

EURAMERICA Vol. 47, No. 3 (September 2017), 263-297
© Institute of European and American Studies, Academia Sinica
<http://euramerica.org>

Engaging Politically from the Margin —Critical Cosmopolitanism in the Works of Kamila Shamsie*

Pei-chen Liao

Department of Foreign Languages and Literature, National Cheng Kung University
No. 1, University Rd., East District, Tainan 70101, Taiwan
E-mail: pcliao@mail.ncku.edu.tw

Abstract

This essay explores Pakistani British writer Kamila Shamsie's engagement in local and global politics, focusing in particular on her book-length non-fiction *Offence: The Muslim Case* (2009) and two recent novels, *Burnt Shadows* (2009) and *A God in Every Stone* (2014), which mark two significant temporal points in Shamsie's life: 9/11, and her acquisition of British citizenship. Bringing to the fore the impact of international events, immigration, and national allegiance on Shamsie's political engagement, I argue that these three books bear witness to Shamsie's critical cosmopolitanism, which is locally rooted, universally diverse,

Received February 15, 2017; accepted June 21, 2017; last revised June 12, 2017
Proofreaders: Hsueh-mei Chen, Alex C. Chang, Kuei-feng Hu

* This essay is the result of two research projects sponsored by the Ministry of Science and Technology in Taiwan, grant number MOST 103-2911-I-006-502 and MOST 102-2410-H-006-090-MY3. Part of this essay was presented at the international conference "Creative Misreading and Evolving Paradigm" held at National Cheng Kung University on June 12, 2015. I am indebted to Professor Hsiu-chuan Lee for her valuable comments at the conference.

and essentially self-reflective. Shamsie's cosmopolitanism issues forth from the perspectives of silenced and marginalized Pakistanis, Muslims, migrants, and women, but it does not take plurality simply as the goal when challenging universal norms that are essentially ethnocentric, as exemplified by the global designs of British imperialism and American nationalism. At the same time as it addresses uneven international and cross-cultural relations, it also acutely discerns, from a micro-societal perspective, changes within personal, national, and other local identities. It reflects internally and reflexively on the problems of Islamic fundamentalism, divided loyalties and nationalism, as well as gender politics in Pakistan. Shamsie's works ultimately and paradoxically show that, rather than mobility across borders, reflexive self-understanding is a core component of cosmopolitanism, on the basis of which connection to the world is critically established.

Key Words: politics, critical cosmopolitanism, *Offence*, *Burnt Shadows*, *A God in Every Stone*

In an interview, Elizabeth Kuruvilla asked Kamila Shamsie, “Is it important for writers to hold an activist point of view?” Shamsie replied, “I think the question is, is it important for human beings to hold an activist point of view?” (2015). This was not the first time Shamsie has expressed her interest in politics, specifically the “politics of government” and the “politics of gender” (2014b: 9). Being convinced that “aesthetics are [*sic*] about precision in representation through the use of metaphor rather than about constructing a realm outside of or above politics” (Shamsie, 2007: 150), Shamsie has written both political fiction and non-fiction. As Bruce King points out, Shamsie’s first four novels all grapple with Pakistan’s politics:

the crisis caused to local society and the long-lasting divisions within some families by the migration of north Indian Muslims at Partition (*Salt and Saffron*); the constant military coups against democratically elected governments (*In the City by the Sea*); the civil war and ethnic hatreds that led to the independence of Bangladesh and the violence of the 1990s (*Kartography*); and the feminist movement within Pakistan and the Islamic world during the 1970s and 1980s, and the military’s encouragement of Islamic fundamentalism . . . (*Broken Verses*). (2011: 149)

Indeed, many of Shamsie’s works are political. As a writer, she has been actively involved with politics because she believes engagement is a human duty, and more importantly, because “if you grow up in Karachi, you don’t have that separation” between “what is happening at the political level and what is happening in people’s lives” (Shamsie, 2015).

Shamsie repeatedly shows how one’s environment impacts one’s political engagement. If Shamsie’s experience growing up in Karachi has inspired her interest in Pakistan’s history and politics, what role does dislocation play in her political engagement? Having grown up in Karachi, studied in the United States, and recently become a British citizen, how has she engaged in local and global politics? In this essay, I address Shamsie’s engagement in local and global politics, focusing in

particular on her book-length non-fiction *Offence: The Muslim Case* (2009) and two recent novels, *Burnt Shadows* (2009) and *A God in Every Stone* (2014). I am fully aware of the differences between fiction and non-fiction in terms of formal elements, yet the three books are read together in this essay because they mark two significant temporal points in Shamsie's life, 9/11 and her acquisition of British citizenship. Unlike Rebecca L. Walkowitz, who, in *Cosmopolitan Style*, "treat[s] literary style politically" (2006: 6), I focus attention on contextualizing the aforementioned three books and reading them against Shamsie's earlier works in order to chart Shamsie's progression from an activist writer of domestic issues to her fusion of local and global politics in the post-9/11 era. My approach to these works is therefore more holistic and biographical than analytical or stylistic.¹

Bringing to the fore the impact of international events, immigration, and national allegiance on Shamsie's political engagement, I investigate in particular the ways that *Offence*, *Burnt Shadows*, and *A God in Every Stone* deal with political issues of terrorism, nationalism, imperialism, and gender politics, and the impact of each on personal lives. Over the last two decades of the 20th century, these issues have been under serious discussion in globalization studies, transnationalism, diaspora, postcolonial and feminist discourses. Critical cosmopolitanism, which I argue is present in Shamsie's works, is conceived in relation to concepts popular in these scholarly discourses, yet it simultaneously complicates, challenges, and at times even brings them into conflict. If a cosmopolitan is a person who is, in a more or less utopian sense, a citizen of the world, Shamsie is a critical cosmopolitan who, rather than celebrate the borderless world and diversity under globalization, creatively intervenes from the margin as a Pakistani, a Muslim, a woman, and a

¹ An analytical approach is adopted, for example, in *Cosmopolitan Style*, in which Walkowitz discusses modernist writers' critical cosmopolitanism through analyzing their literary styles and narrative strategies, including "wandering consciousness, paratactic syntax, recursive plotting, collage, and portmanteau language" (2006: 2).

migrant. Taking my cue from Kwame Anthony Appiah, Walter D. Mignolo, and Gerard Delanty, I contend that Shamsie's cosmopolitanism is locally rooted, universally diverse, and essentially self-reflective. It issues forth from the perspectives of silenced and marginalized voices, but it does not see plurality simply as the goal when it challenges universal norms that are essentially ethnocentric, as exemplified by the global designs of British imperialism and American nationalism. At the same time as it addresses uneven international and cross-cultural relations, it also acutely concerns, from a micro-societal perspective, changes within personal, national, and other local identities, thereby negating a simple equivalence between cosmopolitanism and transnationalization. It reflects internally and reflexively on the problems of Islamic fundamentalism, divided loyalties and nationalism, as well as gender politics in Pakistan, while sending poignant messages on civil liberties for people of all races and religions and on women's rights beyond borders. Shamsie's works ultimately and paradoxically show that, rather than mobility across borders, reflexive self-understanding is a core component of cosmopolitanism, based on which connection to the world is critically established.

I. *Offence and Burnt Shadows*: 9/11, Islamic Fundamentalism, and Patriotism

While it is commonly agreed that many of Shamsie's works are of a political nature, 9/11 and its consequences played an important role in provoking Shamsie to take up journalism and active protest against criminalization of Islam, American nationalism, and xenophobia. Shamsie "started writing for newspapers just after 9/11" (2011: 216). Writing journalism or non-fiction in general in the aftermath of 9/11, Shamsie was committed to making an immediate impact, reaching global readership, and providing information while adhering to the principles of accuracy and verification. As she pointed out in an interview, "[I]n 2001, people began talking about Afghanistan and

Pakistan, often making misinformed claims” due to their lack of knowledge of the areas (216). In the early 2000s, as one of the very few “Pakistanis whom journalists knew and could ring,” Shamsie “at least [knew] a little more, and [was] very interested in politics,” so “[n]ow and then, they asked me to write something” (216). Since then, Shamsie has been writing comment articles for a number of newspapers and magazines, including the *Guardian*, and has joined international institutions such as the Index on Censorship, English PEN, Free Word, and Liberty. In particular, endeavoring to fend off the dangers posed by misinformed claims about Muslims, Shamsie agreed to write on “Islam and Offence” for Seagull Books.² *Offence: The Muslim Case* is the result published in 2009.³

Offence promotes a global understanding of Islam by fleshing out how Muslims in Pakistan could be offended. It in a way reveals that “[c]osmopolitanism should not be confused with the negation of national identity—and vice versa,” as Victor Roudometof argues in distinguishing cosmopolitanism from transnationalism (2005: 122). *Offence* privileges the nation state as a unit of analysis because, as Shamsie explains, “[w]hen I look at events in Pakistan, the context of national government and politics helps me understand what’s going on far more than I understand anything that’s happening in Palestine, Chechnya, or elsewhere in the so-called Muslim world” (2011: 217). Therefore, she confines herself to Pakistan “as a case study,” but her analysis is highly critical of “the interplay of national politics and religious ideology” that gives rise to the ascendancy of the “hardliners” in Pakistan (2009b: 13). Shamsie attributes some people’s biased

² In addition to Shamsie’s book, the “Offence” series also includes Brian Klug’s *Offence: The Jewish Case*, Irena Maryniak’s *Offence: The Christian Case*, Salil Tripathi’s *Offence: The Hindu Case*, Casper Melville’s *Taking Offence*, and Martin Rowson’s *Giving Offence*.

³ *Offence: The Muslim Case* is also part of the “Manifestos for the Twenty-First Century” series, which, according to Pdraig Reidy, is a series of “books that evolved out of a close collaboration between Seagull Books and *Index on Censorship*, a home and a voice for freedom of expression since it was founded in 1972” (2007).

association of Islam with extremism to hardliners, “whose interpretations of Islam give fuel to the Violently Offended Muslim by stressing violent punishment over opportunities for repentance, and by their sidelining of courts of law in decisions about innocence and guilt” (13). Her historical analysis in *Offence* begins with the Indian Mutiny or Revolt against the British in the decade of 1857-67, the establishment of “a true Islamic State” in the post-Partition era (29), the civil war between East Pakistan and West Pakistan in the early 1970s, Zulfikar Ali Bhutto’s militant secularism, Zia-ul-Haq’s Islamization, and then ends with the United States becoming Pakistan’s “great Other” after the Cold War (63). Despite being confined to Pakistan’s national politics and religious ideology, such an analysis is crucial in the post-9/11 era, as it offers insights into global issues of international terrorism.

Through *Offence*, Shamsie renders herself a rooted cosmopolitan of the type for whom Appiah and other critics have argued. Although Appiah has been credited by scholars like Jessica Berman with the phrase “rooted cosmopolitanism” (2001: 27), the phrase was used earlier, and perchance first coined, by Mitchell Cohen in the article “Rooted Cosmopolitanism.” In that article, Cohen argues “against conceiving nationalism as an either/or proposition: either all its forms to be condemned or all its expressions to be sanctioned” (1992: 481). As Cohen explains, “it is not true that all nationalists have had chauvinist views of the world and that all expressions of national sentiment represent particularist evil” (480). Viewing “the legitimacy of plural loyalties,” best evidenced in “trans-nationality,” as “an important democratic principle” (482), Cohen proposes rooted cosmopolitanism as the middle ground and an alternative to abstract universalism, which is illusory and untenable, and to particularism, which is one-sided and unidevotional. Published almost 13 years after Cohen’s piece, the final chapter of Appiah’s *The Ethics of Identity* (2005) is also entitled “Rooted Cosmopolitanism,” although the chapter appears to repeat some ideas that Appiah has argued in an earlier article called “Cosmopolitan Patriots” (Appiah, 1997).

Resonating with Cohen's "plural loyalties," Appiah's notion of "partiality" values particular human lives and acknowledges the diversity of social relationships (2005: 237). Taking a step further than Cohen, who simply states that "nations should be conceived as mediators between the person and humanity" (1992: 480), Appiah asks if national partiality is possible and how it might help modify illiberal universalism that, unconcerned with human particularity, carries "a uniformitarian agenda" (2005: 220). Appiah attempts to reconcile cosmopolitanism and patriotism by suggesting a model of "cosmopolitan patriotism" (237). According to Appiah, cosmopolitan patriotism is tenable because nationalism, as complicated as it can be, is at once as universal as cosmopolitanism and as local as any human particularity. Even though it is usually assumed to oppose cosmopolitanism, "nationalism, too, has been charged with effacing local partialities and solidarities . . . with being a force for homogeneity" (Appiah, 2005: 239). Cosmopolitan patriots are therefore always "*partial* cosmopolitans" (242; emphasis original), who, as citizens of the world, "can make the world better by making some local place better, even though that place need not be the place of [their] literal or original citizenship" (241).

Shamsie could be considered a partial cosmopolitan in the sense that her *Offence* presents cosmopolitanism as an ideal at the global level, but, in achieving the goal, she stays attached, in varying degrees, to different dimensions of the local. My use of the term, "the local," broadly includes the nation, culture, and religion, although, as Appiah has pointed out, "the local" has been interpreted quite narrowly by some as human particularity and thus seen as the opposite of the national. In light of the complexity and ambivalence of the local, which is itself arguably fluid in terms of its scope and definition, Shamsie's *Offence* shows that the cosmopolitan-local relationship is not a dichotomy but rather "a continuum" that involves varying degrees of attachment to the local (Roudometof, 2005: 127). For example, Pakistan, Muslim culture, and Islam can all be considered local fields, but, to some Muslims, *ummah* underscores a form of community

“unified by faith and transcending national state boundaries” (Sayyid, 2000: 36). In *Offence*, Shamsie examines the dialogical relationship between these different local fields and their dialectical relationships with the cosmopolitan. Her aim is to acknowledge the nuances of Muslims and to promote civil liberties and the right to freedom of expression against the growing global “culture of complaint and oversensitivity” (Rajagopalan, 2009). First and foremost, *Offence* notes that Pakistan and Islam are interrelated fields that shape Muslims’ social life and identities, but they are not equivalent. As quoted earlier, when Shamsie claims that she understands more about Pakistan than other places in the so-called Muslim world, she articulates not only her attachment to Pakistan but also the diversity of Muslims living in different nations and areas. The task of cosmopolitanism that Shamsie contemplates in *Offence* is the “debate and conversation across nations” (Appiah, 2005: 246) and other local areas in the world, which, in the post-9/11 era, has been arbitrarily divided into Muslim and non-Muslim. Examining the local situation in Pakistan, *Offence* aims at dispelling the notion of the “Offended Muslim,” now almost universally regarded as “an anti-Western construct” (Shamsie, 2009b: 3). It points out that the combination of Islam with violence is “primarily an intra-Muslim affair and only secondarily concerned with the non-Muslim world” (3), for, even without reference to the West or Christianity, Muslims living in one nation could be offended for various reasons. As important as the idea of Muslim diversity within and across national borders in forming part of Shamsie’s cosmopolitanism and complicating the unified notion of *ummah* are the extra-textual ties that *Offence* forges with other books in the “Offence” series, each of which is “a long-form essay discussing offence from the perspective of the offender, the ‘victim,’ and the religious context of Muslims, Jews, Hindus and Christians” (Rajagopalan, 2009). In a nutshell, although *Offence* is partially rooted in the Muslim case in Pakistan, it fundamentally concerns politics and civil liberties across nations and religions in the post-9/11 era.

Published in the same year as *Offence*, Shamsie’s *Burnt Shadows*,

albeit in a fictional form, similarly ponders the cosmopolitan-local continuum.⁴ The novel has been said to make “a new departure [from previous novels] in being set in Japan, India, Afghanistan and New York as well as Karachi” (King, 2011: 149). Shamsie herself also grants that the novel is “more international” than her first four novels (Shamsie, 2011: 212). Such an international novel, however, does not uncritically celebrate mobility under globalization. Rather, it depicts in detail the traumas of Asian and Muslim immigrants from WWII to the War on Terror to underscore the plight of people in diaspora and the danger of patriotism being mutated into aggressive nationalism and expanded into imperialism. There seems to be a contradiction between *Offence* and *Burnt Shadows*, as the former favors the nation as a unit of analysis in shedding light on Shamsie’s rooted cosmopolitanism, whereas the latter criticizes nationalism as a serious challenge for cosmopolitanism. However, with respect to individuals’ attachment to the nation or state, it is essential to distinguish patriotism from ethnocentrism. As Roudometof points out, “[t]he moral advocacy of rooted cosmopolitanism rests on the proposition that patriotism . . . does not necessarily imply ethnocentrism” (2005: 122). Yet, as my later analysis of *Burnt Shadows* will show, patriotism becomes destructive when it is confused and conflated with rabid nationalism and ethnocentrism, which, according to Roudometof, is a quality “conceptually linked to locals, who are expected to adopt the viewpoint of unconditional support for one’s country, putting one’s country first and protecting national interest irrespective of whether their own position is morally superior or not” (122). It is not the idea of national identity or love of one’s country *per se* that Shamsie’s critical cosmopolitanism denounces but rather ethnocentric patriotism

⁴ I have written elsewhere on *Burnt Shadows* with thorough analysis of Shamsie’s trauma writing in relation to diaspora and ethics. Other critics like Aroosa Kanwal (2015), Gohar Karim Khan (2011), and Sachi Nakachi (2012) have dealt with issues of Islamophobia, globalization, nationalism, feminism as well as Shamsie’s use of transnational allegory. My analysis here will therefore focus on a few critical parts of the novel that could best substantiate Shamsie’s critical cosmopolitanism as it is developed in the subaltern positions.

and its expansion into imperialism.

Burnt Shadows examines extreme patriotism and imperialism as the main causes of many traumatic events in history, and provides its critique from Muslim and Asian migrant perspectives. Such perspectives, I argue, echo the subaltern perspectives that Mignolo contends could bring forth critical cosmopolitanism. According to Mignolo, critical cosmopolitanism is distinguished from global designs and cosmopolitan projects. Global designs—“as in Christianity, nineteenth-century imperialism, or late twentieth-century neoliberal globalization”—are “managerial” (Mignolo, 2000: 722-723), whereas cosmopolitan projects—“as in Vitoria, Kant, or Karl Marx, leaving aside the differences in each of these projects”—are “emancipatory” (723). Despite significant differences, both are “linked to coloniality and to the emergence of the modern/colonial world” (722). In contrast, critical cosmopolitanism negotiates “the coloniality of power and the colonial difference” (742) and conceives of “diversity as a universal project” (743). Like Cohen and Appiah, Mignolo underlines diversity as the ground for political and ethical cosmopolitan projects. His idea of cosmopolitanism is, to some extent, rooted as well. Yet, instead of discussing diversity generally and positively as if it were a value shared equally by all human beings, Mignolo draws attention to the “critical and dialogic” aspects of cosmopolitanism (743), whose diversity is achieved through the “tool” of “border thinking” (737). By “border thinking,” Mignolo means “the recognition and transformation of the hegemonic imaginary from the perspectives of people in subaltern positions” (736-737). Articulated through “silenced and marginalized voices” (736), critical cosmopolitanism of diversity counters global designs, namely “cosmopolitanism managed from above” (741). At the same time, it is distinguished from emancipatory cosmopolitan projects in the sense that the silenced and marginalized voices actively “are bringing themselves into the conversation of cosmopolitan projects, rather than waiting to be included” (736). Critical cosmopolitanism is therefore an actively “transformative” project from a subaltern perspective rather than a passively “reformatory” one in alliance with

Eurocentrism (736).

Burnt Shadows could be read as an actively transformative project from subaltern perspectives to counter the global designs of the United States from WWII through to the War on Terror. The prologue of the novel introduces a prisoner who is stripped naked and, while waiting to be dressed in an orange prison jumpsuit, asks, “*How did it come to this.*” The first chapter is set in 1945, in Nagasaki, where the atomic bomb dropped by the United States claims the lives of the father, and Konrad, the German fiancée, of the female protagonist, Hiroko. Two years later, to alleviate her sorrow, Hiroko goes to Delhi, India, where Konrad used to live with his sister, Elizabeth, and her English husband, James Burton. There, Hiroko meets and marries Elizabeth and James’s Muslim employee, Sajjad Ashraf. As a result of the Partition in 1947, Hiroko and Sajjad are forced to move to Karachi, Pakistan. In the meantime, Elizabeth gets divorced and moves to New York with her son, Henry. When India performs nuclear tests in 1998 to threaten Pakistan, Hiroko moves to New York to live with Elizabeth and her granddaughter, Kim. The novel traces the shared histories of the Ashrafs and the Burtons across three continents. As the narrative progresses, 9/11 and its consequences challenge the close relationship between the two families. The murder of Henry in Afghanistan and Kim’s radical distrust of Muslims cause Raza to be mistakenly identified and arrested as a terror suspect. The end of the story suggests that Raza might be the unidentified prisoner from the prologue, who is waiting to be sent to Guantánamo.

Having incorporated 9/11 into its final section, *Burnt Shadows* has been read by quite a few reviewers as a post-9/11 novel.⁵ However, when the interviewer Michele Filgate asked Shamsie, “A section of this novel is set in New York after 9/11. Did you deliberately set out to write a post[-]9/11 novel?” Shamsie gave a firm answer, “No” (Shamsie, 2008). Instead, as Shamsie (2008) explained in the interview, she

⁵ Charlie Lee Potter of *The Independent*, for example, praises *Burnt Shadows* as a “decade-spanning and continent-bestrident post-9/11 novel” (2009).

“quite deliberately use[d] the phrase ‘War on Terror,’” for “to talk about a ‘War on Terror’ novel is to really talk about the consequences of the decisions made by various governments (including those of the US and Pakistan), rather than to place the terrorists of 9/11 at the centre of the narrative.” The War on Terror, which the American government called for in the immediate aftermath of 9/11 to protect democracy and liberty, has inflicted suffering on many Muslims in the United States, especially after the Patriot Act was signed and enacted.⁶ In the novel, in the wake of 9/11, Kim becomes more patriotic and paranoid than before, and yet, when Raza tells Kim that the Patriot Act permits the FBI to “indefinitely detain someone with just minor visa violations if they have even the vaguest suspicions about them” (Shamsie, 2009a: 305), Kim appears to have known nothing about it. Kim’s ignorance reflects some extremely patriotic Americans’ blind support of their government’s actions without knowing or caring about the outcomes.

Despite being called the Patriot Act, such a homeland security policy seems to reflect a sentiment less related to patriotism than to ethnocentrism and aggressive nationalism which, while including white Americans, excludes immigrants in the rebuilding of the nation. This is the other side of immigrant story that remains mostly untold in Shamsie’s Karachi novels, in which migrant characters appear, to some extent, to be unaffected by, or unconcerned with, the politics of their host country while constantly feeling nostalgia for the homeland.⁷

⁶ USA Patriot Act stands for Uniting and Strengthening America by Providing Appropriate Tools Required to Intercept and Obstruct Terrorism Act of 2001.

⁷ In fact, Shamsie’s fourth novel, *Broken Verses*, briefly touches upon Americans’ anti-Muslim xenophobia after 9/11. In the novel, the male protagonist Ed returns from New York to Pakistan because of the immediate consequences of the 9/11 events, such as “[t]he INS[,] Guantanamo Bay[,] [t]he unrandom random security check in airports[,] [t]he visit from the FBI” (Shamsie, 2005: 45-46). Most importantly, as he says with “anger on his face”: “I was laid off because I’m Muslim” (46). These, however, are the only parts about 9/11 and its impact on the immigrants. The main focus of the novel is still on the Pakistani society that Ed returns to.

From the migrant perspective, *Burnt Shadows* represents in detail the plight of people in diaspora regardless of their attachment to or distance from their countries of origin. The novel directly addresses the convergences and disjunctions among diaspora, the nation, and the world, thereby making a critical intervention in diaspora, postcolonial, and globalization studies. As Vinay Dharwadker points out, over the last three decades or so, in postcolonial and globalization studies, the association of diaspora and cosmopolitanism derives from “a series of links between migration and hybridity and diaspora and creolization,” as evidenced, for example, by Salman Rushdie’s *The Satanic Verses* and Homi K. Bhabha’s theories (2011: 126). Shamsie’s novel does not negate the possibility of achieving cosmopolitanism through diaspora, as my later analysis will show; yet, it questions the general association between the two without distinguishing “subaltern diasporas and elite diasporas” and “what kinds of diaspora consciousness and double consciousness they develop” (Dharwadker, 2011: 141). In the novel, Shamsie depicts how, in the post-9/11 United States, an illegal Afghan migrant worker is denied basic human rights, not to mention an opportunity to intermingle in two cultures, because of his ethnicity and socioeconomic class. Abdullah, Raza’s childhood friend, is an Afghan working illegally as a taxi driver in New York. Because he is an undocumented migrant worker, he “jumped out of the window” when “some FBI guys came around to his apartment building” and “knocked on the door” (Shamsie, 2009a: 304). Even though he runs away simply out of fear, his act is taken as “evidence of terrorism” (305) in the wake of 9/11. If Abdullah is arrested, he could be detained indefinitely as a terror suspect in compliance with the Patriot Act. It would have been a benign act of protecting human rights had Kim, at Raza’s request, helped innocent Abdullah leave the United States. And yet, when Kim drives Abdullah across the border and arrives in Canada, her patriotism gives her the impulse to secretly report Abdullah to the police. At the same time, Raza is at the border to return from Afghanistan to the United States and finds the police arriving to arrest Abdullah. In order to protect Abdullah, Raza comes out and is himself arrested by the

police, who believe they have arrested Abdullah. The novel's ironic and dramatic ending manifests how, in the post-9/11 United States, Muslims simply look alike to paranoid Americans and are subject to investigation or arrest no matter whether they are illegal immigrants or green-card holders.

As subaltern as Abdullah, Hiroko is, however, a critical cosmopolitan in the novel. She is neither one of the elite nor "the 'new diasporas' under globalization, which mostly prove to be dispersions of professionals and corporate personnel" (Dharwadker, 2011: 137). Instead, Hiroko is displaced thrice in the novel, first from Japan to British India after the atomic bombing on Nagasaki, then from British India to Pakistan after Partition in 1947, and finally from Pakistan to the United States in 1998 for fear of a nuclear war between India and Pakistan. It is not the simple fact of living in several foreign countries that makes Hiroko a cosmopolitan, as Abdullah's case has clearly challenged a direct and simple equation between diaspora and cosmopolitanism. Rather, Hiroko can be argued to be a critical cosmopolitan because of the kind of "border thinking" she shows in her critique of aggressive nationalism and various forms of imperialism, even before she leaves Japan. As Mignolo maintains, "[b]order thinkers did not buy into" the idea of "a world without borders" (2011: 332); instead, border thinking "confront[s], and delink[s], from the imperial and colonial differences," which, according to Mignolo, are "strategies of classification . . . that the world is built on two poles, the negative and the positive" (2011: 337, 330). Unlike Mignolo, whose "critical cosmopolitanism" (2000: 723) or "decolonial cosmopolitanism" (2011: 329) simply questions Eurocentered cosmopolitanism or global imperial designs of the West, Hiroko in Shamsie's novel is critical of both American ethnocentric patriotism and Japanese imperialism. The beginning of the novel presents a sharp contrast between Hiroko's and Americans' views of the atomic bombing on Nagasaki. For Hiroko, the bombing is an "unspeakable" trauma (Shamsie, 2009a: 100), whereas, for one of the Americans Hiroko has worked for in Tokyo, "the bomb was a terrible thing, but it had to be done to save American lives" (63).

Regardless of whether the United States was justified in dropping the atomic bombs, the American's unconditional support for his country and his reflective protection of national interest irrespective of others' suffering foreshadows that of Kim six decades later. After learning what Kim has done to Abdullah and her son, Hiroko says to Kim in despair, "[R]ight now, because of you, I understand for the first time how nations can applaud when their governments drop a second nuclear bomb" (370). It is, however, not the United States *per se* that Hiroko criticizes but rather the strategies of imperial and colonial differences adopted in dividing the world. Like her father, who is seen by their neighbors as a "traitor" for his public criticism on the Emperor and Kamikaze (7), Hiroko is critical of Japanese nationalism and imperialism as well. In wartime Japan, she dreams of the day when "the war ends there will be a ship to take her and Konrad far away into a world without duty" (16). Years later when she lives in Pakistan, she even compares "[r]idiculous" Islamic religious tests required of all law students to Kamikaze's loyalty to "Japan and the Emperor, during the war," for both manifest "[d]evotion as public event, as national requirement" (147). From the marginal perspective of a Japanese victim and a diasporic migrant as self-critical as Hiroko, *Burnt Shadows* manifests the importance of reflexive self-problematization as well as border thinking in developing a critical sense of cosmopolitanism from below.

Burnt Shadows concerns not only how a self-critical individual like Hiroko develops critical cosmopolitanism through the tool of border thinking but also how human beings, beyond identities, are connected by the commonality of their trauma experience in an age of imperial expansion and globalization. Shamsie represents various historical and personal traumas in different places, as revealed most simply and evidently in the titles of the four chapters: "The Yet Unknowing World: Nagasaki, 9 August 1945," "Veiled Birds: Delhi, 1947," "Part-Angel Warriors: Pakistan, 1982-3," and "The Speed Necessary to Replace Loss: New York, Afghanistan, 2001-2." The four chapters revolve around WWII, Partition, the Cold War, and the War

on Terror, respectively. The place and country names indicated in the chapter titles suggest that these historical events are collective traumas experienced by people in specific local contexts. Their traumatic experiences, albeit of different scales, all attest to colonial and imperial power that cuts across borders to dominate the world. There are Hiroko as a “hibakusha,” namely “an explosion-affected person” in Japan (Shamsie, 2009a: 50); Hiroko’s husband, Sajjad, as a subaltern in British India and a “Muhajir,” “who had come to Pakistan from what was now India at Partition” (152); their son, Raza, as a “a bomb-marked mongrel” in Karachi (194); and Abdullah as a terror suspect in the United States. These characters all represent subaltern perspectives, from which Shamsie brings into question British, American, as well as Japanese global imperial designs, in which “a set of institutions or country determines the rules to be followed” (Mignolo, 2011: 329). The links between the commonality of Shamsie’s subaltern characters’ colonial experience with uncommon local histories are shown subtly and metaphorically in the novel through their interwoven relationship as either family members or friends. Such links create a possibility to envision a universal project similar to Mignolo’s “pluriversality” (343) or “diversality” (2000: 743). Pluriversality or diversality as a universal project should not be confused with diversity without borders. Rather, in Shamsie’s works, pluriversality underscores connectivity to the world from a wide range of borders, as represented in *Offence* by the pursuit of civil liberties of all people and religions through attachment to different dimensions of the local, and in *Burnt Shadows* by the subaltern’s common yet different trauma experience of colonial and imperial differences.

II. *A God in Every Stone*: Pacifist Nationalism and Women’s Rights

As discussed previously, paying attention to human particularity and diversity, Shamsie’s cosmopolitanism is as rooted as Appiah’s cosmopolitan patriotism, and, issuing forth from the subaltern

perspectives, it is critical as well. In her most recent novel, *A God in Every Stone*, Shamsie takes a step further to develop a critical cosmopolitanism that is not merely about plurality, but, as Delanty suggests, it also “concerns the internal transformation of social and cultural phenomena through self-problematization and pluralization” (2006: 41). The reflexive process of self-understanding that critical cosmopolitanism entails arises as a result of “the interplay of self, other and world” (41). *A God in Every Stone* zeros in on self-transformation, first and foremost, by reflecting on the question of divided loyalties. The novel was published in 2014, the year Shamsie gained British citizenship. It is also the first novel she claims to have written outside of Karachi (Shamsie, 2015). With its theme of divided loyalties, *A God in Every Stone* shifts the emphasis of cosmopolitanism from “seeing globalization as the primary mechanism” to “internal developmental processes within the social world” (Delanty, 2006: 27). It also exemplifies how Shamsie transforms her crisis as a migrant who felt “betrayed and betrayer both” upon receiving British citizenship (Shamsie, 2014a) into an opportunity to find different ways of engaging in the political activities and social reforms of Pakistan, Britain, and the world.

Unlike *Burnt Shadows*, part of which is set in the post-9/11 world, *A God in Every Stone* is a historical fiction that reimagines the world in the past. It also differs from *Burnt Shadows* and Shamsie’s earlier Karachi novels in its focalization. The narrative is presented not only through the subaltern perspective of the colonized and oppressed but also through the colonial perspective of the English, as Shamsie imagines, for the first time in her writing career, an Englishwoman as her protagonist. Except for the brief opening (515 BC) and ending (485 BC) about Scylax of the Persian Empire and his circlet, the novel is divided into two parts and is set largely in London and Peshawar in the years between the start of WWI and the escalation of the Indian struggle for independence from the British Raj in 1930. Book I begins in July 1914 with an Englishwoman, Vivian Rose Spencer, who joins the Turkish archaeologist, Tahsin Bey, at a dig in Turkey. When WWI

breaks out, Vivian returns to London to serve as a VAD nurse with her old school friend Mary, who is a suffragette turned zealous supporter of the war. Upon receiving a postcard from Tahsin and believing that Tahsin is encouraging her to go to Peshawar to escape the war, Vivian travels to Peshawar, where she befriends a young Pashtun, Najeeb Gul, and teaches him about excavations and antiquity. At the same time, Najeeb's brother, Qayyum, is discharged from a British hospital in Brighton after losing an eye on the Western Front, where he has served with the 40th Pathans for the British Raj. The first part of the novel ends in 1916 when, deeply disappointed at not finding Tahsin and Scylax's Circlet, Vivian returns home to find more job opportunities for women in London and is saddened to learn that Tahsin has died because she betrayed his secret role in the rebellion against the Ottoman Empire to the British War Office. In Book II, Najeeb's letters bring Vivian back to Peshawar in 1930 to dig for the Circlet again with the discovery he has made as Assistant of the Peshawar Museum. The region is, however, in full ferment, and Qayyum becomes involved with Ghaffar Khan, an independence activist known for his non-violent opposition to the British Raj. On April 23, 1930, the English order a massacre in the Street of Storytellers, injuring Najeeb and killing dozens of Pashtuns.

As the above plot summary has clearly shown, from the subaltern perspective, Shamsie has blended fact with fiction to include historical figures and invented fictional characters who are colonial subjects serving and rebelling against different empires in history. These characters could be read as Shamsie's spokespeople, whose divided loyalties complicate the way we think of patriotism and cosmopolitanism. At first sight, they might appear to be patriots who, like Kim in *Burnt Shadows*, only care about their nations; yet, if we follow Mignolo's idea of border thinking and Delanty's self-problematization, their patriotism after experiencing divided loyalties may be reinterpreted with critical cosmopolitan imagination. It is because these subaltern people's patriotism, under the impact of the other and the world, is ultimately geared toward internal societal

change, rather than toward globalization or exclusion of others, as seen in the global War on Terror and the Patriot Act. At first, like Shamsie, Scylax of the Persian Empire, Tashin of the Ottoman Empire, and Qayyum of the British Empire all feel “betrayed and betrayer both” at some point. Yet, at the end of the novel, when conflicts occur, the three of them choose to side with their countrymen, not the emperors, even if they have benefitted from the empires. Although Scylax is entrusted by Darius “to lead the most daring of missions in the Empire” to navigate the Indus River (Shamsie, 2014c: 8), he is critical of the Persian Empire and allies himself with the Carians when the Carians rebel against Darius’ Persians. Similarly, retelling Scylax’s story to Vivian and determined to find the Cirlet of Scylax, Tahsin reveals his secret allegiance to the Armenians, his grandmother’s people, not to the Ottomans, even though, like Scylax, he is trusted by the empire and has been “given permission to excavate the most astonishing site by the Ottoman authorities” (Shamsie, 2014c: 30). Echoing Scylax and Tahsin, Qayyum at first feels honored to be part of the 40th Pathans, tasked to fight in the Great War for the British Raj. As one of his comrades imagines, “one day they’ll tell stories about us in the Street of Storytellers” (59). The truth is that, as a one-eyed man back from the war, Qayyum walks in the Street of Storytellers, and, instead of hearing glorious stories about the 40th Pathans, he finds the story, “Hadda Mulla’s jihad against the English,” appealing to “the largest crowd” (142). Upon hearing the last couplet, “Haji Sahib in the hills is gathering his forces. / Rise up! Join him! By foot or on horses” (143), he walks away from the Storyteller and the cheering crowd “because for a moment he pictured himself in the uniform of the British Indian Army, and what he felt was shame” (144). In the novel, Scylax is a historical figure and Tahsin and Qayyum are Shamsie’s invented characters. However, by juxtaposing real and fictional characters from three empires in different historical periods, with a focus in each on the imperial subjects’ shared struggle for independence, Shamsie indicates the importance of self-problematization when one encounters the global design of imperialism.

In *A God in Every Stone*, internal societal changes brought forth by the reflexive self-transformation of the subaltern reflect the micro dimension of cosmopolitanism. According to Delanty, the micro dimension of cosmopolitanism could be exemplified in changes within individual agency, national and societal identities, so “cosmopolitanism is not to be equated with transnationalization” (2006: 42). Through the peaceful actions that Qayyum has taken to bring change to society and the nation, Shamsie demonstrates that patriotism could be non-violent as well, as opposed to violent extremism of some of Qayyum’s countrymen. After feeling ashamed of himself for having served the British Raj, Qayyum begins to participate in local political activities against the British Raj. However, he refuses to join Haji Sahib’s jihad although his best friend, Kalam, does, and even accuses him of betrayal: “You’ll fight for the Europeans who want to keep their land away from invaders but when your brothers want the same thing you turn the invaders into your beloved” (Shamsie, 2014c: 147). For Kalam and other jihadists, attacking English troops is the only way to show loyalty to their compatriots and to relieve the plight of the Pashtuns. For Qayyum, however, “Ghaffar Khan is a true Pashtun” (179). Here, once again, Shamsie includes another historical figure into the novel. It is known that Haji Sahib and Ghaffar Khan once worked together to “set up a programme for education and reform,” but, “when Haji Sahib declared jihad[,] their paths diverged” (180). Qayyum joins Ghaffar Khan, who “travelled all through the settled districts setting up schools where the Pashtuns could find education untainted by the superstition of the mullahs and the brainwashing of the English” (180). In 1930, Qayyum becomes more a part of the Khudai Khidmatgar, meaning “Servants of God” (239), to engage in civil disobedience against the British. The non-violent struggle, however, ends in a massacre ordered by the English officers, who, according to Qayyum, “couldn’t believe we were unarmed” and “wouldn’t believe we weren’t intent on violence” (261). It is because, in the eyes of the English, the Pashtuns are “savage men of the Frontier” (322). With “accelerating cars, men crushed beneath wheels, machine

guns, fire, screams of death and slogans of freedom, bullets and stones,” the Street of Storytellers is “turned into a battleground” (255-256). Even so, as the narrator tells us, in face of the King’s forces, “hundreds of Peshawaris planted their feet on the Street of Storytellers and said no, they would not retreat,” for, “[i]f a man is to die defending a land let the land be his land, the people his people” (256). From setting up education programs and launching the civil disobedience movement, Qayyum, the Khudai Khidmatgar, and Ghaffar Khan in the novel all together send out a pacifist message that is as important now in the post-9/11 era as it was before. In doing so, the novel fights back against biased Western media representation of Muslims as terror suspects, a labeling that has been repeated in news coverage since 9/11, “solidifying the connection between terrorism and Islam” (Powell, 2011: 97). Most importantly, Shamsie’s novel asserts that, by rejecting the use of violence that extremist groups such as Haji Sahib’s jihadists, 9/11’s terrorists, and ISIS’s militant groups have taken up, nonviolent civil resistance can provide an alternative to the passive acceptance of oppression. Patriots can engage in constructive tactics such as education, mass noncooperation, and civil disobedience to achieve local political and social change while contributing to world peace.

In addition to the micro dimension, *A God in Every Stone* also presents critical cosmopolitanism from a macro-societal perspective. It could be reflected, as Delanty maintains, in “changing core-periphery relations, with the core having to re-define itself from the perspective of the periphery” (2006: 41-42). As pointed out earlier, a large portion of *A God in Every Stone* is set in London, and it is also in this novel that Shamsie first imagines an Englishwoman, Vivian, as a protagonist. Through Vivian’s border-crossing from England to Turkey and then to British India, Shamsie explores the dynamics of core-periphery relations. It is a critical approach similar to, yet different from, the one Shamsie employed in *Burnt Shadows* through Hiroko’s border crossing. While the latter is situated in the subaltern position, the former is from the colonial perspective. In other words, what *A God in Every Stone* is

focused on is the possible reflexive self-understanding of not only the subaltern but also the colonists. Such changes might be partly accounted for by Shamsie's dual citizenship and her settlement in London, which appear to have affected the ways she addresses Pakistan's and Britain's domestic politics as well as their interaction. During the period between 2009 and 2014, when the novel was written, Shamsie was living in London. Just as London gradually became her main residence, its landscape, politics, and history were also combined in the novel in a way rarely seen in her other works. In "Tri-Sub-Continental," Shamsie claims that England and the United States were present in her earlier fiction "only because they are the places from which people return to Karachi or to which people go and become cut off from home or fear becoming cut off from home" (2002: 90). In *A God in Every Stone*, however, London and Britain play an important role.⁸ Shamsie herself makes it very clear that, being "the first novel I've written in the time I've been resident outside Pakistan," *A God in Every Stone* is "as much about the UK's history as Pakistan's" (2014b: 8). Furthermore, she foresees an increasingly important role for Britain in her future writing and life, as she is "interested to see what happens in the next decade or two now that I'm living in the UK" (8). With her settlement in London and growing interest in British history and politics as the nation interacts with the world, Shamsie's critical cosmopolitanism concerns a dynamic relation between the local and the global that, as Delanty (2006) has argued, may hopefully transform and redefine the self-understanding of not only the periphery but the center.

In *A God in Every Stone*, through Vivian's traveling between London and Peshawar, Shamsie represents the political and social

⁸ Several critics have noticed the importance of London and Britain in *A God in Every Stone*, but not all are satisfied with the novel's representation of the transnational space. Michael Duffy, for example, claims that, "[f]or Shamsie[,] England has always been a peripheral space where characters recoup or retreat" (n.d.). Rajender Kaur (2014) likewise contends that Shamsie's representation of Britain is less detailed and thought-provoking than that of South Asia or the Middle East.

changes of both Pakistan and Britain in both 1914-1915, and 1929-1930. While Quayyum and Najeeb represent Pashtun men's ambivalence towards WWI, with a focus on their strong sense of national allegiance and involvement in civil disobedience, Vivian, as an Englishwoman, provides a different perspective from which to examine British and Pakistani politics. Through her, the novel reveals in particular the relevance of the women's rights movement to local and global politics. Vivian, her father, and best friend all support the Great War so zealously that Vivian betrays her beloved Tahsin; her father expects her to "join the mobile nursing units at the Front" (Shamsie, 2014c: 52), and Mary's brother dies of wounds. This is a collective memory of WWI shared by many British people, but, as Rajender Kaur points out, through the story of Quayyum and the 40th Pathans, Shamsie's novel "participates in revaluations of the 'Great War' by addressing more than a few of the blind spots in the collective memory of the British" (2014). It foregrounds "the heavy toll paid by thousands of Indian soldiers who fought for the Allied cause as part of the British empire" (Kaur, 2014). Less noticed by critics of the novel is, however, Vivian's feminist motivation to join the war. Like her friend, Mary, who "had transformed so rapidly and completely from the suffragette who smashed windows, to this zealous supporter of the war" (Shamsie, 2014c: 33), Vivian wants to prove that women are as "indispensable" as men in times of war (37). As a daughter and the only child in the family, she desires to meet the expectations of her father, who once declared that "[a] daughter nursing in a Class A hospital was almost as fine as a son going into battle" (35). The novel highlights how the Great War in Europe parallels not only the independence movement in Peshawar but also the campaign for women's suffrage in London. This parallelism is not merely a chronological coincidence. Rather, the national and other local movements in Peshawar and London for political independence and gender equality, respectively, have affected and conditioned, albeit in opposite ways, the British Empire's transnational involvement in the Great War. A close correlation between local and global politics is thus

brought to light in the novel.

Though the Great War ends in 1918, in *A God in Every Stone*, both the Pashtun independence activism against the British Raj and the women's suffrage movement continue into the 1920s and 1930s and are brought together in Book II of the novel. How the two liberation movements may collide or unite when they meet across national borders is a question the novel explores in depth. There is a collision between the two when Vivian, a Western feminist, is convinced of the simple oppositions created by the political discourse of Orientalism that has been dominating the West for centuries: the West versus the East (or Islam), modern versus traditional, and secularism versus fundamentalism. For Vivian, in terms of gender equality, London is much more progressive than Peshawar. As she explains in a letter to Najeeb, "At present, though, England is by far the most interesting place to be as my old friend Mrs Mary Moore, a local councillor, plans to run for Parliament in the next elections, which will be the first to allow women voting rights on equal terms with men" (Shamsie, 2014c: 225). While suffragettes in Britain are making revolutionary progress, Vivian "dare[s] say" that "this all seems very odd" to Najeeb, who has grown up in a traditional Muslim society (225). Vivian remembers that, in 1915, Najeeb unwillingly ended her private tutoring or "civilising mission" (113), for it was not right for him to be alone with a woman. Even if Vivian offered to teach his sisters as well, he refused because "they're girls" (197). Vivian is shocked to discover that Pashtun women are forbidden to receive education and have no right to even choose what to wear.

In the novel, the veils or burqas that women in Peshawar wear to cover their bodies in public stand for the oppression of women from Vivian's viewpoint even though at times she disguises herself in a burqa in order to hide her English identity. When she arrives by train in 1930, for example, she puts on a burqa to safely enter the Peshawar Valley, which is in turmoil because Pashtuns are protesting for their independence. "[O]n behalf of the women of the Peshawar Valley," Vivian feels "rage" over the restrictive nature of the burqa, finding

“Indian demands for self-rule” hypocritical, because, in fact, “they only wanted it for half the population” (Shamsie, 2014c: 273). As a feminist, Vivian believes that “social change” of the country should take place before talking about “political change,” namely independence (273). It is the Pashtun men, rather than the English, that should be the enemies of Pashtun women and any women, and, therefore, upon arriving at her temporary home in the Valley, “[w]ith something of the same grandness with which she had cast her first vote[,] she threw off the vile cloth, and didn’t look back” (273). Here, in a translational space between self and other that, according to Delanty’s argument, can lead to “world openness” (2006: 27) if the core redefines itself from the perspective of the periphery, Vivian does not seem to undergo the process of “self-transformation in which new cultural forms take shape and where new spaces of discourse open up leading to a transformation in the social world” (Delanty, 2006: 44). Instead, she is frustrated beneath the burqa, disdains Indian demands for independence, and speaks as a representative for the Pashtun women. Vivian’s desire to appropriate others counteracts “the tendency within modernity” that Delanty optimistically believes “towards self-problematization” (40). Rather than present self-problematization, Shamsie’s novel sheds critical light on the long history of Western feminism’s ties to imperialism.

Having created a white English feminist character and focused in detail on the symbol of the veil, *A God in Every Stone* on the one hand comments on the ironical dissociation of Britain’s national movement of social reforms in the early 20th century from its oppression of the imperial subjects, and on the other hand compels the reader to rethink the global phenomenon of the unveiling of Muslim women, which has been an obsession, especially in the West, from the first wave of feminism till now. The situation nowadays is even more urgent as Duffy points out, “especially as the contested issue of the lawfulness of the burqa in France, Quebec and the United Kingdom gains traction and legitimizes a wide-reaching stigmatization of Muslim women” (n.d.). Indeed, as Duffy has persuasively argued, “[b]y introducing a

character [Vivian] so representative of this contemporary obsession into an historical novel, Shamsie posits the colonial moment as a precursor to the clashes in its wake” (n.d.). Despite her elite, Westernized, and avowedly secular background,⁹ Shamsie, a feminist and a migrant writer living in London, can be seen to be distancing herself from progressive Western feminists and, at the same time, she continues to actively engage in local feminism in Pakistan, which she spares no effort to advocate, starting with her earlier works. As Ruvani Ranasinha notes, Shamsie’s first novel “depicts a local feminist campaign for illegally dispossessed widows,” and the fourth, *Broken Verses*, embeds a familial narrative of an inspirational feminist activist “within a larger story of the resistance to the rise of the Islamic right, Zia ul-Haq’s military dictatorship and oppression of women” (2012: 203). It is without question that, as depicted in these earlier works, “[w]hile Shamsie’s fiction depicts Pakistan as a deeply patriarchal country, she is equally concerned to map the thriving women’s movements that have campaigned against the social and legal strictures against women” (Ranasinha, 2012: 203). Similarly, *A God in Every Stone* contains both Zarina, with her “face uncovered” when she “rush[es] into a street filled with men” (Shamsie, 2014c: 352), and Diwa, who is “bare-headed” (257) when she is shot by the English, a pair of Pashtun feminists who prove that Vivian’s Western feminist ideology is wrong. In them are shown Pashtun women’s desires for both social change and political independence.

The political and social activism of Zarina and Diwa challenges some Western feminists’ emancipatory cosmopolitan projects, within which hides a racist view of Muslim women as passive victims, as evidenced in the novel by Vivian’s response. In the post-9/11 era, as

⁹ As Claire Chambers points out, Shamsie comes “from an elite *muhajir* family, her mother’s relatives being *taluqdar* feudals from Lucknow in India, and the Shamsies belonging to an eminent family of Syeds from Delhi” (2011: 207). Despite her claim to be a member of the middle class, Shamsie received education in the United States, and, having written several best sellers, she is able to profit as well from the global political economic system that has enabled her to make homes in multiple locales.

Rachel Holmes points out, this racially biased view is also held by “the right-wing military of the world’s superpower,” namely the United States, which “is going around the world saying we are bringing feminism to liberate you” (2013). As local feminists and political activists, Zarina and her sister-in-law, Diwa, are both dubbed “Malala of Maiwand” in the novel on different occasions (Shamsie, 2014c: 269, 353). Before the massacre breaks out in the Street of Storytellers, Zarina “took a dagger in her hand and walked out bare-faced, the dye of the Khudai Khidmatgar staining her skin” (355). Diwa is fearless, too, when she “stepped out from the lines of the Peshawari men, walked through the ranks of sepoys who stepped aside as if she were a djinn whose touch might burn them, and stopped in front of an armoured car” (257). Even though Diwa dies of a gun shot in the end, she is mourned by Peshawaris as “[t]he angel on the Street of Storytellers” (Shamsie, 2014c: 322). Being dubbed “Malala of Maiwand,” both Zarina and Diwa remind the reader of the Pakistani feminist, Malala Yousafzai, who, being a Pashtun, is also named after Malala of Maiwand, a national folk hero of Afghanistan who rallied local fighters against the British troops at the 1880 Battle of Maiwand. Even though she was shot in the head by the Taliban, Malala Yousafzai has never stopped speaking out against the Taliban and insists on women’s rights to education, for which she was awarded the Nobel Peace Prize in 2014. By creating two Pashtun activist female characters, who recall Malala of Maiwand and remind the reader of Malala Yousafzai, and juxtaposing them with the non-violent male characters, Shamsie’s novel shows that “[i]t is, and has always been, possible to be a Muslim Pashtun and to embrace nonviolence and a prominent role for women in public affairs” (Dalrymple, 2013). In short, concerning critical cosmopolitanism, the novel underscores not only the complexity of Muslim culture but also the long history of Muslims’ local resistance against the globally widespread violence of extremism and patriarchy while fighting against Western imperialism.

III. Conclusion

From *Offence* and *Burnt Shadows* to *A God in Every Stone*, Shamsie's works show how a political event like 9/11 and its global consequences, and a migrant writer's geographical location and dual citizenship, might have impacted her local and global political engagement. In the moments when she is politically engaged, Shamsie develops critical cosmopolitanism that arises as a result of the interaction and tension between the local and the global. Such a dynamic relation can be seen in *Offence*, *Burnt Shadows*, and *A God in Every Stone* at three levels, all of which illuminate a universal cosmopolitan project of diversity through border thinking and self-transformation. First of all, in the post-9/11 era, the three books can be read as Shamsie's protest against the global violence of extreme patriotism as well as the criminalization of Islam. This internationalist message on global peace is combined on the one hand with the domestic claims Shamsie lodges against the role that the government plays in the rise of the hardliners in Pakistan, as discussed in *Offence*, and, on the other hand, with the history of non-violent activism in Peshawar that she traces in *A God in Every Stone*. The consequences of the criminalization of Islam are most vividly depicted in *Burnt Shadows*, as Pakistani or Muslim immigrants suffer from racial prejudice in the United States after 9/11.

This demonstrates Shamsie's critical cosmopolitanism at a second level against the global design of imperialism, under the force of which the sharp line between domestic and international politics can no longer be drawn. *Burnt Shadows* illustrates how the domestic politics of the United States, such as its Patriot Act, has affected immigrants living within its national border. And, through Henry and Raza's secret connection with the CIA, the novel examines American interference in Pakistan's domestic politics since the Cold War, a problem that *Offence* deals with as well. In *A God in Every Stone*, which Shamsie claims to have written totally outside of Pakistan, her attention is turned from the transnational impact of American imperialism to the civilizing

mission of the British Raj and to the divided loyalties and independence movements of colonial subjects. Writing about independence movements in *A God in Every Stone*, however, Shamsie does not retreat to extreme patriotism that she has criticized in *Burnt Shadows*. Instead, when she challenges the global design of imperialism from the subaltern perspective as Mignolo has called for, Shamsie focuses more on internal changes within individual, societal and national identities than on the exclusion of others.

As a dual national of both Britain and Pakistan, Shamsie in *A God in Every Stone* revisits the shared history of British and Peshawari women fighting against patriarchy, and thus brings her cosmopolitanism to a third level, which is also the most critical one. In advocating women's rights beyond borders, the novel raises the question of how feminists in different countries, from different cultures or of different religions, may find common ground. In criticizing Vivian for being a Western imperialist when she speaks as a human rights advocate "on behalf of the women of the Peshawar Valley" (Shamsie, 2014c: 273), the novel warns against the constraint of rooted cosmopolitanism. There is a danger in rooted cosmopolitanism that should be noted when well-intentioned but misguided activists mistake their local experience and knowledge rooted in a specific national context for a transnational experience shared by people all over the world. A rooted cosmopolitan should therefore reflexively problematize the self to create a world of diversity.

References

- Appiah, K. A. (1997). Cosmopolitan patriots. *Critical Inquiry*, 23, 3: 617-639.
- Appiah, K. A. (2005). *The ethics of identity*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Berman, J. (2001). *Modernist fiction, cosmopolitanism, and the politics of community*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Chambers, C. (2011). *British Muslim fictions: Interviews with contemporary writers*. Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Cohen, M. (1992). Rooted cosmopolitanism. *Dissent*, 39, 4: 478-483.
- Dalrymple, W. (2013, October 25). Before Malala. *New York Times*. Retrieved from <https://www.nytimes.com>
- Delanty, G. (2006). The cosmopolitan imagination: Critical cosmopolitanism and social theory. *British Journal of Sociology*, 57, 1: 25-47.
- Dharwadkar, V. (2011). Diaspora and cosmopolitanism. In M. Rovisco & M. Nowicka (Eds.), *The Ashgate research companion to cosmopolitanism* (pp. 125-146). Burlington, VT: Ashgate.
- Duffy, M. (n.d.). "There's more past than present here." *Review 31*. Retrieved from <http://review31.co.uk/article/view/219/there%E2%80%99s-more-past-than-present-he>
- Holmes, R. (2013, April 1). Fifty shades of feminism. *Guernica*. Retrieved from <https://www.guernicamag.com/fifty-shades-of-feminism/>
- Kanwal, A. (2015). After 9/11: Islamophobia in Kamila Shamsie's *Broken verses* and *burnt shadows*. In C. Chambers & C. Herbert (Eds.), *Imagining Muslims in South Asia and the diaspora: Secularism, religion, representations* (pp. 185-197). New York: Routledge.
- Kaur, R. (2014). Review of *A god in every stone* by Kamila

- Shamsie. *Transnational Literature*, 7, 1. Retrieved from http://dspace.flinders.edu.au/jspui/bitstream/2328/35079/1/Kaur_God.pdf
- Khan, G. K. (2011). The hideous beauty of bird-shaped burns: Transnational allegory and feminist rhetoric in Kamila Shamsie's *Burnt shadows*. *Pakistaniaat: A Journal of Pakistan Studies*, 3, 2: 53-68.
- King, B. (2011). Kamila Shamsie's novels of history, exile and desire. *Journal of Postcolonial Writing*, 47, 2: 147-158.
- Mignolo, W. D. (2000). The many faces of cosmo-polis: Border thinking and critical cosmopolitanism. *Public Culture*, 12, 3: 721-748.
- Mignolo, W. D. (2011). Border thinking, decolonial cosmopolitanism and dialogues among civilizations. In M. Rovisco & M. Nowicka (Eds.), *The Ashgate research companion to cosmopolitanism* (pp. 329-347). Burlington, VT: Ashgate.
- Nakachi, S. (2012). "Why a second bomb?": Kamila Shamsie's challenge to American xenophobia in *Burnt shadows*. *Journal of Ethnic American Literature*, 2: 132-141.
- Potter, C. L. (2009, April 11). *Burnt shadows*, by Kamila Shamsie. *The Independent*. Retrieved from <http://www.independent.co.uk/>
- Powell, K. A. (2011). Framing Islam: An analysis of U.S. media coverage of terrorism since 9/11. *Communication Studies*, 62, 1: 90-112.
- Rajagopalan, S. (2009, July 10). A defense of and against offence. *Livemint*. Retrieved from <http://www.livemint.com/Leisure/cDOFJ8piKY2FG2DeSTJaGK/A-defence-of-and-against-offence.html>
- Ranasinha, R. (2012). Resistance and religion in the work of Kamila Shamsie. In R. Ahmed, P. Morey, & A. Yaqin (Eds.), *Culture, diaspora, and modernity in Muslim writing* (pp. 200-214). New York: Routledge.

- Reidy, P. (2007, November 21). Seagull books and index on censorship: Manifestos for the twenty-first century. *Xindex*. Retrieved from <https://www.indexoncensorship.org/2007/11/seagull-books-and-index-on-censorship-manifestos-for-the-twenty-first-century/>
- Roudometof, V. (2005). Transnationalism, cosmopolitanism and glocalization. *Current Sociology*, 53, 1: 113-135.
- Sayyid, S. (2000). Beyond Westphalia: Nations and diasporas—the case of the Muslim *Umma*. In B. Hesse (Ed.), *Unsettled multiculturalisms: Diasporas, entanglements, transruptions* (pp. 33-50). London: Zed Books.
- Shamsie, K. (2002). Tri-sub-continental. *Index on Censorship*, 31, 3: 86-91.
- Shamsie, K. (2005). *Broken verses*. London: Bloomsbury.
- Shamsie, K. (2007). “In a world of consequences”: An interview with Kamila Shamsie. Interview by C. Cilano. *Kunapipi: Journal of Postcolonial Writing*, 29, 1: 150-162.
- Shamsie, K. (2008). The Kamila Shamsie interview. Interview by M. Filgate. *The Quarterly Conversation*. Retrieved from <http://quarterlyconversation.com/kamila-shamsie-burnt-shadows-interview>
- Shamsie, K. (2009a). *Burnt shadows*. New York: Picador.
- Shamsie, K. (2009b). *Offence: The Muslim case*. London: Seagull Books.
- Shamsie, K. (2011). Kamila Shamsie. In C. Chambers (Ed.), *British Muslim fictions: Interviews with contemporary writers* (pp. 207-227). Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Shamsie, K. (2014a, March 4). Kamila Shamsie on applying for British citizenship: ‘I never felt safe.’ *The Guardian*. Retrieved from <https://www.theguardian.com/uk-news/>
- Shamsie, K. (2014b, October 20). Books are always a fine context through which to encounter a place. *Publishers Weekly*: 8-9.

- Shamsie, K. (2014c). *A god in every stone*. London: Bloomsbury.
- Shamsie, K. (2015, February 10). Kamila Shamsie's writerly impulses. Interview by E. Kuruvilla. *Livemint*. Retrieved from <http://www.livemint.com/Leisure/TAYYoFwHIyLtAXOD5PAIDI/Kamila-Shamsies-writerly-impulses.html>
- Walkowitz, R. L. (2006). *Cosmopolitan style: Modernism beyond the nation*. New York: Columbia University Press.

從邊緣投入政治： 卡美拉·森絲作品中批判的世界主義

廖培真

國立成功大學外國語文學系
70101 臺南市東區大學路 1 號
Email: pcliao@mail.ncku.edu.tw

摘要

本文藉由巴基斯坦裔英國作家卡美拉·森絲的三部作品——長篇散文《冒犯：穆斯林個案》(2009) 與兩本小說《灼痕》(2009) 和《每一塊石頭都有神》(2014)，探討作者對地方政治與全球政治的投入。此三部作品合併來看，彰顯出作者生命中兩個關鍵點——九一一事件和成為英國公民，進而凸顯了國際事件、移民和愛國心對其政治投入的影響。本文主張，此三部作品印證了森絲的世界主義是帶有批判動能的，其根植於地方，強調多元化的普遍性，且本質上是自我反思的。此批判的世界主義透過巴基斯坦、穆斯林、移民和女性的視角，為被邊緣化的沉默者發聲；在其挑戰如英國帝國主義和美國國族主義等具種族中心本質的普世規範之時，並非單純以多元主義為目標。森絲的世界主義在關切不平等的國際和跨文化關係的同時，也深入洞悉個人、國家與其他在地身分的變化，此舉可從她以微觀社會的觀點對巴基斯坦境內伊斯蘭基本教義派、分裂的忠誠與民族主義、以及性別政治的內省反思中看出。森絲的作品最終弔詭地顯示了世界主義的核心不是越界流動，而是反身的自我理解，以此為基礎才來建立起與世界的批判性連結。

關鍵詞：政治、批判的世界主義、《冒犯：穆斯林個案》、《灼痕》、《每一塊石頭都有神》