Yardie*, which inaugurated a new genre of black pulp fiction that directly addressed the condition of black diasporic life in the postcolonial metropolis.

See also my critique of 'yardie fiction', *South Atlantic Quarterly*, vol. 100, no. 1, Winter 2001.

13. J. M. Coetzee, *Slow Man*, Viking, New York, 2005, p. 197. Further references are included within the text.
14. Edward Said, 'Reflections on Exile', in *Reflections on Exile and Other Essays*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge, MA, 2003, p. 186.
15. Said, p. 177.
16. Derrida, *Rogues*.
17. There is in much of Malouf's work a deep sense of (white) Australia being haunted by the 'chthonic'. (Even in his work on the exiled poet Ovid in imperial Rome, *An Imaginary Life*, there are echoes of the 'chthonic'.) In this regard, in addition to *Remembering Babylon*, *The Conversations at Curlow Creek*, Random House of Canada Limited, Toronto, 1996 is especially noteworthy.