

Macalester International

Volume 3 *Literature, the Creative Imagination, and Globalization*

Article 6

Spring 5-31-1996

Editors' Note

Follow this and additional works at: <http://digitalcommons.macalester.edu/macintl>

Recommended Citation

(1996) "Editors' Note," *Macalester International*: Vol. 3, Article 6.

Available at: <http://digitalcommons.macalester.edu/macintl/vol3/iss1/6>

This Front Matter is brought to you for free and open access by the Institute for Global Citizenship at DigitalCommons@Macalester College. It has been accepted for inclusion in Macalester International by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@Macalester College. For more information, please contact scholarpub@macalester.edu.

EDITORS' NOTE

The Macalester International Roundtable, an intellectual festival convened each year in October, is an occasion for serious conversations across the College on topics of transnational significance. The practice is to commission five essays — a keynote address, followed by four additional essays delivered by seasoned scholars—which become the center of debate and discussion. Each of the four essays receives public response from a Macalester student, a faculty member, and a fellow of the World Press Institute, which has been affiliated with the College for thirty-five years. The purposes of the Roundtable are (a) to cogitate together upon crucial but difficult global questions and (b) to cultivate further the equipoise that minds of the Macalester academic community have long been expected to hold between local anxieties and transnational pressures. The theme for the 1995 International Roundtable was “Literature, the Creative Imagination, and Globalization.”

I. The Creative Imagination and the Ways of the Modern Era¹

It can be argued that from the beginning of human consciousness, the realms of the material and the sensuous have always combined to give an intelligibility to our feelings, actions, relations, and the mystery of the world around us. The first conjures up an inanimate system that implies closure, regularity, security and predictability, and an intellectual style characterized by logic, reason, and empirical discovery. Human sensibility, on the other hand, while lodged in its own kind of social structures, nonetheless suggests greater suppleness, fluidity, and ambiguity. Expressed through language and the arts, the aesthetic realm is better understood by a different mode of investigation, i.e., the mythopoetic. The creative imagination, fundamentally the power of intuition, informs both sources of knowledge. But it is in the making of self, through “collective fictions,” that the imagination is tightly associated with understanding that goes beyond immediate observation, and facilitates deep human bonding. The balance between these two ways of knowing has varied across cultures and ages.

The dawn of the modern era constituted a major threshold in what became a fateful distancing between, if not decoupling of, what was seen as the immutability of the universe and the changefulness of human sentiments and passions. Despite his awareness of the value of both ways, here is Francis Bacon making a historic pronouncement:

The entire work of the understanding must be begun afresh and the mind, from the start, not left to take its own course but guided step by step and the business done as if by machinery.²

René Descartes's rigorous abstractions and the successes of Newtonian science poured more intellectual energy into this epistemology. Aligned to the emerging commodity culture, the combination was potent.³ The dissenting voices of some notwithstanding — notably the obscure but original Giambattista Vico, who saw the glory surrounding these developments as part of a final but long degenerative stage defined by the demise of *sensuous communis* and dominated by what he regretfully called "Barbarism of Reflection"⁴ — the juggernaut of instrumentalist rationalism was unstoppable. Mythopoetic reason and imagination, consequently, were relegated to lesser and lesser significance in intellectual life. The Enlightenment project reinforced rationalism's growing privilege by rigorously accentuating the conjugality between scientific techniques, industrial production, and social "rationalization" and totalization. The consequences were numerous. On one hand, these developments, in general, set the intellectual and social basis for confrontations with repressive and exclusive orders (e.g., feudalism), and planted the seed for Kantian universalism. On the other hand, the modern period, particularly in its Enlightenment guise, valorized and then enshrined the conflation of the human and natural worlds. As a result, there arose an enthusiastic application of the methods of the study of nature to human behavior and institutions. It was in this milieu that the social sciences were conceived — children of the Enlightenment *episteme*.⁵ In an effort to accent the naturalistic, three axioms were proffered: (a) despite some superficial differences, human beings have an unchanging ontology of which the most basic element is self-preservation; (b) this essential trait and its dynamics can

best be discovered through the application of Newtonian science, as a kind of “social physics” borne of observation and calculation; and (c) the terms of lucidity are cleansed of any anthropomorphism such that scientific (i.e., naturalistic) language chases out any humanistic (i.e., emotional and contingent) expressions such as analogies, metaphors, and lyrical forms. Moreover, the Enlightenment culture, with its emphasis on a total and linear progression of both knowledge and history, strengthened the self-confidence of a powerful social class that saw the world as their theater.⁶ Dialectically, then, the universalist posture was partially a correlate of a mounting assault on and degradation of the different. The most concrete consequences were unprecedented imperial expansion and colonialism — salient features of the modern period whose origins go back to the so-called Age of Discovery and the earlier era of commercial capitalism.

The successes of instrumental rationalism, sustained by the combined forces of bureaucratic administration (i.e., “the iron cage”), scientific technique, and heightened private interest, became so persuasive and uncontested, for the most part, that they assumed the status of second nature for many — creating a supreme hegemony.⁷ But all moments of triumph carry their own contradictions and costs. The paramount contradictions were to be played out in the discrepancies between touted universalism and the realities of imperialist subjugation; the costs were most typified by further exile of the precognitive — a critical location for the creative imagination. Subsequently, writers of different persuasions (e.g., Hamann, Herder, Wordsworth, Coleridge, Goethe, and Carlyle) resounded the alarm.

We are apt to think of civilization as something solid and external, but at bottom it is a collective dream. “In so far as the soul is in the body,” says Plotinus, “it lies in deep sleep.” What a people dreams in this earthly sleep is civilization. And the substance of this dream is a myth, an imaginative interpretation of human existence, the perception (not the solution) of the mystery of human life The office of literature in a civilization is not to break the dream, but perpetually to recall it, to recreate it in each generation, and even to make more articulate the dream-powers of a people. The project of science [re: instrumentalist rationalism], as I understand it, is to solve the mystery, to wake us from

our dream, to destroy the myth; and were this project fully achieved, not only should we find ourselves awake in a profound darkness, but a dreadful insomnia would settle upon [humankind] not less intolerable for being only a nightmare. The gifts of the greatest literature, is a gift of imagination. Its effect is an expansion of our faculty of dreaming. Under its inspiration the familiar outlines of the common dream fade, new perceptions, and emotions hitherto unfelt are excited within us, the till-now settled fact dissolves once more into infinite possibility, and we become aware that the myth (which in the substance of the dream) has acquired a new quality, without our needing to detect the precise character of the change.⁸

Oakeshott's meditation above and accompanying image have been echoed by some contemporary thinkers.⁹ One perspective on the "nightmare" points to a crisis loaded with painful disillusionments. For many, the Enlightenment had exhausted itself, leaving behind a fatigued and disorderly world where the winners had become vectors of an alienated *Geist*, and the outcasts had accepted defeat and ephemerality. Here, both myth and efficacy — that is, the inspiration of the collective imagination and the human act of remaking the world — have run their course.¹⁰ But, of course, this can be neither the whole nor the end of the story. For, in the thick of such profound disquiet, there is, nonetheless, a call for contingency, smallness, decentralization, and, most of all, a recognition of the importance of difference.

A third phase of the challenge to the creative imagination is this time of globalization. Despite the reservations of earlier commentators and the trenchant critique of contemporary observers pinpointing the deep flaws of the modern age, there is little doubt that it has entered a new stage of preeminence. The old trilogy of utility, techno-rationality, and bureaucratic management has acquired an unprecedented and sophisticated interdigitation and reach. As we stated in earlier issues, then, if part of the curse of globalization is homogenization—that is, the leveling of difference by making everyone standardized (and this is, of course, the case only if one is not already marginalized or eliminated) — the creative imagination has its work cut out. The choice, it seems, is between a hollowed-out amusement suitable only for, in Nietzsche's terms, "the last man" or a bulwark against the danger of a creeping monochrome transnationalism.

If it is to be the latter (the only real option), there is no alternative but to reclaim the Vichian principle of the poetic imagination as a main corridor to human agency, and to reunite the historical and the experimental, or *scienza* and *coscienza*. Articulating a similar aesthetic, Eagleton writes:

[A]rt [is a] critique of alienation, . . . an exemplary realization of creative powers, . . . the ideal reconciliation of subject and object, universal and particular, freedom and necessity, theory and practice, individual and society.¹¹

One of the great tasks confronting those who live in the modern period's newest and most pronounced stage—globalization—is the construction of an intersubjectivity as well as a supra-intersubjectivity that are equal to an increasingly stealthy corrosion of humanistic values. We are fortunate to have such globe-spanning writers as Fadhma Amrouche, Mariama Bâ, Anita Desai, Peter Høeg, Cheikh Hamidou Kane, V. Y. Mudimbe, Bharati Mukherjee, Ngugi wa Thiong'o, Nawal El Saadawi, and Derek Walcott, whose works engage this challenge.¹² Literature and the creative imagination are needed now more than ever.

II. The Roundtable

The theme of the 1995 International Roundtable was predicated on these assumptions: (a) that language and the aesthetic are some of the earliest of human inventions and are the gateway to culture and civilization; (b) that given the geographical spread of communities and correlative circumstances, different societies responded differently to their particular mix of the necessities and utilities faced by all; (c) that this is the origin of the rich diversity in language and the arts, and habit; and (d) that globalization, through a constellation of forces, presents novel and formidable challenges to producers and interpreters of all cultures. With this background, we asked the participants to work from these questions:

- Is there a global culture in the making?
- If so, what is to become of localized meaning and metaphysics?

- Is hybridity the response to multiculturalism?
- What is the place and role of the literary and artistic/creative imagination in this age of shifting images, definition, “structures of feeling,” and tastes?

Edward W. Said’s disquisition on the theme was the keynote for 1995. He echoes Shelley, Joyce, and Gordimer in describing the peculiar gifts of the artist—gifts that usually transcend the confinements and ordinariness of everyday life. Said enters the theme by stressing these phenomena of the new time: (a) a global literary bazaar; (b) the rise to prominence of a small set of authors from Latin America and the Caribbean, Asia, Africa, and Australia, whose works are consumed in large quantities in the metropolitan centers of the West; and (c) the appearance of “world literature” with world readers, which has created an, at times, dangerous milieu in which the authenticity of the local could be lost in the amalgam of internationalization. While Said reasserts the “independence of aesthetic” and its “relative social autonomy,” he also points to its inadequacies in the face of concrete—and, for us, “globalized”—situations. In such circumstances, we must, he proposes, call on the assistance of the “wordliness” of the secular and public mind. Working from a kinetic tension that he observes between the artistic imagination and the public intellectual, Said concludes by giving a pivotal role to the latter. And, for Said, six interactive functions define the intellectual’s vocation, functions he describes as the archival, reinterpreted, epistemological, dramatic, insurgent, and moral.

The first set of discussions focuses on the role and place of the Western canon. Our lead author, **Mary-Kay Gamel**, confirms a changing world pushed by three worldwide and eclamptic phenomena: “globalization,” “democratization,” and “decolonization.” These forces generate new questions and concerns that seem to subvert the established order. It is her premise that products of the creative imagination are to be valued for capturing human emotions and for presenting different, non-“scientific,” and discretionary interpretations of the “real.” The classics, for Gamel, both reflect and portray changes that are familiar in human or aesthetic life. In this sense, then, Gamel embraces a historicist position that stresses that creative works must be continuously reinterpreted to respond to the needs of a particular

community at a particular time. Further, she underscores the importance of earlier works as rich background, and the deployment of the metaphor of "map" instead of "canon." This, she suggests, makes it possible for us to find universal significance as well as to note contestations and diremptions. In the end, the critical issue for Gamel is not so much the value of a text but the "methods of reading."

Emily Eagen concurs that this is a moment of significant change in literature. However, she wonders whether Gamel is caught in a dilemma: feeling deep attachment to the Western classics yet, at the same time, eagerness to join the revolt against it. For Eagen, a sustained demystification of the canon is a key to global education and understanding. **Fiona Carruthers** gives us interesting glimpses of how her country of Australia is coping with the twin pressures of redefining "nationhood" and regional identity. The word from the Antipodes is that a canon—that is, a set and immutable list of classic texts of transcendental greatness—need not be inimical to human mutuality, or what Hans Gadamer calls "the fusion of horizons." **Jeremiah Reedy** disagrees with Gamel's assertion that the Western canon is historically specific and, therefore, a metaphor susceptible to obsolescence. From there, he proceeds to face down initiatives to expand, let alone dethrone, the canon. He exults Western classics by asserting that the worldwide yearning for "democracy," "scientific knowledge," and "human rights" are imputable to the Western intellectual tradition. To jettison the Western canon, Reedy concludes, is to relapse into darkness.

The second discussion is led by **Wai-leung Wong**. He starts with a neat and historically informed sketch of ancient Chinese literary tradition that speaks to the issue of "creative imagination." Wong sees the twentieth century as a virtually unidirectional time in which the West has acted on Chinese intellectual culture. Here, it is interesting to note that Professor Said, perhaps the sharpest literary critic of the Occident, is identified as one of the "Western authors" whose influence is discernible in contemporary China. Chinese literary multiculturalism is demonstrated through the work of these great writers: Qian Zhongshu, Yu Guangzhong, and Huang Guobin. Wong expresses his confidence in a coming confluence of ancient pan-human commonalities and the sweeping currents of modern

interactivity. **Wendy Guyot** emphasizes the universalist elements of the creative imagination. All cultures produce works, from poetry to painting, that capture the individual artist's and, in many cases, a society's aesthetic cast. For Guyot, globalization is a divisive force, replete with further stratifications that give the illusion of decentralization in a mounting concentration of power. As a result, the role of the creative intelligence, she concludes, is to lay bare these developments and to imagine more humane alternatives. **Anu Kuistiala** states that the creative imagination, a precious human talent, can be used for ill or good. She sees the United States as a major laboratory for any evaluation of global, i.e., transcultural, society. While her journalist's sojourn in the United States has made her feel worried about present realities, she believes that literature and journalism are suitable vehicles for the engendering of global education. Finally, **Chia-ning Chang** brings the literary experience of modern Japan to the discussion in order to widen the frame of reference, as well as to fertilize our meditations on the theme. Chang challenges Wong's criteria for multicultural writing, which Wong sees as identifying with the winners of globalization. Chang concludes by alerting us to the danger of limiting any new human intimacies generated by this age to an "East-West axis."

The third conversation surrounds **Andrei Codrescu's** essay, which deploys a rich metaphoric of myth and enclosure. Codrescu's focus is on Eastern Europe, particularly Romania, and the time around the demise of the "Wall." He pays particular attention to the complexities caused by the drastic changing of identities, perspectives, and the rhythm of political life. Codrescu deeply regrets the loss of what he calls "metaphorical obliqueness" — that literary trait which was cultivated to confront ubiquitous censorship. He says that while there are now "rivers of talk," there is little literary authenticity and even less sense of humor. Finally, Codrescu warns against the emergence of new and pernicious walls in the form of sharp differences in economic privilege and micronationalisms. **Abigail Noble** concentrates her attention on two of Codrescu's metaphors — "walls" and "jokes." She dissents from what she believes to be a main point of the essay: the immobilization of the creativity of writers. Noble thinks that Eastern Europe's current literary

scene is not unknown in other parts of the world. She suggests that an effective response to the widely felt shattering of community is to reappropriate the specific and, through it, to rework the general. **Josef Tuček** does not dispute Codrescu's preoccupation with the appearance of new walls. However, he is more sanguine about the present, and interprets recent developments in the region to be the beginning of a new epoch of openness and optimism. **Rachel May** concentrates on one of Codrescu's major points — the combined menace of ethnic identity and global business to literature in Eastern Europe. She resists the notion that communist repression necessarily gave birth to high subversive art, or compelled writers to cling to extraordinary and whole truths that transcended their context. She argues that the joke has not disappeared but moved with the changing circumstances, which are now, perhaps, more raw and universal. For May, writers of the post-Soviet time are leaving behind an uncomplicated local rectitude in the face of immediate tyranny, only to enter a transnational and bewildering arena that, one may think, is akin to Arthur Schopenhauer's "permanent night."

The fourth and final set of discussions of the 1995 International Roundtable was organized around **Carole Boyce Davies'** essay. Boyce Davies stands unwaveringly askew to the celebrations of globalization. She tells us that the phenomenon is nothing more than the generalization of what she sees as the sordid instrumentalism that has been a permanent feature of the global-system. Boyce Davies asserts vigorously that there is no single "global culture," but rather a multiplicity of societies and cultures trying to survive the relentless buffeting of greater forces. Afro-diasporic culture, the focus of her essay, is an example of one which is the "Other" of globalization. In view of this, then, Afro-diasporic culture is "transnational" in scope and "transformational" in character, and it rejects a homogenizing hybridity as it mounts resistance to a "uniform global culture." **Pamela R. Gozo** registers with approval Boyce Davies' courage in dissenting from the rejoicing that surrounds the current order of things and her tenacity in reading "Afro-diasporic" ways of life as a counterflow to globalization. However, Gozo decries what she sees as an overly complex style of presentation in the essay, and the lack of a tight relation between the critical arguments of the essay and the theme of the Roundtable. Gozo dis-

agrees with the intimation that globalization is the 1990s' shibboleth of old imperialists, and she challenges Afro-diasporic memory and creative imagination to become sources of beneficial engagement with the world-system. **Bolaji Ojo** points to what he thinks to be a compulsion built into the phenomenology of the people of the African diaspora—reclamation of Africa to situate their dreams. He worries about the dangers of crippling aesthetics as it is pressed to serve social and political ends. For Ojo, the Afro-diasporic imagination should go beyond the “binary” movement of “us” against “them” and partake in the making of “our globe” in progress. **David Chioni Moore** expresses slight regret that this occasion does not afford him the opportunity to engage Boyce Davies as one specialist to another. For if he could, he would be driven to ask, among other things, for specific clarifications and definitions of central terms. Moore turns, then, to amplifying the meaning of the essay and to drawing on the lives of Langston Hughes and Alex Haley to enlarge Boyce Davies' central point. Moore concludes by instructing us to note the “multiple axes” of selfhood. This is particularly the case with the “people of the Black Atlantic.” Consequently, Moore writes, claims on the part of any one culture to universality are untenable, and the beauty of great writers such as Hughes and Haley is that they provide a combination of Afro-diasporic and transnational image.

The 1995 International Roundtable raised many complex points. What is perhaps most notable and, from our perspective, heartening about our discussions is the extent to which the explicit literary and artistic concerns of our 1995 International Roundtable led inevitably to questions of individual identity, ethnic belonging, nationalism, and transnationalism. For it is precisely these four themes that will be at the center of our next Macalester International Roundtable to be held in October 1996.

Notes

1. “Modern era” is used here to identify a time and a way of being in the world that are undergirded by the confluence of scientism, commodification, and bureaucratic management. Relating modernism and modernity, Jameson writes that

the catastrophe of modernity . . . in truest Weberian fashion dashes traditional structures and life-ways to pieces, sweeps away the sacred, under-

mines immemorial habits and inherited languages, and leaves the world as a set of raw materials to be reconstructed rationally and in the service of profit and commerce, and to be manipulated and exploited in the form of industrial capitalism. What happens to the existential... can most instructively be observed in the realm of time, which on one hand is seized upon in its measurability... and on the other becomes the deep bottomless vegetative time of Being itself, no longer draped and covered with myth or inherited religion.

Fredric Jameson, *The Seeds of Time* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1994): 84.

2. Quoted in S. V. Keeling, *Descartes* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1968): xv.

3. Morris Berman, *The Reenchantment of the World* (Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1981), particularly chap. 1–4; and Christopher Hill, *The World Turned Upside Down* (New York: Viking, 1972).

4. Giambattista Vico, *The New Science of Giambattista Vico*, trans. Thomas Goddard and Max Harold Fisch (Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1984): ¶ 1106.

5. The center of gravity of the Enlightenment can be assigned to the influence of the *Philosophes*, e.g., Holbach, Condorcet, and Hartley, and the works of, among others, Diderot, Voltaire, and Kant. See Scott Gordon, *The History and Philosophy of Social Science* (London: Routledge, 1991); Michel Foucault, *The Order of Things: An Archaeology of the Human Sciences* (New York: Vintage Books, 1973); and Max Weber, "Science as a Vocation" in *From Max Weber: Essays in Sociology*, ed. H. Gerth and C. Wright Mills (New York: Oxford University Press, 1946). See also David Hume, *An Enquiry Concerning Human Nature*, ed. L. A. Selby-Brigge (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1902); and *A Treatise of Human Nature*, L. A. Selby-Brigge, ed. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1882).

6. Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels, in 1848, captured this development for posterity.

The bourgeoisie, by the rapid improvements of all instruments of production, by the immensely facilitated means of communication, draws all, even the most barbarian, nations into civilization. The cheap prices of its commodities are the heavy artillery with which it batters down all Chinese walls, with which it forces the barbarians' intense hatred of foreigners to capitulate. It compels all nations, on pain of extinction, to adopt the bourgeois mode of production; it compels them to introduce what it calls civilization into their midst, i.e., to become bourgeois themselves. In one word, it creates a world after its own image.

Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels, *The Communist Manifesto* (1888; reprint, London: Penguin Books, 1967): 94.

For a current enthusiastic confirmation of Marx's and Engels's early insights, but one based on an entirely different paradigm, see Rosabeth Moss Kantor, *World Class: Thinking Locally in the Global Economy* (New York: Simon and

Schuster, 1995). A remarkable challenge to the established presumptions of the social sciences is presented by Immanuel Wallerstein, *Unthinking Social Science: The Limits of Nineteenth-Century Paradigms* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 1991).

7. Michael Adas, *Machines as the Measure of Men: Science, Technology, and Ideologies of Western Dominance* (Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1989); Ashis Nandy, *Traditions, Tyranny, and Utopias: Essays in the Politics of Awareness* (Delhi: Oxford University Press, 1989); and Tzvetan Todorov, *On Human Diversity: Nationalism, Racism, and Exoticism in French Thought* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1993).

8. Michael Oakeshott, "Leviathan: a myth" in his *Hobbes on Civil Association* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1975): 150–51.

9. Krishan Kumar, *From Post-Industrial to Post-Modern Society: New Theories of the Contemporary World* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1995); David Harvey, *The Condition of Postmodernity: An Enquiry into the Origins of Cultural Change* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1989); Linda Hutcheon, *A Poetics of Postmodernism: History, Theory, Fiction* (London: Routledge, 1988); Ihab Habib Hassan, *The Postmodern Turn: Essays in Postmodern Theory and Culture* (Columbus, Ohio: Ohio University Press, 1987); Andreas Huyssen, *After the Great Divide: Modernism, Mass Culture, Postmodernism* (Bloomington, Ind.: Indiana University Press, 1986).

10. Clipping together long-standing intellectual disputes about knowledge and contemporary arguments about social life, Kohn tells us that,

[T]he prevailing mood is fatalistic.... Among the majorities faith has ebbed — in ideologies, in the power of governments to ameliorate social ills, and in the power of people to change their lives by political action. This loss of faith has been accompanied by a shift towards the belief that human society is preordained to be the way it is; that nature shapes our lives more than nurture.

Marek Kohn, *The Race Gallery: The Return of Racial Science* (London: Cape, 1995). Quoted in Tom Nairn, "Wanting to Be Special," *London Review of Books* (21 March 1996): 10

A critical element of postmodernism, in the thinking of Jean-Francois Lyotard, is "incredulity toward meta-narratives." J. F. Lyotard, *The Postmodern Condition: A Report on Knowledge*, trans. G. Bennington and B. Massumi (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1984): xxiv. Also, Rajni Kothari, "The Yawning Vacuum: A World Without Alternatives," *Alternatives* 8, no. 2 (Spring 1993): 119–39.

11. Terry Eagleton, *The Ideology of the Aesthetic* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1990): 369.

12. See Fadhma Amrouche, *My Life Story: The Autobiography of a Berber Woman*, trans. Dorothy S. Blair (New Brunswick, N.J.: Rutgers University Press, 1989); Mariama Bâ, *So Long a Letter*, trans. Modupé Bodé-Thomas (1976; reprint, Portsmouth, N.H.: Heinemann, 1989); Anita Desai, *Clear Light of Day* (Hammondsworth: Penguin, 1980); Peter Høeg, *Smilla's Sense of Snow*, trans. Tiina Nunnally (New York: Dell Publishing, 1994); Cheikh Hamidou Kane, *Ambigu-*

Editors' Note

ous Adventure, trans. Katherine Woods (1962; reprint, Oxford: Heinemann, 1972); V. Y. Mudimbe, *Between Tides*, trans. Stephen Becker (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1991); Bharati Mukherjee, *Jasmine* (New York: Fawcett Crest, 1989); Ngugi wa Thiong'o, *Devil on the Cross* (Oxford: Heinemann, 1982); Nawal El Saadawi, *She Has No Place in Paradise*, trans. Shirley Eber (London: Minerva, 1987); and Derek Walcott, *Omeros* (New York: Farrar, Straus, and Giroux, 1990). We are grateful to our colleague Professor David Chioni Moore for his assistance with these citations.