Introduction
Global Fissures: Postcolonial Fusions

Today's world is marked by uncertainty, violence, and haste. It is increasingly shaped by globalization, a term used either pejoratively to signify the overpowering reduction of the earth and its inhabitants to its economic and cultural use by those empowered by capital and technology, or more innocuously to refer to the flows of goods, people, capital, knowledge across borders due to the lowering of barriers and the reduced costs of transport and communication.1 It is also shaped by the conditions of postcolonialism, a term that ought to suggest the demise of colonialism but for all theoretical purposes is ever haunted by its presence; in an era of multinational capitalism it has expanded semantically either in resistance to globalization or in significant ways overlapping with it. The contemporary moment demands re-examination by questions such as: how are literary and cultural representations shaped by the times, specifically of postcolonialism and globalization? What is the role of the creative writer and critic at the intersection of globalization and the postcolonial? How do the postcolonial and globalization interact with and shape each other and other aspects such as nation, identity, or aesthetics? Do postcolonial readings of past and contemporary literary works enable a more historical understanding of globalization and vice versa? How have postcolonialism and globalization contributed to the modes and media of the new technologies?

The essays in this collection respond to these queries by exploring perspectives arising from the complex interface between these two theoretical positions and the interlinked historical, political, economic, and ethical developments and conflicts with which they are associated. They

represent responses of theorists and critics from First and Third World nations to the accelerating pace of globalization which the new electronic media and networks mobilize, to new eco-environmental issues that they raise, and to faster communication and increased mobility of peoples. Some draw on theories of globalization which cogently address economic and political issues, while others turn to postcolonial theory for intellectual critique and a countervailing ethic. Among the perceptions offered are that the two theories are collapsing together in significant ways, the global becoming elided with the postcolonial as a theory of cultural difference, resistance and change, through the common denominators of diaspora, migration, and identity. Or that postcolonial theory’s promotion of cultural phenomena, cultural difference and Third World agency is impotent in the face of economic and political globalization; despite advocating resistance to globalization’s homogenizing forces, the postcolonial fails to make any substantial impact on ever-encroaching global networks, corporations, NGOs etc. Finally, others discover within metropolitan discourses and their hoped-for theoretical elisions a potential resurgence under a new guise of postcolonial issues such as historical injustice, resistance, and finding a voice.

The ‘fissures/fusions’ dichotomy of the collection’s title challenges the reductive stereotypes by which each position and/or theory labels the other: postcolonialism’s view of global forces as homogenizing and commodifying culture, and globalization’s view of postcolonial resistance to such universalisms and First World synthesizing of cultural difference. ‘Fissures/fusions’ suggests alternative categorizations of these positions. It implies that globalization is a deterritorializing force that ‘fissures’ the nation-state because of the increased movements of migrant, exilic and diasporic groups, and the new margins within the nation that they create, even though it ostensibly synthesizes differences between nations through its economic and fiscal policies and cultural commodification. Postcolonialism ‘fuses’ in responding to the challenge of deterritorialization and, drawing on its colonial origins, acknowledging the continued importance of the nation-state and the ‘national imaginary’, even as it interrogates principles and assumptions of national culturalism in demanding increased recognition of ethnic difference, whether it be under the banner of biculturalism, multiculturalism or even the ‘melting pot’, the ‘mosaic’ or the ‘rainbow nation’. These contradictions and polarizations suggest some
of the tensions that the uneasy conjunction of the postcolonial and the
global create, and which these essays address.

The question of the artist or intellectual's political commitment is one
that preoccupies many theorists and writers today. Salman Rushdie's
injunction, in his essay "Outside the Whale," that the artist be politically
engaged and swim in the ocean of world affairs, outside the body of the
whale, was a defining one in 1981. Rushdie was contesting George
Orwell's 'quietist' position for the writer/intellectual, advanced in his
essay in 1941, of "remaining passive, accepting": i.e. of staying within the
body of the whale. Rushdie would replace the "whale" with a "wail" and
would place Orwell's Jonah outside the whale amidst "the unceasing
storm, the continual quarrel, the dialectic of history." He concludes: "in
our whaleless world, in this world without quiet corners, there can be no
easy escapes from history, from hullabaloo, from terrible, unquiet fuss." This
debate provides a point of reference for several essays, and Orwell's
whale-metaphor is variously adapted to refer both to the global and to the
postcolonial. John Hawley suggests that Rushdie posits a Noah rather than
a Jonah, because the ocean in which we live is global and so capable of
bringing the diasporic experience from the margins to the centre of our
experience; for there are fewer hiding places today. Chris Prentice, in
writing on the New Zealand film Whale Rider, uncovers a further dimen­sion
of that metaphor: that of 'riding the whale' of globalization. The
film's tenuous elevation of the indigene, she points out, is suggestive of
the balancing-act required of a minority culture in order that its voice may
intervene in dominant discourses. Edward Said's 1993 Reith lectures, later
published as Representations of the Intellectual, are an even more cogent
call to intellectuals in enjoining that they "speak the truth to power." Robert
Spencer turns to Said in reminding us that the critic should be ac­tively committed by showing "literature's entanglement with the world."
The subtitle of Spencer's essay on silence, "Intellectual Communication
in an Age of Globalization," emphasizes the public role of the intellectual
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in engendering and influencing debate through his “reflection on matters of public concern.”

In the first section, “Theories of the Postcolonial and Globalization,” three theoretical essays expose the uneasily shifting boundaries between the postcolonial and the global, as they address the question of whether any grounds of compatibility might be established. In “Theorizing the Diaspora,” John Hawley asks how influential the nation-state is today when international business is the engine of global culture. Drawing on Aihwa Ong’s *Flexible Citizenship*, he argues that postcolonialism is “weakened by its dependence on an idealized composite image of the diasporic, subaltern and working class subject” and in “celebrating cultural difference and hybridity in resistance to homogenizing trends.” Diminished postcolonial and diasporic discourses in fact fail to recognize the new conditions of enslavement suffered by many migrant workers. By contrast, Hawley finds in the economic and political analyses of globalization an ability to link state power, institutional capitalism and transnational networks to forms of cultural reproduction. Identifying in the diasporic subject – whether migrant intellectuals (Western and non-Western), yuppie *internationales* or migrant workers (skilled and non-skilled) – a *Zeitgeist* for our time, he develops R. Radhakrishnan’s suggestion that identity politics should be revalued, particularly as culture becomes more a matter of “conscious choice,” in Arjun Appadurai’s words; such revaluation, Hawley argues, may bring the postcolonial and the global into a more dialectical relationship.5

Hawley perceives that increased international migrancy of the last decade has led to a hurried raising of cultural anchors, pushing us all into “literal or intuited diasporas.” Robert Spencer finds that the crisis of an age of political and economic globalization demands that urgent attention be paid to the rights and wrongs of silence. In “The Price of Silence” he revisits the question of subaltern silence, of whether or not to speak for the Other (crucial in postcolonial theory ever since Spivak’s essay “Can the

5 But Slavoj Žižek, according to Robert Spencer, claims that the politics of identity, in the form of local differences and singular identities, offers only “ideological escape from global capitalism,” which is well able to withstand the challenge they represent.
Subaltern Speak?”). Turning to postmodern theory and its antecedents – Lyotard, Derrida, Adorno and Nietzsche among others – in which silence is often seen as a logical consequence of the doubts about language’s capacity to express and represent knowledge, Spencer critiques current postcolonial theory for its over-determined response to the historical predicament of subordinated subjects. A generation of critics, he argues, does not speak for the Other, because they are acutely aware (after Edward Said’s *Orientalism*) of the potential for misrepresentation. Believing they lack any “right to discuss anything beyond themselves,” they reject “the possibility of constructive, willed communication between different societies.” This Orwellian “intellectual withdrawal,” Spencer argues, is paralleled by the postmodern reluctance to speak in place of others, which leads to politically unavailing cultural relativism and an unwillingness to reflect critically and speak out about one’s own country’s malpractice and misdemeanours. Spencer suggests that modernism provides a viable model for postcolonial theorists because of its concern to communicate with others without taking over from them. He advocates two other modes of redress: Said’s “permission to narrate” for Third World subjects, who are encouraged to make known their grievances; and, in the words of Subcomandante Marcos, “respectful silence,” a form of deference towards interlocutors, which allows others the chance to speak.

Shaobo Xie, in “Is The World Decentred? A Postcolonial Perspective on Globalization,” also calls for renovation and recuperation of postcolonial theory. Xie takes issue with the claim of Michael Hardt and Antonio Negri that empire is over, and he contests their universalizing, synthesizing assertion that “both postcolonialism and global capitalism celebrate and employ protean difference in the varied forms of hybridity, mobility and diversity.” By contrast to Hawley’s scepticism about the continuing influence of the nation-state today, due to globalization’s being driven by international business, Xie asserts that globalization is a new form of imperialism – i.e. Americanism – and that rampant American consumer capitalism is the villain that it spawns. In Xie’s analysis, therefore, the centre/periphery distinction, central to postcolonial theory, still obtains today despite the existence of newly decentred metropolises. Xie draws upon difference for his critique – cultural, ethnic, national – in order to differentiate the postcolonial from the global, and he argues that capitalism, or globalization in its monetary-economist guise, both feeds off and breeds difference. He demands that postcolonialism be mobilized to theor-
ize global resistance to global capitalism. In advocating greater distance between and separation of the respective positions of the postcolonial and globalization, as a form of political necessity, Xie’s agenda contrasts with that of Hawley, who seeks some degree of reconciliation between the two theories through a renewal of identity politics. It is closer to Spencer’s demand for reassessment of the postcolonial (and postmodern) advocacy of silence, and is, by implication, a renewal of the ethic of intellectual commitment that speaking-out implies.

In the second section, “Literature and Globalization,” the relationship between the two theoretical positions is represented as equally conflicted, with identity politics, based on issues of nationality, migrancy, and marginality, complicating the picture. Essays in this section focus their enquiry through literary texts which both illustrate resistance to global hegemony and power structures and represent alternative ways of manipulating them in order to highlight issues such as environmental loss. Cynthia Sugars examines the situation of Canada’s complex ‘international’ nationalism as its literature becomes newly eminent in a global age; by contrast, Isobel Hoving studies two Dutch migrant writers whose work challenges assumptions of mainstream eco-environmental politics in the Netherlands; while the concept of aesthetic resistance is at the heart of Chitra San karan’s discussion of Arundhati Roy’s The God of Small Things, a novel which also reveals an ethical concern for the plight of the other; Clare Brandabur, in her postcolonial interpretation of Samuel Beckett’s Waiting for Godot, suggests that power relations between victim and victimizer are at the heart of his writing. These are merely replayed on a larger scale in the American/British identification of the axis of evil and the wars against terror in Afghanistan and Iraq. Accordingly, the existential phrase “I can’t go on, I’ll go on” acquires new political dimensions within a postcolonial reading that privileges the stubborn resistance of the oppressed. That postcolonial texts usually inscribe the reader as both insider and outsider, thereby encouraging postcolonial readings, is the issue pursued by C.L. Innes as she examines selected works of James Joyce, Chinua Achebe, and Salman Rushdie. Mustapha Marrouchi’s focus is on the outsider as diasporic traveller, on “writers of a half way house” whose quest for home identifies them as dispossessed. He examines the works of the Chinese
poet Bei Dao, the Palestinian poet Mahmoud Darwish, and Edward Said as responses to their exilic lives, lived “in translation.”

Issues of nationhood are at the heart of Cynthia Sugars’ “World Famous Across Canada”: National Identity in the Global Village,” and its articulation of a key postcolonial anxiety from the perspective of the national imaginary: the loss of cultural specificity when a culture goes global. Sugars focuses on the recent international success of born-elsewhere ‘Canadian’ writers – Michael Ondaatje, Yann Martel, and Rohinton Mistry – to stress the fact that issues of nationhood persist in a global age even though, or perhaps because, diasporic and migrant groups contribute to the ‘deterritorializing’ of the nation. Sugars’ analysis of the meaning for the nation-state of Canada of the conflicted relationship between the postcolonial and the global is premised on the presence of the multicultural in the nation’s identity. This has historically always undermined claims to uncomplicated national autonomy. In her typology, then, the Canadian postcolonial is already international (hence the title of her essay). Existing somewhere between the national and the global; whereas the global, a resurgence of the cosmopolitan-imperialism debate which dominated Canadian nationalism in the 1940s, is post-national and also multicultural. Sugars’ identification of Canadian angst in defining and defending a national essence stands in sharp contrast to Jennifer Lawn’s discussion of the apparently uncontested top-down governmental corporatization of the arts in New Zealand, converting creativity into an export industry, and culture into a commodity. But Sugars, in linking the global with the national-cultural, and repositioning the postcolonial as part of an internationalizing of culture, suggests a new paradigm. Is this culturally specific to Canada or potentially adaptable to the circumstances of other ex-British white settler colonies like New Zealand, Australia, and South Africa? An interesting new area of enquiry offers itself here.

Isabel Hoving focuses on contradictory assumptions about nature and the natural found in biological and environmental discourses in the Netherlands, assumptions that are then used to support different positions in debates on multiculturalization and globalization: e.g., the “eco-racist” view that Muslim migrants, like an alien species, constitute a threat, or alternatively, the view that, like a new species or culture, they enhance diversity. Hoving introduces contrasting attitudes to the environmental concept of “diversity” expressed in the work of two migrant writers who undermine current theories based on environmental discourses. Such dis-
courses present the Netherlands either as a “closed system” which an influx of migrants would threaten, or as a natural community which should develop its fullest potential with minimum interference, according to “systems ecology.” The Dutch–Moroccan Hafid Bouazza feminizes and sexualizes Dutch multicultural society; his minority view is that nature, always transgressive, sexually abundant and dynamic and never a “balanced ecosystem,” is the real source of diversity, not migrants. The Dutch–Surinamese writer Ellen Ombre, by contrast, critiques the dominant Dutch discourse on biodiversity – quality is translated into quantity as natural produce is commodified, leading to scarcity – in the context of global trade and destructive commercial practices. One of Ombre’s characters uses global products to create and manage biodiversity locally because exploitative global economics have frustrated “her effort to create natural diversity.” Hoving argues that Ombre, in her revisionist handling of this eco-environmental theme, also counters stylistically – with an aesthetic of fragmentation drawn from a Caribbean “poetics of diversity” – the ideology of coherence which the dominant Dutch economic discourse on diversity promotes.

Chitra Sankaran, in “Ethics, Aesthetics and the Globalized Other in Arundhati Roy’s The God of Small Things,” like Shaobo Xie, Vijayasree Chaganti and Kanukolanuk Ravichandra, points out the negative effects of global cultural values on Third World society, noting the paradox of the international success of Roy’s novel, given its hostility to global corporatization. This contradiction has been reinforced by Roy’s subsequent advocacy of environmental issues and her hostile stand on issues of Indian postcolonialism, leading to her media image as ‘the’ voice of anti-globalization: the big-dam project in the Narmada Valley, the embrace of a nuclear-weapons programme in the hostilities towards Pakistan, and the rise of right-wing Hindu nationalism. Sankaran also identifies in the novel a continued, though somewhat symbolically restricted indigenous otherness, hence resistance to globalization, through the truncated space in which the Kathakali, the dance drama of Kerala, is enunciated. The novel’s ethical position – its concern for the Other – is linked to its aes-
thetic, projected in its narrative form through an organic connection to the Kathakali.

Modernist texts are also subject to revisionist readings in the light of contemporary issues of the postcolonial and globalization, as Clare Brandabur shows in “The Elephant in the Living Room: A Postcolonial Reading of Waiting for Godot.” Identifying postcolonialism as a politics of resistance, Brandabur, by drawing on biographies and studies of Beckett’s historical contexts, demonstrates that Beckett’s dramaturgy was strongly influenced by his involvement in the French resistance in the Second World War, leading to his flight from Paris with his wife Suzanne. The power-relations in the play between Pozzo and Lucky, as well as their privations, can be mapped onto the biographical facts of Beckett’s life at this time; equally, they are susceptible to an allegorized reading as representative of the unequal power-relations between the Nazis and oppressed French subjects. Brandabur argues, contrary to the time-honoured view of Beckett as a master of the absurd promulgated by Martin Esslin in 1961, that Beckett was essentially driven by political as much as aesthetic motives, but that he expunged references to political and historical events in successive revisions of this and other plays, because of his aim to achieve a minimalist form. She reinforces her thesis with reference to contemporary events in the Gulf and Iraq, and, pointing to Beckett’s last play, Catastrophe (1982), dedicated to Vaclav Havel, argues that Beckett’s work can be read as part of the tradition of resistance writing.

In “Cosmopolitan Readers: Postcolonial Identities,” C.L. Innes examines a not often considered aspect of postcolonial literary texts, its readers. She notes, “Where there is diversity or ambiguity of meaning, many critics assume it to be a property of the text rather than a consequence of diverse readerships.” She goes on to explain that many postcolonial texts actually construct hybrid readers, a function often unavailable to modernist and postmodernist writers. The postcolonial text, by contrast, is shaped by the writer’s acute consciousness of “a double audience,” one linked to the colonizer and the other to the colonized. Thus James Joyce’s Ulysses, here read as a postcolonial text, like Chinua Achebe’s Things Fall Apart, creates “insiders” and “outsiders” out of readers. Joyce’s Leopold Bloom makes insiders of Irish readers, a category that Joyce extends and defines, so that “a corollary of the multiplicity of voices and the question of the authoritative speaker, is the multiplicity of listeners and the question of the authoritative reader.” Postcolonial texts aim to create corollary out-
siders not to impose meaninglessness but, rather, to encourage among the insiders “a shared knowledge and history, over which they have authority and mastery,” in which the outsiders must be educated. Failing this education, outsider readers may commit the fallacy of generalization, as Aijaz Ahmad notes about Fredric Jameson’s description of Third World texts as “national allegories.” Nevertheless, as Robert Spencer points out, texts and readers are variously determined by different contexts: “The reader [...] is a worldly creature; his judgements or interpretations are not hunches or whimsical private surmises but the result of a dialogue with the text and with the milieux in which it is produced and read.” But not all postcolonial texts, Innes argues, prompt outsider readers to become “more like insiders” and so, in fact, more aware of the resultant double consciousness. For example, Salman Rushdie’s novels often keep the outsider reader as outsider.

This section concludes, appropriately enough, on a lyrical note, with Mustapha Marrouchi’s appreciation of the condition of exile, homelessness, and impermanence as experienced and articulated by three exiled writers and intellectuals: the Chinese poet Bei Dao, Darwish Mahmoud, the national poet of dispossession for the Palestinian people, and the influential Palestinian-American writer and theorist, Edward Said. For Marrouchi, the rootlessness of all three is a way of life, for the “dispossessed subject introduces himself as metaphysical foreigner twice displaced” and his work “travesties the idea of a single homeland.” Drawing on Theodor Adorno’s writing on exile, he argues that, for these writers, the text becomes a provisional new homeland, as new territory that the subject uncovers is mapped. Exile in Darwish’s work pushes one’s consciousness “into unforeseen and sometimes almost unbearable shapes”; Dao’s poetry “captures the vastness of what has been lost which makes itself known in unanticipated ways,” and Said’s comment that exile creates a “contrapuntal habit” because “the expression or activity in the new environment inevitably occurs against the memory of those things in another environment” gains heightened validity in Marrouchi’s reassessment. His sympathetic portrayal echoes Spencer’s argument that writers such as Said refused to bow to the postmodernist insistence on silence in the face of oppression of the Other and further suggests, in sympathy with Hawley’s view, that just as diasporas are “exemplary communities of the trans-
national moment,” so the dispossessed writer is an important icon of the early-twenty-first century.

Essays in the “Globalization, Politics, and Culture” section point to the often negative effects of globalization on homogenizing cultures, creating technocrats in the service of the global market-place, as new technologies of production, distribution, and communication usher in such modes of labour as textile sweatshops and outworkers at home. Such conditions are critiqued, for example, in Chaganti and Ravichandra’s essay on globalization and the Indian academy, which argues that under the guise of internationalization, globalization is ‘westernizing’ the academy in India, affecting adversely the culture, ethos and autonomy of the universities, as the Microsoft revolution has led to the growth of “IT coolies,” and similar intellectual colonization is revealed in the way the “tyranny of the market language strangles the voice of the academy.” The essays by Lawn and by Spaul and Minhas, by contrast, suggest that global networks and the technological revolution marginalize or efface postcolonial resistance, as Second World governments translate politics into policy and as the new media provide opportunities for revitalizing niche marketing associated with tourism, one of the most dynamic sectors of the global economy. Chris Prentice looks at both sides of the issue in examining how the New Zealand Māori are re-positioned with reference both to the success of the 2003 film Whale Rider and to its representations of indigeneity. Finally, in a study of Latin American photography, Peter D. Osborne examines the impact of cultural hybridity on the modernist impulse, particularly given the locations of photographs in a postcolonial space. Osborne sees the Latin-American problem as one of “representing multiple ways of seeing in which traditional visualities and epistemologies both combine and conflict with modern, often globalized and technologically transformed ways of seeing and understanding.”

Vijayasree Chaganti and Kanukolanuk Ravichandra, in “Macaulay to Microsoft: Globalization and the Indian Academy,” argue that globalization is having an adverse effect on the Indian academy by encouraging the
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privatization and commercialization of education and the large-scale emigration of Indian students to Western metropolitan centres. The Indian universities, originating as instruments of British colonial rule and inseparable from national development, have now succumbed to the pressure of the world’s funding bodies, trading corporations and other NGOs, which prevent the development of sound policies regarding the internationalization of higher education. The current state of emergency in the Indian academy is manifested in conflicting drives: either to ‘indigenize’ or ‘indianize’ education, although this has a controversial divisive and religious agenda, or, since the 1990s, to reform education into a competitive sector of the knowledge economy and the knowledge society following massive withdrawal of public funding and government subsidies and the introduction of a policy framework for private and foreign investment.

Focusing on “Microsoft education” in information technology, which in India has become a handmaiden to capitalist enterprise, they argue that cultural specificity is being erased as “IT coolies” are trained to neutralize their accents, allowing their intellectual potential to be colonized as computer-skilled labour becomes an export commodity. Such homogenizing of opportunity comes at the expense of a liberal education and its traditions of protest and dissent, and serves further to skew the concept of “internationalization of education” between East and West. The general decline in standards they see as reflected in the tyranny of market language, which strangles the voice of the academy.

The international distribution networks which the visual media have harnessed and the consequences these new export industries and growth areas have for a national economy are the subject of Jennifer Lawn’s “Creativity Inc.: Globalizing the Cultural Imaginary in New Zealand.” Lawn draws attention to the corporatization of creativity coinciding with the international success of the Lord of the Rings trilogy, by means of which the Labour government is providing new incentives to the arts to bring them in line with other export industries; the aim is to rebrand New Zealand as a creative, yet entrepreneurial economy. The ‘network model’ of globalization adapted by the Labour government consists of a two-way traffic of cultural products which offer opportunities for entrepreneurs to develop niche export markets. Chris Prentice, in contrast to Lawn, focuses on the consequences for indigenous peoples of the internationalization of New Zealand culture. She develops the ‘inside/outside the whale’ dichotomy in line with the film Whale Rider’s climactic moments and asks
whether ‘riding’ (either steering or being carried by) the whale of late
global capitalism empowers local Māori communities to participate in the
global cultural market or whether it reinforces oppressive power-relations
of the past. Prentice argues that despite its mythological story and pro-
duction of ‘the natural’, including the New Zealand coastline, for tourist
consumption, the film knowingly situates the Māori within current local
discourses about Māori self-help, parental neglect, health-promotion etc.
The fibreglass whale might finally be seen as a symbol of the hyperreal-
ization of Māori culture being inserted into the global economy.

Martin Spaul and Amina Minhas, in “Representing Interconnection and
Cultural Flow: Towards Reframing Tourist Experiences with New
Media,” start by introducing the ethic of transnationalism involved in
tourism, which stems from the inequalities between ‘host’ and ‘guest’
nations. They ask: how can a cosmopolitan understanding of tourism be
developed in a globalized world? Ecotourism, they claim, involves re-
framing images of tourist destinations by using the ‘rich media’ of com-
puter technology to provide representations of cultural interconnection
and flow. One contemporary model is avant-garde montage, based on the
revival of the French ethnographic surrealism of the 1920s and 30s
(creating bizarre juxtapositions – “illuminations” – between diverse cul-
tures), and found in multimedia museum displays. This may not be appro-
priate to represent the hybridization and cultural flows caused by ac-
celerating globalization, because contemporary audiences expect the
virtual environments of computer-based representations to display a seam-
less unity and a navigable order. One solution to the problem of organiz-
ing a multi-perspectival ethnography in a hypermedia structure, therefore,
is to provide an “ethnographer,” a guide figure “sensitive to the problems
of imposing itineraries and interpretations.” This “representational strate-
gy” by which the “fragmented” modernist codes of montage and multi-
vocality may be revised, in its turn furnishes such codes with a similar
“dissonant experience” by offering a variety of explanatory frameworks.

The ethical questions that Spaul and Minhas raise concerning the use of
new media to represent the cross-cultural encounter of tourist experiences
and destinations provide another perspective on the complex issue of
crossing national boundaries which Hoving identifies with the Dutch im-
migration authorities’ perception of migrants as disturbing the natural
balance of the “closed system.” Spaul and Minhas’s focus on contempo-
rary tourism also intersects with Lawn’s discussion of the globalization of
the New Zealand cultural sector, through the restructuring of the creative arts as entrepreneurial industries: the international success of Peter Jackson's *Lord of the Rings* trilogy as a “weightless foreign exchange earner” generating new merchandise and cross-marketing initiatives, such as renaming Aotearoa/New Zealand as Middle Earth, has revitalized the tourist industry (Hobbiton Tours, Red Carpet Tours etc. are now on offer); photographs and computer-generated imagery and special effects developed by creating fantasy locations of Tolkien's world have been imprinted by the New Zealand Tourism website onto the landscape of New Zealand.

Finally, Peter D. Osborne, in “anredoM acitpO or Aztec Cameras: Cultural Hybridity and Latin American Photography,” considers the formulation of hybridity as an interaction between the modern and the traditional within specific postcolonial spaces in Latin America. He defines this interaction and creativity within the theoretical framework of Aimé Césaire's concept of “miraculous weapons,” by which is meant the conscious utilization of mythic and poetic language as a cultural and political instrument of resistance and change, and the embracing of Néstor García Canclini's privileging of “cultural hybridity” as “an objective condition, inherited from history” and a process “to be accepted, celebrated, and mobilized” – hybridity, according to Canclini, having the potential to collapse cultural hierarchies. The photographs Osborne examines as instances of hybridity and resistance are those of the Mexicans Manuel Álvarez Bravo and Pedro Meyer, the Brazilian Bauer Sá, the Guatemalan Luis González Palma, the Venezuelan Nelson Garrido, and the Argentinean Gerardo Suter. Suter's photography in particular, notes Osborne, in attempting to reintroduce premodern indigenous forms, pushes the boundaries of photography, where “photography does what it is famous for, gives presence to what is absent and yet cruelly confirms its irretrievability.” Yet what is reintroduced is not the past – it is, rather, the affect of allegory in the supplement of the sign and the displacement of verisimilitude, as Craig Owen would define the process.

Osborne’s insights into the hybrid forms of Latin American photography link up with Hawley’s arguments on the inherence of hybridity in the phenomenon of globalization. Hawley acknowledges the importance of diaspora and its heterogeneously globalized condition when he argues for the centrality of the hybridized diaspora within “the whale of globalization.” Hybridity as the interaction between traditional and modern elements becomes a presence to be reckoned with in spaces both postcolonial
and globalized, so that Osborne confers the term “ritual device” on the capacity of Latin American photography to not just ‘resemble’ but to ‘contain’ the object, significantly enhancing the importance of art photography within the study of both postcolonialism and globalization. Osborne’s examination of Pedro Meyer’s 1991 photograph “The Temptation of the Angel” stresses “how a world is experienced by means of how it is imagined,” but, further, points to the message emanating from the photograph: “only when Mexico incorporates its own otherness will it fully develop its own modernity.” The theme has affinities with Sankaran’s detailed analysis of representations of the marginalized Other, where she makes an argument for the priority of the ethical in The God of Small Things on account of the centralizing of the marginalized Other in that novel. If postcolonialism has traditionally been criticized for its insistence on difference and globalization is currently being criticized for its homogenizing tendencies, the concept of hybridity, as a condition and a process that bring together the self and the Other, offers what Homi Bhabha has termed the “Third Space” between postcolonialism’s fissures and globalization’s fusions – hence the title of the present collection, “Global Fissures : Postcolonial Fusions.” Such alterities of spaces, processes, and movements variously tempt the agent, Jonah, to step inside or outside the whale.
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