DETERRITORIALISING THE MODERN STATE: A POSTMODERN STUDY OF THE SELECTED WORKS

BY

WAQAR UL HAQ

NATIONAL UNIVERSITY OF MODERN LANGUAGES

ISLAMABAD

November, 2025

DETERRITORIALISING THE MODERN STATE: A POSTMODERN STUDY OF THE SELECTED WORKS

By

Waqar Ul Haq

BS English, National University of Modern Languages, Islamabad, 2018

A THESIS SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF

THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF

MASTER OF PHILOSOPHY

In **English**

To

FACULTY OF ARTS & HUMANITIES

NATIONAL UNIVERSITY OF MODERN LANGUAGES, ISLAMABAD

FACULTY OF ARTS & HUMANITIES
NATIONAL UNIVERSITY OF MODERN LANGUAGES

THESIS AND DEFENSE APPROVAL FORM

The undersigned certify that they have read the following thesis, examined the defense, are satisfied with the overall exam performance, and recommend the thesis to the Faculty of Arts & Humanities for acceptance:

Thesis Title: Deterritorialising the Modern State: A Postmodern Study of the Selected Works

Submitted By: Waqar Ul Haq **Registration:** 251-MPhil/Eng/Lit/S22

Dr. Yasir Arafat
Name of Supervisor

_____
Signature of Supervisor

Dr. Farheen Ahmed Hashmi
Name of Head (GS)

_____
Signature of Head (GS)

Dr. Arshad Mahmood
Name of Dean (FAH)

_____
Signature of Dean (FAH)

_____
Date

AUTHOR'S DECLARATION

I Waqar Ul Haq

Son of Zia U Haq

Registration # 251-MPhil/Eng/Lit/S22

Discipline English Literature

Candidate of **Master of Philosophy** at the National University of Modern Languages do hereby declare that the thesis **Deterritorialising the Modern State: A Postmodern Study of the Selected Works** submitted by me in partial fulfilment of MPhil degree, is my original work, and has not been submitted or published earlier. I also solemnly declare that it shall not, in future, be submitted by me for obtaining any other degree from this or any other university or institution.

I also understand that if evidence of plagiarism is found in my thesis/dissertation at any stage, even after the award of a degree, the work may be cancelled and the degree revoked.

_____
Signature of Candidate

_____
Name of Candidate

_____
Date

ABSTRACT

Title: Deterritorialising the Modern State: A Postmodern Study of the Selected Works

This study analyses Teju Cole's *Open City* and Joseph O'Neill's *Netherland* to show how the nomads deterritorialise the modern state by problematising the binary of citizen/alien created by the logic of dualism. Drawing on nomadology and micropolitics by Deleuze and Guattari, and historiographic metafiction by Hutcheon in a supporting role, this thesis discusses how Julius in *Open City* and Chuck in *Netherland* deterritorialise themselves and the modern state. Firstly, the study attempts to explore how the nomadic characters portrayed in the novels deterritorialise themselves. The analysis of my primary texts reveals that Julius achieves deterritorialisation and creates his nomadic subjectivity through his practice of psychiatry, aimless wanderings, choice of music, and rejection of racial categorisation. Chuck does so through contingencies, the deterritorialisation of friendship and romantic relationship, and detachment from his homeland. Secondly, the analysis shows how the nomadic characters deterritorialise the modern state. Julius, in *Open City*, uses his wanderings through the city as a medium of deterritorialisation of the modern state. He along with Chuck in *Netherland* carries out historical inquiry to challenge the internal coherent self, which is central to the formation of national identity. The historical inquiry, performed by the nomads, challenges the state's ability to define who is included and who is not within its boundaries. Furthermore, both *Open City* and *Netherland* use the gray zone of the immigrants to challenge the logic of dualism of the modern state. Thirdly, the study highlights the dangers of the line of flight as portrayed in the novels. It contributes to the scholarly debate on 9/11 fiction by focusing on the deterritorialisation of the modern state.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First and foremost, I am profoundly grateful to Allah Almighty, whose countless blessings, guidance, and mercy have enabled me to complete this research.

I extend my sincere appreciation to the Department of English, whose academic environment, resources, and continuous encouragement provided the foundation for my learning and growth throughout this research journey.

I am grateful to my supervisor, Dr. Yasir Arafat, whose insightful guidance and feedback have shaped the course of this work. He helped me stay focused, motivated, and confident at every stage of this journey.

I would also like to thank my friend Syed Faisal Shah who edited and proofread my thesis. Lastly, I would like to thank my friend Muhammad Ejaz for his constant support and valuable feedback.

DEDICATION

This thesis is dedicated to my parents, whose unwavering support has guided me throughout my academic journey. Their constant encouragement, prayers, and belief in my abilities have been a source of strength and resilience. Every step I have taken and every milestone I have achieved is a reflection of their sacrifices and unconditional love. It is their faith in me that has enabled me to persevere and successfully complete this research. To them, I owe my deepest gratitude.

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

This study aims to depict the shift in the treatment of the modern state as perceived in the selected texts. In this critical inquiry, I have attempted to show how literature, through the portrayal of nomadic characters, can deterritorialise the modern state by challenging its ability to construct a coherent self against the external threatening other.

I have selected two works of long fiction for analysis: *Open City* by Cole and *Netherland* by O'Neill. The research aims to explore the selected works in the light of theoretical concepts proposed by Deleuze, Guattari and Hutcheon. This study seeks to analyse how nomadic characters are portrayed in the novels. It further explores how the nomads depicted in the novels resist the modern state and how the nomadic identity is created by the writers in the selected works. This research has further attempted to interrogate what kind of resistance against the modern state is feasible and at which point it becomes too dangerous, as portrayed in the selected works.

Since the Treaty of Westphalia (1648), the modern state has remained the dominant mode of political organisation. It creates itself through the logic of dualism: internally, a unified self and externally, the threatening other. To maintain the distinction between the self/other, insider/outsider or citizen/alien, it controls borders and regulates the flow of people, capital and sometimes even ideas. Given its ubiquity, it can be easily forgotten that there have been other modes of political organisations based on love of God, bond of kinship, fealty to a person (knight, lord and King), and so forth. Although the modern state has been central in the postWestphalian society, this centrality does not go unchallenged. The forces of globalisation, migration and transnational movements constantly test its capacity to maintain internal coherence. Literature, especially in the post 9/11 era, has been the site of resistance between the modern state and the forces that oppose it.

The 9/11 attacks were a pivotal moment as they revived the authority of the modern state when its power seemed to be waning. In the euphoria of globalisation, there was a widespread belief that with the proliferation of liberal ideals, what Fukuyama called the end of history, the modern state would give way to the flow of

capital and people. At least the Europisation of the world seemed the destiny of humans. But the resurgence of the security state following the September 11 attacks proved that the modern state would not compromise on the right of exclusion– the power to decide the question of belonging and non-belonging.

In the wake of the post 9/11, literature has had to configure a space for itself as it grapples with the questions of identity, belonging and history. Among the literary figures, some foreground the trauma caused by the attacks while others stress its geopolitical context. Still others question the modern state's right of exclusion that imposes identity on individuals and divides humans into citizens/foreigners. Novel as a genre, in particular, has emerged to reimagine the modern state by foregrounding the forgotten histories, highlighting the position of the immigrants and portraying nomadic characters who resist the right of exclusion.

My primary texts – *Open City* by Teju Cole and *Netherland* by Joseph O'Neill – acquire significance in the backdrop of these shifting dynamics. Contrary to Hamid's *The Reluctant Fundamentalist*, which shows Changez helpless against the power of the modern security state, these novels depict individuals subtly resisting and deterritorialising the state. Julius deterritorialises the modern state through his nomadic wanderings, unburying histories that the state has buried to maintain the coherent self. He also resists labels of identity and records encounters with the grey zone of the immigrants.

The primary concern of this thesis is to demonstrate how literature shows the power of territoriality of the modern state, and how it suggests ways of deterritorialising it. My reading through the lens of Deleuze and Guattari's micropolitics and nomadology reveals that nomads in *Open City* by Teju Cole and *Netherland* by O'Neill deterritorialise the state by questioning its logic of dualism and exposing cracks in the striation of the modern state.

1.1 Contextualising the Selected Texts

On the morning of September 11, 2001, the economic and the military centres of the USA were hit in a deadly terrorist attack. The destruction of the World Trade centre and the Pentagon badly damaged the narrative of "American exceptionalism" (Gray 3). The aura of American invincibility, created by its geographic insularity, was broken. It engendered the militarisation of foreign and the securitisation of domestic

policy. As a consequence, after a brief respite in the globalisation moment of the 90s, the modern state began to reassert itself, vividly drawing the boundaries between the insiders/outsiders. The terrorist attacks influenced every walk of life in the US, in particular, and the West in general. Just like the two preceding great wars, it affected the production of aesthetics. Although America had fought wars in the last century, this was a significant moment because its mainland had not experienced any attacks since 1812. This is the reason that it created a "Crisis of representation" for writers (Keniston and Quen 1). They were faced with the same question that troubled Lyotard, that is, how fiction could adequately represent this new reality. Gray argues that it brought literature onto the verge of becoming a medium for sentimentality and patriotic fervour (12). DeLillo, the renowned American novelist, in his essay, "Ruins of the Future," asserted that 9/11 created a new "narrative necessity" for the writers (gray 3). And he was justified in what he said because for the first time, the attacks were broadcast all over the world. Then, followed the erratic response of the Bush administration as it waged the "war on terror" abroad and increased the powers of law enforcement within the country. Detention, surveillance and tightening immigration control became the new normal. It was the revival of McCarthyism for the Muslims living in the US.

1.1.1 First Wave of Fictional Responses

The early works of fiction were preoccupied with covering the trauma of the 9/11 attacks. Jonathan Foer's *Extremely Loud and Incredibly Close* and Don DeLillo's *The Falling Man* focused on the personal consequences of the attacks. They were confined to the domestic sphere, prioritising the loss of American lives and avoiding engagement with the causes of the attacks and their consequences in the non-Western world (Gray 18). This preoccupation with American lives, perhaps inadvertently, helped the Bush administration construct a narrative of victimhood, which led to calls for internal unity against the external enemy. This kind of literature, however, did not go unchallenged for long. Soon, it was countered by writers with a transnational focus on the attacks (Keniston and Quen 5). They produced literature that challenged the dualism of us/them. The works I have selected fall into this category of fiction. These writers represent a cosmopolitan movement in the 9/11 fiction as they, against the current of 9/11 fiction, rejected the closed borders and celebrated the flow of people (Schoene 15). They shifted the focus from the Caucasians to the immigrants.

The September 11 attacks found expression first in poetry (Keniston and Quin 5-6). Poetry gave voice to the American anger and grief over the tragedy. In this regard, poem “Somebody Blew up America” by Amiri Baraka deserves a special mention. Barak came under fire for his criticism of the American government's culpability in the terrorist attacks. Reaction to the poem shows how literature became a battlefield for representation and exposed limits to the right of expression in a post 9/11 democratic society. It also underscores the impossibility of an apolitical act of producing literature. The absence of the outsiders was a political decision in the early fictional response to the destruction of the two towers.

Apart from poetry, the terrorist attacks on the towers also found expression in drama. The Guys by Anne Nelson focuses on the grief of a fire captain in New York as he composes a eulogy for the men he has lost. Performed shortly after the 9/11 attacks, the drama represents the documentary impulse common to the earliest literary responses, which prioritise the portrayal of the event over the utilisation of proper literary techniques (Keniston and Quin 8). In depicting mourning as an experience of the collective, she uses aesthetic expression to heal the whole nation. Treating the grief as experienced by the society as a collective reinforces the view that the USA is a unified subject, and its citizens, on account of having a single coherent identity, endorse the actions of the government.

With the emergence of the novel as a 9/11 fiction, the impulse to confine the terrorists' attacks on the towers and their consequences in the domestic sphere became strong. These novels portrayed trauma caused by 9/11 and reinforced the narrative of victimhood that fuelled the war on terror. One such novel is Terrorist by John Updike. It features A Muslim fundamentalist, Ahmad, who, on the insistence of his Imam, drops out of college and takes up trucking. Later in the story, he agrees to blow off the Lincoln Tunnel. After his accomplices do not show up on the agreed-upon day of the planned attack, Ahmad avoids arrest and decides to go ahead with the attack on his own. But his mother’s partner Jack Levy get in his truck while Ahmad is on his way to blow off the tunnel and persuade him to abandon the attack. The threat of fundamental Islam to America is the central theme of this work.

The domestic element is also strong in DeLillo’s *The Falling Man*. Gray argues that it represents the effort to take refuge from the trauma of 9/11 in the confines of

family. The plot of the novel revolves around Keith Neudecker, whose inability to cope with the reality of the terrorist attacks makes him estranged from his wife. It prevents him from forming a strong connection with his son. DeLillo sees the event as breaking the bonds of the community because of the psychic trauma it engenders. He tries to express the inexpressible by consigning the terrorists to the margins of the plot. Denying the terrorists a centre state, He informs his readers of their activities through references scattered throughout the novel. Furthermore, he is criticised for overlooking the global context of 9/11 and for reproducing the binaries of Insider/outsider and us/them (Keniston and Quin 8). After reading the novel, you get the sense as if 9/11 was an uncaused cause.

Extremely Loud and Incredibly Close by Jonathan Safran Foer represents the same refuge in family life. Revolving around a child, Oscar Schell, whose father dies in the terrorist attacks on the World Trade Centre, the novel focuses on the loss and personal trauma caused by the event. It registers the inability to speak about the attacks through narrative techniques: photographic narrative, typographical irregularities and narrative fragmentation. But by using the bond of the family to ease the pain caused by the destruction of the towers, it affirms the narrative of American resilience. In focusing on personal strategy, it evades a discussion on the foreign and domestic policies that caused 9/11 and were caused by it.

Even across the Atlantic, the domestic thread remains dominant in the early fictional responses to 9/11. *Saturday* by Ian McEwan is set in London on Saturday, February 5, 2003, the day of the largest demonstration against the Iraq war. The plot of the novel covers a day in the life of a neurosurgeon, Henry Perowne. It briefly mentions the violence of the "war on terror," but ends in an incident of domestic violence, an attempted Burglary at the doctor's home. Failing to address the conflict directly, McEwan explores it through personal insecurity.

For all their differences, a common thread runs through these novels. They reinforce the binary of insider/outsider; the insiders (citizens) are full of courage, and outsiders are reduced to the margins. We mostly get some hints about the outsiders, while they keep the insiders in focus. Perhaps, the absence of the terrorists can be explained away as a natural reaction to actors that the authors could not cope with. But

this explanation falls apart when the supposed offender is Saddam, the head of an internationally recognised state.

The Submission by Amy Waldman is an attempt to explore the consequences of 9/11 for Muslims. It centres around Muhammad Khan, an architect, who submits a design for the 9/11 memorial anonymously to the jury in charge. Expecting praise, he gets condemnation after he is identified by the jury. Waldman brings to attention the suspicion that Muslim Americans were faced with. They had to live with questions about their loyalty to America after the terrorist attacks. As Keniston and Quin argue, Waldman's novel is a challenge to the traditional narrative about innocent victims and guilty perpetrators (14).

1.1.2 The Second Wave of Fictional Responses

In the wake of 9/11, the state gave broad power to its law enforcement agencies that encroached on civil liberties. Whenever it felt a threat to national security, Giorgio Agamben argues, the state of exception snooped on, profiled or arrested people. This consolidation of power was aimed mainly at Muslim communities. The second wave literary works must be understood in this context. Gray states that immigrant writers like Mohsin Hamid, Kamila Shamsi and Salman Rushdie dealt with how the attacks redefined the limits of trust, loyalty and suspicion in the US in particular and the global north in general (85-90). Hamid's The Reluctant Fundamentalist, I believe, is the most illuminating account of the resurgence of the security state.

Hamid's *The Reluctant Fundamentalist* centres around Changez, a Pakistani-born professional who is drawn to the US by the promise of globalisation. In the first part of the novel, we get a glimpse of his life in America; he moves in the elite circles and is fully assimilated into American culture. The fatal day of 9/11 caused a drastic change in his life. On his way back to America from a business conference, he is taken aside, detained, searched and is made to suffer questions that he could not have conceived of being asked in pre-9/11 America (Hamid 74). All his cosmopolitan illusions burst like a bubble at this contact with the dynamics of geopolitics (Hamid). Changez is, after all, an outsider. The novel records the collapse of the dreams of a borderless world under an assault by the sovereign modern state and its right of exclusion (Schoene 211).

Hamid's *The Reluctant Fundamentalist* demonstrates the reterritorialising power of the post 9/11 state. Changez is not only a migrant faced with an identity crisis, but he is also faced with the machine of territoriality of the modern state. He is deemed a suspicious outsider; his body is reterritorialised as a threat to the US. The porous borders of the pre 9/11 globalised world harden against Changez. As a representative of the post 9/11 fiction, The Reluctant Fundamentalist show the precariousness of cosmopolitanism in the face of demands for national loyalty and national security (Keniston and Quin 112).

Hamid's *The Reluctant Fundamentalist* is significant in the context of my research because it serves as a foil to Cole's *Open City* and O'Neill's *Netherland*. Hamid shows the reterritorialisation of the subject as immigrant and suspect. O'Neill and Cole conceive of the nomadic characters that evade the territoriality of the modern state. What reterritorialises Changez is resisted by Julius through his wanderings. In a sense, Hamid's novel provides the backdrop for the subversive movement of the nomad.

Another work of fiction falling in the category of the second wave 9/11 literature is *Burnt Shadow* (2009) by Kamila Shamsi. Her novel assumes importance in the context of 9/11 because it situates the attacks within their historical context. The dominant discourse treated the event as if it had no history, as if it were an uncaused cause. Shamsi see it as a link in a bloody chain that stretches from Nagasaki to New York. She also shows how the binaries of East/West and insider/outsider are not new but were present in the Cold War discourse. Similarly, Rushdi's *Shalamar the Clown* (2005) rejects the notion that the attacks are an aberration. They are but the continuation of the violence perpetrated by the modern state in silencing dissent at home and abroad in the colonies. Gray asserts that these novels represent "the return of history" in post 9/11 fiction (97).

In foregrounding the reterritorialisation of the subjects by the modern state, these works by South Asian immigrant writers reveal the prevailing conditions in the post 9/11 America, which makes the nomadic resistance of Julius in *Open City* and Chuck in *Netherland* very significant. They highlight how the modern state represses individuals, while Cole and O'Neill show the way of resistance.

1.2 Contextualising Theoretical Perspectives

The conceptual foundations of this research come from the intellectual movement of postmodernism and poststructuralism. I am tracing this genealogy to show that the concepts of deterritorialisation, micropolitics and nomadology, proposed by Deleuze and Guattari, have emerged out of an intellectual landscape that is characterised by rejection of universality, scrutiny of authority and questions on the monopoly of the modern state over meaning. In tracing this genealogy, I will be able to provide a background to my primary theorists and answer why Deleuze and Guattari are particularly suitable for the analysis of the selected texts.

The Postmodern Condition by Jean-François Lyotard is one of the most widely known books on postmodern theory. According to Lyotard, postmodernism is characterised by "incredulity towards metanarratives" (xxiv). He takes metanarrative to include the grand stories of progress, emancipation and enlightenment that lend legitimacy to modernity and its projects, including the modern state. The scrutiny of these totalities opens the space for a mini-narrative, fragmented and plural. In literary studies, the postmodern incredulity transforms into resistance against historical linearity, the embrace of heterogeneity and an attempt to destabilise the unified subject. My primary texts resonate with this position; they prioritise the fragmented experiences of the immigrants, the natives over the coherent narrative of the modern state.

Lyotard questions our master narrative, but Foucault goes a step further: he challenges our epistemological understanding. He argues that there is a nexus between knowledge and power. *In Discipline and Punish* and *The History of Sexuality*, Foucault argued that the institutions of the modern states create subjects through surveillance, mobility and biopower. In his understanding, power is not only repressive, but it is productive as it creates the categories of knowledge. He also asserts that the modern state exercises its power as much through categorisation as through violence. These categories are important from the perspective of my research because, in talking of segments, Deleuze and Guattari are, in a sense, talking about them. Another important figure of the poststructuralist movement is Jacques Derrida. He challenges the traditional concept of meaning through the strategy of deconstruction. In *Off Grammatology*, his seminal work, he shows how the meanings of the words in our languages are not pure because they are contaminated by their antonyms.

Deconstruction undermines binary opposition, speaking/writing, presence/absence and citizen/alien and highlights the instability of cultural and political organisation. Derrida believes that what is excluded or absent leaves its trace in what is present. Deleuze and Guattari resonate with him on this point as they also believe that the second line is present in some form on the first line. Class is a segment, reterritorialised on the first line; it is made of individuals. That is why macropolitics is always about micropolitics. Immigrants living in the gray zone is but the Derridean trace.

Lyotard, Foucault and Derrida challenge the certainty of modernity and offer new ways of understanding history, subject and power. Their influence on literary studies has been profound. Historiographic metafiction owes its existence to Lyotard's suspicion of the grand narrative and Derrida's stress on textual instability. Postcolonial studies borrowed heavily from Foucault's understanding of power and Derridean criticism on binaries. My primary texts are already embedded in the postmodern paradigm as they challenge the official narrative, self-consciously blend the fictive and historical elements and foreground hybridity.

This is the intellectual backdrop against which Deleuze and Guattari develop their concepts of deterritorialisation, micropolitics and nomadology. They do draw on the aforementioned trinity of the postmodern and poststructural theory. But there are significant differences between them and Deleuze and Guattari. They are among the first of the postmodernists who have some hints of the emancipatory project. Foucault investigates how power categories and structures; Deleuze and Guattari suggest the flows that can be used to escape it. Derrida deconstructs binaries; they conceptualise rhizomes, structures without a centre. They also introduced the concept of the lines of flight against the structures. Then, through deterritorialisation, any fix system (political, economic, linguistic) can be destabilised. Micropolitics shows us how power operates at the level of the desires of the individual and how it can threaten the macropolitics of the modern state.

Postmodern theory exposes the basis of the state by interrogating its narrative, categories and representation. Deleuze and Guattari go a step further: they offer a way to imagine an alternative mode of political organisation. Their theoretical perspectives allow me to analyse my primary texts to demonstrate how the nomad deterritorialise the modern state not only by problematising its right of exclusion, but embodying

difference in their lives. The development of postmodern theory from Lyotard to Deleuze and Guattari is the journey from suspicion to celebration of the nomadic way of life.

1.3 Situatedness of the Researcher

Every academic project is, somehow, a result of the researcher's intellectual development. My interest in the modern state, its right of exclusion and the ways aesthetics may resist it, is the product of my observation and scholarly interest. I have closely watched conflicts over borders in the South Asian region, in particular, and the whole world in general. I have also noticed the intensification of crackdowns against illegal immigrants in Pakistan and elsewhere. This has made me conscious of the fact that the modern state prioritises its citizens over the rest of humans.

This perception is sharpened by the constantly occurring conflict around me and across the globe. The long and chequered history of relations between Pakistan and India, the ongoing genocide in Gaza and the bloody war in Ukraine demonstrate how the modern state continuously defines itself through the right of exclusion and the capacity to identify external threatening others. I have seen borders becoming flashpoints and humans becoming weapons. Living in such troubled times, it is difficult not to search for alternative modes of political organisation.

When I read *Open City* and *Netherland*, I saw its deterritorialising potential. They showed individuals subtly resisting the categories imposed on them. Julius, through his wanderings, and Chuck, through his interest in cricket, performed a form of politics that, in Deleuzean understanding, is micropolitics. Their nomadic movement resonated with my intellectual interest in looking beyond citizens/aliens.

Thus, this project is not a mere academic necessity for me, but it is a product of my search to find a conceptual filter to come to grips with the present situation. I have decided to use Nomadology and micropolitics for my analysis of the primary texts because they allow me to read aesthetics as portraying the deterritorialising forces that prevent themselves from being segmented into rigid categories necessary for the existence of the modern state. Moreover, my training in literary studies and postmodern theory enables me to understand fiction as a historiographic intervention, a way to foreground what is forgotten.

My motivation for analysing *Open City* by Cole and *Netherland* by O'Neill comes from my personal sensitivity to the prevailing situation and my conviction as a scholar that literature may offer ways to reimagine alternatives. The right of exclusion of the modern state is not only a matter of intellectual interest but is a part of lived reality; the interaction of personal and intellectual makes this project possible for me.

1.4 Delimitation of the Study

9/11 fiction as a category consists of literary works written after the September 11 terrorist attacks. It includes works written by authors belonging to different regions of the world. To show this diversity, I have chosen novels written by authors with different geographic backgrounds. My primary texts are *Open City* by Teju Cole, who has an African origin. And *Netherland* by Joseph O'Neill, an author of European origin. I have selected these novels for analysis because they fall into the third wave of literary responses to the terrorist attacks; therefore, they are critical of the 9/11 narrative created by the USA. Given the scale of research, the study will be delimited to the exploration of nomadic forces and their resistance against the modern state. I have used only two theorists: Deleuze and Guattari as the primary theorists and Huchon as a supporting theorist.

1.5 Thesis Statement

The selected 9/11 novels attempt to deterritorialise the modern state through nomadic characters who challenge the dualism of citizens/aliens. The invocation of Deleuze's and Guattari's theoretical perspectives, supported by Hutcheon's ideas, is likely to help read the primary texts that engage with individuals instead of categories, humans instead of citizens. Since 9/11, fiction as a literary category is generally understood to be preoccupied with trauma; this study's focus on the deterritorialisation of the modern state is likely to provide fresh insights into the scholarship on 9/11 fiction.

1.6 Research Questions

This research intends to answer the following questions:

1. How do Julius and Chuck in Teju Cole's *Open City* and O'Neill's *Netherland* deterritorialise themselves and become nomads?

2. How do nomads, portrayed in the selected novels, deterritorialise the modern state?

3. How do the selected novels depict the dangers of the third line?

1.7 Chapter Breakdown

The chapter breakdown for the thesis is as follows:

Chapter 1: Introduction

Chapter 2: Literature Review

Chapter 3: Theoretical Framework

Chapter 4: The Nomad

Chapter 5: the deterritorialisation of the modern state

1.8 Significance of the Study

The study is significant on three grounds. Firstly, it offers a new way of reading 9/11 fiction that is not concentrated on violence, trauma, security and identity. Secondly, it shows how, through the portrayal of nomadic characters, literature can challenge the modern state. Thirdly, this study combined nomadology with historiographic metafiction to demonstrate how they challenge the narrative of the modern state, which allows them to problematise the internal coherent self. It is also anticipated that this research could generate new debates in the academia nomad and the modern state. Moreover, by not falling into the dualism of citizens/aliens, we could move towards discussions that are beyond the modern state.

After stating the premise of my research, it is likely to be useful to situate my research in contemporary critical scholarship. For this purpose, I have reviewed an assortment of the available scholarships related to my research in the next chapter.

CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Introduction

The purpose of this chapter is twofold: to situate my research work in the currently available scholarship and to find gaps in the available critical sources. In line with this purpose, I have carried out the following review of the scholarly works relevant to my topic. It is to be made clear that I have selected the works for review that have immediate relevance to my research; therefore, there is a high likelihood that they will contextualise my research in the available critical apparatus. Furthermore, I have divided the chapter into 4 parts: Part I is the introduction, part II selectively reviews the available literature relating to the theoretical perspectives that guide this investigation, Part III reviews works on 9/11 fiction, and Part IV is a collection of critical works relating to the texts selected for this analysis.

2.2 Critical Works Relating to the Theoretical Perspectives

2.2.1 The Conception of the State

The modern state is generally considered to be the extension of kinship groups. A nation is defined as a group that has racial or linguistic ties, but Benedict Anderson rejects this view. Since we can see the flag of the state, walk across its territory, identify its boundaries, may meet its citizens and watch on tv or read about its rulers in the newspapers; we assume that the modern nation-state has a tangible existence, product of some geographic feature (mountains, river, island) or the natural consequence of broadening of blood and kinship ties. On the contrary, it exists in the minds of the citizens—national imaginary--- who are conscious of a mental bond with each other, a communion not based on personal relations, in fact they are fully aware of the inequalities between them, yet they are willing to dye as they would for a comrade in some worthy cause (Anderson 14-17). Three factors are responsible for the rise of national consciousness and the attendant ascendancy of the Westphalian state system as a model for the nation-state. Anderson argues that the scarcity of readers and the lack of profit pushed the owners of the printing industry to publish books in the local language (37). They, however, had to get around the difficulty created by linguistic

diversity as dialects of a single language differed so much in syntax, morphology, and phonetics that each dialect, according to the modern understanding of linguistics, would be classified as a separate language. Under the influence of Capitalism and printing technology, in a process of what Anderson terms as “The vernacularising thrust of capitalism,” different dialects became one language through arbitrary sign-sound system, so if A northern English dialect speaker could not understand the speech of Chaucer, he could comprehend the latter's writing, making him conscious of millions of others like him; this consciousness became national consciousness (Anderson 42-44).

But language alone could not engender the metamorphosis of different individual speakers of the language into one nation. This transformation was achieved through literature. Anderson argues that the publication of Catholic priest Joseph Dobrovsky's Geschichte der böhmischen Sprache und ahem Literatur für, the first systematic Czech history and literature, unified the Czech-speaking peasants in Bohemia into a Czech nation; Similarly, the publication of Gyorgy Bessenyei's work, Magna Opera, sparked Hungarian nationalism. But when aesthetic production was not possible, especially in the South and Latin America, the Pilgrimage of the new functionary of the empire, who was appointed on merit, not hierarchy, paved the way for nationalism by serving either as a point of contrast or a node of connection.

Anderson's assertion that the nation-state is not a naturally determined category, but a culturally constructed entity, is a step forward in the understanding of the modern state. His theory, however, does not recognise the role of the logic of dualism in the formation of the modern state; therefore, we turn to Deleuze's and Guattari's phenomenology. A nation-state is an assemblage, assemblage of cities and their infrastructure, transportation, or the lake of it, their geography and the provinces they form; assemblage of government and its organisations; assemblage of networks, interpersonal institutions and their members (Delanda 10-11). Assemblage should not be confused with totality, which is formed by the properties of the components and subsumes the parts. The elements of an assemblage have a relation of exteriority with each other so that they can be separated and plugged into another rhizomatic system; not the properties of individual element, but capacity of all the elements creates the assemblage, therefore it is not reducible to the properties of the individual components; assemblage is not logical, it is contingent and susceptible to change (Dalanda 10 11).

Dalinda further adds that elements come in two types: there are those that stabilise the assemblage (reterritorialization) and those that destabilise the assemblage (deterritorialization) (10-11). This work resonates with my research because it takes the modern state as an assemblage, which means that the hierarchy of the state is based on the multiplicities of individuals and macropolitics on micropolitics. Still, he gives the impression that the modern state is created through the homogeneity of the population that already exists in the area. The modern state, through the right of exclusion, can fashion homogeneity out of heterogeneity. This incomplete understanding of the modern state provides a rationale for my study.

To understand how the modern state homogenises heterogeneity, we need to have at least a rudimentary understanding of how multiplicities are created and how they work. Žukauskaitė states that according to Deleuze and Guattari, multiplicity is virtual potential and its actualisation, idea and thing, abstract and substance (2-3). Multiplicities cannot be determined in advanced, because virtual potential does not have to actualise into things, and when it does, it may take different forms; what is more important, it emerges in the relations between self-determining elements and it has two poles, the abstract and the concrete (Žukauskaitė 2-3). Žukauskaitė argues that Deleuze, in part, draws on Riemman's manifold space to conceive multiplicity, a concept he later develops with Guattari; like a manifold space, multiplicities are multidimensional, but have supplementary dimension no heaven, like manifold space, change is not caused by external intervention, it is the result of interaction between the elements (3-4). And in part, the concept of multiplicity is based on Simondon's theory of pre-individuation and individual, the former referring to a state of metastability, a charged soup of particles, the latter to the emergence of bodies by the process of de-phasing (Žukauskaitė 5-8). Of course, there is a crucial difference between the two. The passage from pre-individuation to individual is a fact of physical necessity; the passage from virtual to actual is the consequence of contingent relations (Žukauskaitė 8-9). It is also important to note that multiplicity can counteractualise a phenomenon not compatible with Simonod's theory (Žukauskaitė 9).

Although the focus of Žukauskaitė is on the multiplicities of life according to the ontology of Deleuze and Guattari, he provides insights into the multiplicity feeding into strata of the modern state. There are insights to be gained, but he is not interested in the modern state; he asks philosophical questions and is indifferent to political

answers. His preoccupation with the abstract philosophy of multiplicities and the absence of the modern state from his critical work justify my analysis.

In this section, I reviewed some works relating to the modern state. Anderson's notion of national imaginary is a nice starting point in developing an understanding of the modern state, but he leaves out the role of the right of exclusion and the logic of dualism in creating the shared imaginary. Delanda's understanding of the modern state is informed by Deleuze and Guattari's concept of the state; therefore, it has relevance for my research work. His argument about homogeneity is correct, but it does not take into account how the modern state uses the logic of dualism to create the homogeneity required. AudronėŽukauskaitė's work is important for my research, but his focus is not on how the modern state is created or how it can be deterritorialised. Every modern state has a geography, a space. In the next section, I have reviewed critical works that advance the discussion on space.

2.2.2 Deterritorialisation and the concept of Space

Suppose the modern state is an assemblage, a corrupted multiplicity according to Deleuze's ontology. What is space, which is one of the elements required by the Treaty of Westphalia and the Montevideo Convention to gain statehood? Exploring the deterritorialising force of Doctors Without Borders, deterritorialising because it practices across borders, remains neutral and helps all, François Debrix argues that by deterritorialising, Doctors Without Borders reterritorializes as they create the spaces of victimhood and assistance (830-31). It is a war machine: not asking permission for its work, not keeping with the interest of the state (François Debrix 231). Since Doctors Without Borders deterritorialise to reterritorialize, it creates a transversal space, a new space, according to Thom Kuehls, that cuts across boundaries (François Debrix 333). Doctors Without Borders operates beyond borders, but in determining the population in “Distress”, it creates borders (François Debrix 334). The volunteer agent working under its charter carries a deterritorialising force; they charter the territory previously uncharted, like the Amazon Forest, or abandoned by the state, like Rwanda, and construct a space of victimhood (François Debrix 336-337). It is not the only strategy it uses to reterritorialise. Placing states into different categories: those needing intervention and those not needing intervention; those which are peaceful, and which require observation; sharing progress reports with media, corporate, and social, and

displaying the status of the victims on its website, creates a space that is virtual and transversal (François Debrix 838-839).

François Debrix's work on Doctors Without Borders resonates with my research because it also deterritorialises the modern state. But Doctors Without Borders is not nomadic because nomads do not reterritorialise. This allows me to do my analysis of the selected works.

Karyn H. Anderson, while analysing Cynthia Shearer's *The Celestial Jukebox*, argues that smooth space is a dangerous space (6). Shearer narrativises a multicultural community in Madagascar: there is a Chinese, Angus living in an apartment over his store; the Mauritanian migrants are living in Airstream (Trailer Park); there is Bebe, the relic of the plantation system, living in her family home, their equal, rather dependent on them (Karyn H. Anderson 203-5). Rejecting reliance on the state and encouraging the rhizomatic expansion, Angus offers Consuela and Bobdakar jobs, and along with Aubery and Dean, builds a Bunkhouse in the Church for the Honduran workers (Anderson 205-7). The protagonist of the novel, Bobdakar is a Nomad, his life is marked by different trajectory on the line of flight; his first trajectory takes him to the Celestial Grocery; second to his love with the silver guitar; third to his performance on the guitar made off steel in the Church band and when he encounters the forces of territorialisation he does not let himself be captured: The Wastrel tries to teach him the Mauritanian tradition, and the Mauritanian drum, the government wants him to go to school and Dean And Angus wants him to go to the immigration office in Memphis, he avoids capture on all occasions (Anderson 210-17). Anderson contends that smooth space has dangers, and to substantiate her point, she points to the death of Consula's Niece by the outlaws (6).

Anderson’s intervention in The Celestial Jukebox resonates with my research work because it points out the dangers of the smooth space. Although my research also recognises the dangers of the absolute deterritorialisation, it is primarily concerned with the relative deterritorialisation; hence, I have reason to continue with this research work.

Territorialisation and its counter, deterritorialisation, are not only physical but geographical. Language and race can also be deterritorialised. In Cathy Park Hong's *Dance Dance Revolution*,” the language of the desert, by constantly morphing into a

hundred different accents and a hundred different dialects, does not allow any nation to snatch it up and lay claim to it (Williams 645-47). Identification of the language is also made impossible by the fact that the accent or the dialect a language user has for a particular day is influenced not by cultural or regional difference, but by whom he met on that day (Williams 45-47). Language is not sacred; it is a commodity, “its trademark phrases” are sold (Williams 48-50). Race is also deterritorialised as in the wedding, the Historian (The narrator) stumbles on, beige population and jean diversity is celebrated (Williams 655). Of course, the “flux” and flow towards deterritorialisation is possible because the population are migrants, and because they live in a smooth space “between tenuous borders” (Williams 656). In the second part of his essay, Ruth Williams discusses how the desert is ruled by a government which has vanished the natives to” the new town and exiles those migrants who help them owing to a sense of displacement or in celebration of the beige population, in the counterviolence on the tourists (657-58). Is the language really deterritorialised? Does the beige population actually exist? Do they truly live in a smooth space? Isn't it a carefully packaged experience, a heterotopia where the tamed nomad can be safely shown to the public? The last part of the essay casts doubts on the validity of the experience of the people of the Desert. There is a chance for real deterritorialisation, though, as a revolution is in the air (Williams 663-4).

In Hong's novel, deterritorialisation is a managed activity, and the smooth space exists like an exhibit. The deterritorialisation appearing on the horizon is dangerous because it is revolutionary in nature. My research work focuses on the relative deterritorialisation; therefore, William’s intervention in Hong’s novel provides a rationale for my work.

François Debrix's argument about transversal spaces and deterritorialisation, Anderson's notion of the dangers of the smooth space, and Williams' understanding of deterritorialisation engendered by revolution help me in approaching my analysis of the selected works. I know what to avoid. My research work, however, engages with the nomad on the second line where relative deterritorialisation happens, so I have the rationale for my research work. In the next section, I have reviewed works relating to the nomad.

2.2.3 The Concept of Nomad

Craig Mundi argues that it is not easy to answer who the Deleuzen nomad is as Deleuze seeks “Anarchy, but structure, and revolution but not despotic government” (Craig Mundi 235). Nomad is contrasted with polis or state: the latter claiming the land by building walls or demarking boundaries, the former “Insinuating” into the walled area and populating it; the latter living in smooth space, the former striating it; the latter heterogeneous in nature, the former homogeneous in degree (Mundi 235-37). Neat little binaries, but simplistic. State can striate the smooth: its ships move through the sea, and its intercontinental missiles can fly through space, on the other hand, “urban nomad”, through his voyage can live “smooth in a city” (Craig Mundi 236-39). “a stroll taken by Henry Miller in Clichy or Brooklyn is a nomadic transit in smooth space” (Mundi 239). The attempt to reconcile the dualism of polis (state and (nomous) nomad) with the 3 lines: segmentarity, segmentation, and the line of flight results in further confusion, though polis is clearly on the line of segmentarity, nomad can be on either of the 2 lines (Mundi 642-43). In some places he is on the third line, the line of quanta deterritorialisation, the barbarian between Huns and Roman, however, Nomad is not purely destructive, he is creative, and his resistance is cautious, so “A second nomad” is born, different from the barbarian “absolute nomad”, afraid of the “margin”, he does not let himself be identified from “his haircut” (Mundi 244-46).

Mundi helps develop my understanding of the nomad. The differentiation between the ancient and the modern nomad is beneficial to my research project. But the absence of discussion on how the nomad challenges the logic of dualism and the right of exclusion of the modern state justifies my research work.

By studying Laila Lalami's Hope and Other Dangerous Pursuits, Nadjiba Bouallegue seeks to find out if illegal immigrants have nomadic subjectivity. She structures the narrative around 4 Moroccans, who, by illegally immigrating to Spain, seek to escape the striated space; Faten wants to smooth the strata of the Moroccan state, Halima the strata of marriage. Aziz is immigrating because he is a burden on his wife and Murad because he has lost respect as an elder brother (Nadjiba Bouallegue 103-4). Before they attempt a voyage to Spain, Faten relies on Islam to resist striation, and Halima on a voyage without walking (fantasies about living in Europe) (Nadjiba Bouallegue 104-5). Murad is arrested and deported from Spain, yet it does not impede

his becoming an urban nomad, a writer; Halima is also prevented from materialising her fantasies, still, by getting her husband to divorce her and by running a successful business, she smooths her striations (Nadjiba Bouallegue 107-9). The duo who reaches Spain, falls into even bigger blackhole of territorialisation; Azeez's trajectory of deterritorialisation ends when he is caught between longing to return to Morrocco and desire to assimilate in the host country; Faten in pursuit of “her voice” loses even her body when she becomes a prostitute, she is captured, annihilated (Nadjiba Bouallegue 109-10). In short, illegal immigrants are not nomads. By going too far in their resistance, they become too meshed in the strata of territoriality. Especially, the black hole of capture, the machine of territoriality, the apparatus of the state, crushes Faten (Bouallegue 109-10).

Bouallegue's difference between the illegal immigrants and nomads is also likely to be helpful for this work. Furthermore, her argument about the complete reterritorialisation by the modern state resonates with my project. Since Bouallegue is primarily concerned with delineating the nomadic identity of the illegal immigrants and not with the deterritorialisation of the modern state, it provides a rationale for my research.

Nomad challenges strata’s and breaks down hierarchies therefore religion and the state has maintained a strong opposition against the nomad; they have been castigated for deviancy, condemned for barbarity and regarded as cursed in the west; the interaction between the nomad and the sedentary has not been any different in the east as evident in the fact that nomadic movement was criminalised in 1871 at India (Subir Rana 250-260). In this context, the comparison between Rahul Sankrityayan's and Deleuze's notion of nomad is important. In Ghumakkaṛ Śāstra, Rahul Sankrityayan asserts that Nomad innovates and explores; Darwin’s scientific discoveries in the animal kingdom, and Manggole’s inventions of paper and gunpowder prove that Nomad is a vanguard of human evolution, and rejection of “nomadic religion makes China and India unfit to colonise Australia, as cited in (Subir Rana 260-63). In the perception of nomad, Deleuze and Rahul may agree, but in their conception, they differ. Rahul celebrates nomad so far as it enables the state to colonise, to stratify distant lands (Subeer Rana 264-66). Deleuzen nomad does not stratify. The state always seeks to capture, territorialise nomads, and nomads constantly try to escape capture: both are

constantly at war (Subir Rana 263-66). Rahul views nomad as a religious itinerant; Deleuze defines religion as a Trea (Subir Rana 261-66).

Subir Rana's discussion between the eastern and western understanding of nomadism is important; however, the nomads in the works of fiction I have selected for analysis are neither religious nor itinerant, in his understanding of the term, so it provides a justification for my study.

Nomad does not always, according to James Taylor, deterritorialise the strata; when appropriated by the state, they function as a cog of the territorialising machine. The religious nomads in Thailand, ascetic wanderers in the forest, smoothed the striated space by continually crossing and re-crossing the Thailand/Laos border (James Taylor). Like the war machine of the barbarians, their resistance took the form of violence in order to deterritorialise the state (James Taylor). Conscious of the fact that religion serves the interest of the state in territorialising the smooth space, they rejected a fixed religion; as a result, they were labelled as vagabonds and were sometimes beaten by the people (James Taylor). However, in the 60s and 70s, they were appropriated, their flow channelled to strengthen the borders of the state in remote areas of North, South, and East; the nomadic wanderer became a functionary of the state (James Taylor). The government gave them accreditation, built for them a semi-permanent settlement, and asked them to stay there. In exchange, they became "The geographic Scalpel", drawing and inscribing the borders, and they sourced their "free-floating Charisma" to the state (James Taylor).

The paper illuminates the ever-present dangers of the line of flight and the ever-present threats of capture by the line of segmentarity. It also shows that one can fall from one line to the other, from smooth to the striated, easily. It does not discuss the central question of my research work, that is, how nomads deterritorialise the modern state, which gives me the justification to do this research.

The Internet has made possible a new kind of nomad, digital and mobile, more resistant than the urban nomad and more fluid than the ancient nomad (Neema Abelgawad). The digital nomad moves from post to post; page to page; website to website, congregates with others of his kind when he finds something interesting, and disperses after the interest runs out (Abdelgawad). By creating a smooth space online while living in the striated space of the state, he becomes "nomad far excellence" who

possesses the fluidity of movement and enjoys the freedom of expression that are not possible in the state (Abdelgawad). with a tap on mobile screen, anyone can go nomad and because of ubiquity of internet, no nomad can be marginalised: minor/adult, white/black, rich/poor has the same freedom of movement. There are efforts of territorialising by the gurus and clergy who will always moralise, but the digital nomad disregards them (Abdelgawad).

Undoubtedly, Naeema Abdelgawad adds new dimensions to the discussion on Nomadology. Deleuze and Guattari gave us the wandering nomad; Abdelgawad explores the surfing nomad. I am not analysing the surfing nomad in my thesis because online space is not as smooth as he would have us believe. Website owners can monitor the content and ban the Post, and the government may regulate the website and block the internet. And thanks to eco-chambers, internet users congregate semi-permanently around pages that support or promote their political opinion. The walking nomad, the urban nomad, does not operate in some parallel space; he wanders in the striated space and, in his wandering, may stumble on a hidden piece of history that counters the official narrative. This focus on the nomad online provides a justification for my research work.

The difference between a migrant, a nomad, and an illegal immigrant and the nomad is significant for my research work. The concepts of the digital and religious nomad add to the discussion on the topic. Mundi's notion of the modern nomad is very useful to my research project. Still, there is no mention of how the nomad challenges the logic of dualism of the modern state, which justifies my work

2.3 9/11 Fiction

In the 9/11 fiction, trauma emerges to be one of the significant issues in the scholarly debates. Richard Cronshaw, in his article, observes the use of trauma in the post 9/11 literary criticism. The trauma caused by the September attacks may allow for a closer connection between Americans and the victims of violence elsewhere, if it is situated in a context of violence across the globe (Cronshaw 766). Instead, the trauma is localised and understood to be an extraordinary event because it happened on the American mainland (Cronshaw 762). This preoccupation with the local consequences of the attacks can be explained by a desire to reinforce the borders penetrated by the terrorists (Cronshaw 763). Cronshaw argues against the views that focus on the

temporality of the attacks. He calls for understanding the trauma of the events within its spatial dimensions because such an understanding would enable the trauma to challenge the narrative of innocence, the delusions of safety, and the fantasies of American exceptionalism (Cronshaw 772). Cronshaw's emphasis on the spatial analysis of the trauma is an important intervention in the 9/11 fiction.

Building on this analysis, G. Schaap deploys Cultural Trauma Theory in an attempt to understand how the 9/11 fiction serves as a medium to create the collective trauma in the wake of the September 11 attacks. Events are not traumatic in themselves; they become so after they have been made subject to a process of meaning-making by what Alexander calls carrier groups (Schaap 2-3). Despite the general understanding of trauma affecting individuals, Schaap goes for the cultural theory of trauma because he realises that there has been a collective struggle to define 9/11 as a national trauma and retain its memory in the national imaginary (6-8). Through his reading of Husbedt's Sorrows of an America, Hamid's The Reluctant Fundamentalist, and Waldman's Submission, Schaap shows the challenge and affirmation of the struggle to construct the national trauma (135-142).

If Cronshaw and Schaap try to understand the role of trauma in the 9/11 fiction, Matthew Laggatt seeks to explore how memory has been treated in the aesthetics works written during that time. Through reading The Falling Man by DeLillo, Extremely Loud and Incredibly Close by Foer, and Submission by Waldman, Matthew Leggatt seeks to explore how 9/11 fiction engages with cultural memory. Leggatt argues that these works foreground a tension between the presence and absence of memory, so they prevent the commemoration of the attacks. They show the instability of memories and the difficulty of the narrative to represent the September attacks (Laggatt 204-205). This difficulty arises from the conflict between the private mourning and public strategy (Lagatt 210-212).

Furthermore, Laggatt asserts that there is also a tension between the desire to domesticate the trauma and the impossibility of separating American traumatic experience from the experience of people living elsewhere. Trauma cannot be made to appear exceptional just because the victims were special. The shift from present to past and back to present provides a context for the trauma, which makes it challenging to

domesticate it (Laggatt 218-219). On the other hand, Anna Hartmell is interested in the role of literature in destabilising the identity of the victim and the terrorist.

Li and Moray consider literature as the site of resistance. Li, in her thesis, argues that *The Reluctant Fundamentalist, The Falling Man*, and *Saturday* are a type of fiction that resists the media and official discourse on terrorism (iii). She delineates 3 strands of this discourse: The greatness of America, focusing on its heroism, President Bush's dictum of "With us or against us", and the portrayal of the US as the innocent victim and the terrorist as the manifestation of the Devil (Li 6-9). The aforementioned novels resist the narrative by inclusion, disruption, and dissent; in The Falling Man, the censored images of the attacks are reintroduced, in The Reluctant Fundamentalist, a voice is given to the marginalised Muslim, and the mastery of the discourse is challenged with an attack portrayed in *Saturday* (Li 29, 53 77).

Expanding on Li's argument, Peter Moray, in his study, reveals that *The Reluctant Fundamentalist*, as a 9/11 novel, is significant because it problematizes the binaries of the East/West and victim/culprit. The novel challenges the reader's assumptions about culpability by using ambiguity as a narrative device and by rejecting reductionism in the narratives about terrorism (Moray 137-139). The ambiguity of the text manifests in the voice of the protagonist, who is at the same time intimate and reticent. Moray observes that this narrative strategy results from the post 9/11 discourse, which uses suspicion to securitise Islamic terrorism. Hamid explores the global consequences of the September 11 attacks (Moray 145-6).

Finally, some scholars explore the transcultural elements and the immigrant point of view. Estevés-Saá and Pereira-Ares argue that although trauma is the central concern of the majority of the fiction written in the wake of 9/11, some texts resist the urge and foreground transcultural elements (269). Their analysis is based on Ali's *Brick Lane*, McEwan's *Saturday*, along with Hamid's *The Reluctant Fundamentalist* and Waldman's *Submission*. They believe that these works suggest transcultural interaction in the presence of psychological and social horrors of the attacks (270-271). They highlight the inevitability of cultural exchanges across borders and emphasise the need to recognise the differences and similarities of experiences (274-276). In the gaps between conversation and silence, and failure and success of the protagonists, these novels prioritise the global over the local.

Muhammad Shafikul Islam situates the 9/11 fiction within a broad geopolitical and cultural context as he argues that the fiction shows a division of narratives (145-147). He maintains that there are 3 kinds of narratives: neutral narratives that, by their preoccupation with the representation of culture, try to remain free of the politics of terrorism; political narratives that engage with the issues of terrorism directly; and immigrant narratives that attempt to assert the global implications of the September 11 attacks (Islam 150-152, 155-157). The latter brings light to the contribution of the immigrants to American cultural and economic life, and calls for peaceful coexistence in the post 9/11 world. (Islam 160-61).

These scholarly works show that despite the centrality of trauma to the 9/11 discourse, the literature written in the wake of the tragedy is not restricted to the representation of trauma. It offers treatment of various issues: resistance, transculturalism, and immigrant perspectives. Still, much of the available body of research is taken up by the discussion of trauma, identity, violence, and competition over the representation and the interpretation of the September 11 attacks. Some scholars seem to be aware of the role of literature in resisting the mainstream narrative. But they do not go so far as to explore resistance to the modern state., The scholarly debate is silent on how the modern state creates itself. Naturally, they do not engage with how the nomad deterritorialises the modern state. My research contributes to the discussion on 9/11 fiction by highlighting its strategies of resistance against the modern state. In short, this research moves the focus of discussion from trauma to deterritorialisation of the state.

2.4 Works Relating to the Primary Texts

In this section, I have reviewed critical works relating to the selected works of fiction.

2.4.1 *Open City*

Another scholar interested in studying the spatial and temporal coordinates in *Open City* is Giulia Sossella. She argues that in Cole's *Open City*, space and time are connected with each other; the only important development is the “Movement” of Julius through the space of New York and Brussels; the movement becomes symbolic when losing ties with Nigeria, he travels “Through his mind” to his personal past and history

of slaves (73-75). His "Familiarity" and detail description allow Julius to bring about "The concrete realisation" of the space of New York into place (Sossella 78-79). And this rendering is done through "Tour Strategy". As he moves, he encounters people who become a point on his mental map of the "cityscape" (Sossella 82-84, 103). Julius uses language to render space by naming places in New York and Brussels, by "Integration of senses and experience," in which sight is dominant, but sight has limitations as evident in perspectives and blind spots (Sossella 105). It is an interesting take on the construction of space in the novel. My work, however, is not concerned with the creation of space but its striation by the modern state, which gives me the rationale for my analysis of *Open City*.

Monika Mueller is also interested in space, but from the perspective of memory. She argues that *Open City* is similar to another novel by the same author, *Every day is For The Thief*, As it narrator who is an outsider, describes, in "Vague journalistic" language, the metropolis he explores and as he explores and describes New York, he unblocks "Spatial Memory" which exposes his detachment as a consequence of the pain he remembers and violence he inflicted (Mueller 316-330). Her study has some relevance to my research because I am also interested in memories. But for me, memories are a part of the overlooked histories, and in remembering them, Julius does not unblock spatial memory but uses them to challenge the internal coherent self. Thus, I have justification for my work.

Paula von Gleich in her study of *Open City*, she maintains that haunted by personal "Trauma" and the sufferings of slaves, Julius resorts to "Flight", "Flight" from his past in Nigeria and the history of the western world, but he achieves only temporary respite because the text is bound up in the history of the slave trade. His voice is weakened by his culpability 334-351.

Beatrice Melodia Festa Situates *Open City* in the "post 9/11 cannon." She argues that by using the post 9/11 Flâneur, Cole provides a glimpse into the larger national and international consequences of the 9/11 terrorist attacks. To that end, the author "memorialises" and "reterritorializes" violent extremism and terrorism in Brussels (Melodia Festa). She asserts that Cole's position on the effects of 9/11 is universalist, and his perspective is internationalist. According to her understanding, Flâneur is the

trope that allows for a broader dialogue on the importance of the attacks, reterritorialising its implication outside the borders of the US.

One central theme of the critical works on *Open City* is cosmopolitanism. Josh Epstein argues that Mahler, the Austrian musician, is a double for Julius, the protagonist in *Open City*, and a double whose cosmopolitanism is fragmented. Mahler, a homeless thrice as a bohemian in Austria, Austrian in Germany, and jew in Germany and America alike, offers an uncanny mirror-image to Julius, the son of a German Mother, born in Nigeria and citizen of America (Epstein). Split between the present and the past, colonial and cosmopolitan identity, Julius resorts to wandering in the city to reenact Mahler's walks of alienation, with whom he shares cosmopolitanism, fragmented by critique on its aesthetics and love of high art, diluted by a low form of entertainment (Epstein). And Julius is eaten up, hollowed out, by his narrative, just as Mahler sought disintegration through his music. Mahler's music opens the narrative, Mahler's music arouses curiosity about Julius's childhood in Nigeria, his experience of ethnocentrism and trauma, and Mahler's music closes the narrative (Epstein). Basing the polyphonic narrative of the novel on the structure of his symphonies, Cole can present the divergent, interesting ideas of art and history through the walking of Julius, but he fails to synthesise them just as Mahler did with eastern and western musical forms.

Epstein contributes to the discussion on Cole's *Open City* by pointing out similarities between Mahler and Julius in their approach to cosmopolitan aesthetics. He, however, treats Julius as if he had given identity or identities governing his actions. I, however, take a different view based on Deleuze's ontology. Epstein is interested in Julius's wanderings as a reenactment of Mahler's walks; for me, they are the quanta of deterritorialisation. Then his focus is cultural, and mine is political. He focuses on the unsynthesised divergence in Julius's life; I focus on his wandering as a sign of slippage that exists in the line of segmentarity, a rhizomatic shoot in the tree, which provides a rationale for my study.

Developing Epstein's argument, Kristian Shaw asserts that Julius's critical cosmopolitanism stems from the conflict between the desire to protect his identity and the need to be faithful to the West. What makes the cityscape of New York in *Open City* special is the emergence of non-elite mobile, in the guise of Julius, who espouses a “Critical cosmopolitanism that questions the very nature of cultural empathy”; he also

challenges racial monolith, subverting “Cultural Identity” and advocating a vision of multi-cultural community that works through “Negotiation and compromise” because in the wake of 9/11, he has to protect his identity, remain faithful to the west and because in the globalised world, he has to contend with the forces bringing racial and cultural difference to the front (Shaw 103-138).

Pieter Vermeulen adds to the discussion by saying that Julius cannot embrace universalist aesthetics of cosmopolitanism owing to his awareness of the dark places in history. He examines how, with the memory of sufferings and the inability of aesthetics to voice them affectively, *Open City* questions the “Cosmopolitan aesthetic program” and with its dry, unemotional voice to describe the sufferings, it challenges the ability of aesthetics of memory to appeal to international audience and to represent a world stricken by suffering and injustice, therefore as the story unfolds its “apparent celebration of the exemplary cosmopolitan figure of the flâneur makes way for the decidedly less glamorous figure of the fugueur”, a neglected child of modern psychology, suffering from “Unwanted restlessness and ambulatory automatism” moves to the central role of narrating the walks he takes and the suffering he knows about, thus the restricted critical appeal of cosmopolitan art and literature and its “imaginative mobility” and transcultural curiosity is problematised (Vermeulen 40-57).

Emily Johansen observes that the cosmopolitanism celebrated in the *Open City* is “Localised”, not universal. She, rejecting the thesis that *Open City* represents failed cosmopolitanism because of the “ethical failure” of its central character, argues that Cole depicts a “Territorialized cosmopolitanism” that stresses the negotiation of connections between the local and the global instead of celebrating Aesthetics, a localised, momentary cosmopolitanism, not universal. In *Open City*, it occurs in various ways: “through the interaction with and interpretation of place, through embodied forms of sympathetic encounter, and through the transformation of rage at past trauma into a force for social justice and reparation”. These 3 ways are united through rejection of “universalizing liberal cosmopolitanism” despite Julius's favourable opinion of such a community. Then, *Open City* is a cosmopolitan fiction that neither overlooks historical facts nor current situations.

Epstein, Kristian Shaw, Pieter Vermeulen, and Emily Johansen provide an insightful analysis of Julius's cosmopolitanism in *Open City*. They also take Julius's

walking through the city as a crucial factor in his engagement with cosmopolitan aesthetics, or the lack of it. Since their focus is cultural, they do not engage with the modern state, which justifies my work.

Taking a different stance from Emily Johansen and Pieter Vermeulen, Brinker-Gabler asserts that awareness of suffering does not make Julius embrace a fragmented or "localised cosmopolitanism"; it makes him trans-local in his orientation. In his article on Emine Sevgi Özdamar's story "The Courtyard in the Mirror" and *Open City*, he observes the emergence of trans-local literature that is in part caused by decolonisation and in part by globalisation (Brinker-Gabler 1). He defines trans-local literature as involving the crossing of borders, continents, cities, regional areas, and rural boundaries that depict the local, through history, migration, or memory, and connect with other locals in a "Trans local constellation" (Brinker-Gabler 3, 10). Julius in *Open City* becomes trans local because he is alienated from Nigeria, estranged from his family, yet he is not assimilated into U.S. society and has a cosmopolitan node as his love for Mahler shows, and is a flâneur as his walks demonstrate (Brinker-Gabler 8-9). His experience is dark, and his "Trans locality" is not motivated by compassion but driven by an urge to reverse the selective amnesia, "To counter forgetfulness" (Brinker-Gabler 12-14). Thus, Julius's trans locality allows him to report the sights of atrocities; in the process, the local of New York has "Crossovers" with other local and global places. However, in a trans-local narrative shift, Julius has "Crossovers" with crime, making his reports suspicious as an attempt to shift blame from himself (Brinker-Gabler 9-10, 88-92).

Brinker-Gabler's study, though insightful, suffers from limitations exhibited by almost all the scholars dealing with *Open City*; that is, he does not take into account the nomadic subjectivity of Julius, let alone his resistance to the modern state, so I have a rationale for my study.

Some scholars argue that Julius's walks through New York and Brussels are the wandering of a new kind of flaneur who draws on the experience of his French predecessor but is different from him. Sara Faradji maintains that Cole's *Open City* offers a revised flâneur, better suited to "Contemporary global readership"; his main character owing to the experience of trauma and life in the white west, is not simply a detached, dandy observer, but a politically charged critic of society; he does not walk

aimlessly, but to take therapy, to “Forget his brutal past”; in her study, Faradji urges modern readers to recognise and engage critically with the portrayal of “Violence, trauma and exoticism in postcolonial fiction” by showing that *Open City* demands “critical postcolonial cosmopolitanism” that recognises that nationalism and brutality goes hand in hand (26).

Building on Faradji’s argument, Sabah Tasnia observes that Julius uses his postcolonial flânerie to give voice to the marginalised groups of society. She believes that a new kind of revival is taking place in the contemporary aesthetic, the revival of Flâneur conceived by Baudelaire and Walter Benjamin and refashioned by modern authors like Sebald in “Austerlitz” and Cole in *Open City*. She argues that the issues of migration, exile, and dislocation contribute to the emergence of the postcolonial flâneur who, with the “New wander's view”, explores peripheral places, marginalised voices, and overlooked histories.

Agreeing with Faradji and Sabah Tasnia on the postcolonial nature of Julius’s flânerie, Hartwiger adds that his purpose is to historicise the metropolis and criticise the cosmopolitan. With Edward Said's “Contrapuntal reading as a metaphor” for walking, he studies how Julius, “the postcolonial flâneur re-reads New York back into history in *Open City*. Through Julius's “Palimpsestic walks” around New York, the readers can place the global metropolis in history, colonial and postcolonial, questioning the ahistoric identity of the cosmopolitan city (Hartwiger). Drawing on the characteristics of the French Flâneur, the “postcolonial perspective” provides a modality to “re-see” the cityscape with the dialectic of “insider/outsider”, showing the confluence of capitalism and globalisation in silencing voices and covering histories (Hartwiger). *Open City* also problematises the cosmopolitan aesthetics that celebrate the emergence of the “Global citizen” and overlooks the misery of “unhomely” (Hartwiger).

The aforementioned scholars exploring Flânerie in the *Open City* make an interesting argument that Julius, conscious of postcolonial trauma, uses his walks to give voice to the silent sufferers. However, they do not show awareness of Julius's walks as a nomadic strategy, which justifies my research work.

Developing the argument made in the above paragraph, Aristi Trendel argues that Julius is a transcultural flâneur and a nomad as defined by Braidotti 70. He

combines different strands of flâneur present in the continental philosophy, from Baudelaire, he borrows the quality of "passionate spectator" using his walks for contemplation, from Walter Benjamin's love of subway culture, and from Rousseau, his fascination with nature (Trendel 73-74). He is not a dandy, though; he is transcultural as he speaks 3 languages (English, German, and Uroba), converses with books, listens to European music, refuses racial claims, sees his father giving coins to kairon, and has an extraordinary ability to go in and out of cultural diversity (Trendel 76-77). Aristi Trendel observes that Julius's transcultural flâneury makes him a nomad, a post-anthropocentric rejecting the binary of "Human non-human" and caring for the lives of birds and bees 80. By adopting a "non-anthropocentric eco-philosophy", he pits himself against "Late capitalism and its perverse ideology of free mobility, in particular of the American stance on freedom" (Trendel 80). Moving from multicultural identity to post-identitarian, he is minority and a majority, "Victim and the perpetrator" in his religious believes, he is post-secular, drawing on different religions in prayers (Trendel 81-84). Moreover, his mentor wants him to embrace nomadic freedom religion as well (Trendel 84).

Unlike Faradji, Sabah Tasnia, and Hartwiger, Aristi Trendel establishes a connection between the flânerie of Julius and his nomadic subjectivity; still, his analysis is incomplete. He is fixated on the cultural dimensions of Julius's identity, but cultural is political and Julius is politically conscious as evident in his interest in the history of colonialism, slavery and the sufferings of the natives; his rejection of racial claims, his capacity for languages, his love of music and his wandering in the city are quanta of deterritorialisation, an attempt to challenge the logic of dualism of the modern state. This provides a justification for my study.

Discussion on cosmopolitanism, Flanerie, translocality, identity, consequences of 9/11, and spatial and temporal coordinates accounts for the available body of scholarly works on *Open City*. Only Trendel seems to be aware of the nomadic subjectivity of Julius. Still, it appears that none of the scholars, including Trendel, engages with Julius's resistance to the modern state. This absence provides a rationale for my reading of the novel.

2.4.2 *Netherland*

Jeffrey Gonzalez argues that Cole's *Open City* and O'Neill's The *Netherland* are global fiction; therefore, both the novels shares striking similarities: narrators of the novels come to U.S. from outside, move around "New York" and the world, loose fathers young, have complicated "Relationship with their mothers", love birds, situate firmly themselves in the "Urban Landscape" with the lists of street names, locations of subways and histories of monuments, they rattle off; once rooted in the real streets of New York, they, through "Physical movement" connect to other places outside, places in memory or places in history; there they observe the diversity and the "High flow of human traffic" across the boundaries (200-228). Jeffrey Gonzalez's work is significant for my research as it points out similarities in my primary texts. But he does not notice how both novels are similar in resistance against the modern state, which provides a rationale for my study.

Dinat Deena investigates how "Racialised migrant" deals with the global metropolis in Cole's *Open City* and O'Neill's *Netherland*. In both novels, through the movement of the central characters, "post-9/11" New York Cityscape voices racial concerns and foregrounds its troubles. The novels reveal that "Racialised migrant" uses his mobility as an interactive force to be able to offer a critique of the urban centre as the "Sight of modernity" (Dinat Deena). Dinat Deena seemingly argues that *Netherland* affirms the traditional racial categorisation in the metropolis, whereas *Open City*, through the flâneury of Julius, criticises the modern cities, New York and Brussels alike, for their treatment of racial difference and for the histories of brutality. Dinat Deena's study does not discuss the nomadic subjectivity of Cole in *Open City* and Chuck in *Netherland*, which justifies my research.

Arin Keeble argues that by "subverting" and "politicizing" spousal relationship, "One of the dominant thematic rubrics" of 9/11 fiction; by refusing to identify New York to Manhattan and giving voice to marginalised areas of the city; by foregrounding the problems of separating personal from public trauma; and overtly engaging with the implications of the terrorist attacks, Joseph O'Neill avoids the pitfalls of the "post-9/11 cannon" and moves the discussion on the issue from conflict to cooperation 55-71.

Stanley Van Der Ziel argues that despite sharing structural elements with realist novels, *Netherland* falls somewhere between modernism and postmodernism. O'Neill

chooses a self-reflective style of prose and uses fragmented memory as a motive (Der Ziel 74-77). Based on these choices, Der Ziel argues, O'Neill's *Netherland* should be considered as belonging to a tradition that, starting from the Early 20th century, does not regard the realist novel as capable of giving expression to the experience of trauma and displacement.

Bimbisar Ior reads *Netherland* as a transcultural text. He argues that cricket, Google Maps, and the Flenerie of Chuck and the narrator destabilise the traditional narratives of the modern state. Bimbisar further argues that O'Neill seeks to reimagine the cosmopolitan in order to oppose the emergence of the nationalistic novel so typical to the post 9/11 era (152-56). Bibisar's analysis represents an important intervention in *Netherland* from the perspective of my research, as he highlights elements in the novel that are meant to take 9/11 fiction beyond the nation to the cosmopolitan. Unlike my research, he neither engages with the right of exclusion nor with the nomadic resistance to the modern state. He is primarily concerned with the nature of literature written in the wake of the September 11 attacks.

The available body of research on *Netherland* neither discusses the nomadic subjectivity of Chuck nor does it show awareness of his resistance to the modern state. In this case, I am justified in performing my analysis of the novel.

2.5 Conclusion

I have arranged this chapter into 3 sections: Section I contains a discussion on works relating to the theoretical perspectives, Section II contextualises my texts, and Section III reviews critical sources on my primary texts.

The first section reveals that despite the contribution of Anderson, Delanda, Žukauskaitė, Debrix, Aldea, Williams and Mundi to the concept of the modern state, deterritorialisation, space and nomadism, none of them engages with the question of how the modern state creates itself through the logic of dualism and how the nomad deterritorialises it. Their works show what my project seeks to achieve, but they also reveal gaps. The point of departure of my research from their works lies in the fact that I focus on how nomads challenge the dualism of the internal coherent self and the external threatening other and deterritorialise the modern state.

In the second section, I have included works that situate the selected works of fiction in the category of 9/11 fiction. My review of the critical debate on 9/11 fiction reveals that trauma, individual or national, remains the primary concern. At the same time, some scholars foreground transcultural elements, resistance to the traditional interpretation of the terrorist attacks, and the perspectives of the immigrants. These works offer significant insights into understanding trauma, identity, and representation. The available critical works lack a discussion on how the 9/11 fiction resists the modern state itself. My research work contributes to the discussion by shifting from trauma to deterritorialisation, demonstrating how 9/11 fiction challenges the striation of the modern state.

The third section reviews critical works on *Open City* and *Netherland*. The available scholarship has already discussed *Open City* from the perspective of cosmopolitanism, flanerie, identity, translocality, and the impact of 9/11. Trendel is even conscious of the nomadic subjectivity of Julius. However, none of the critical works, including Trendel's, discusses how Julius uses his nomadic subjectivity to deterritorialise the modern state. Similarly, while analysing *Netherland*, scholars ignore the nomadic subjectivity of Chuck and his challenge to the right of exclusion of the modern state. These gaps in research underscore the originality of my approach that reads Julius and Chuck as the nomadic subject engaged in deterritorialisation of the modern state.

CHAPTER 3

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK AND RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1 Introduction

In this chapter, I have discussed the theoretical perspectives and research methodology that I have considered appropriate for the analysis of the selected texts. A review of the existing body of scholarship has allowed me to develop critical insights into the theoretical approaches that can be effectively used in my analysis of the texts. Keeping in view the thesis statement of this research, it can be asserted that theoretical perspectives relating to postmodernism, micropolitics, nomadology, and historiographic metafiction are likely to provide conceptual scaffolding for my study. I have examined my primary works in light of the aforementioned theoretical perspectives, especially where they meet. Furthermore, since my study follows a qualitative paradigm, the research method that I have chosen is mostly subjective. To that end, I have used Alan McKee's textual analysis, as described in his essay, as a research method to analyse the selected texts. The claim that micropolitics shapes macropolitics, and individuals can deterritorialise the strata in concern, makes me carry out this research. Textual analysis is suited for my research because it recognizes that meaning is subjective and dependent on the context. For the sake of clarity, I have divided my theoretical framework into the following subheads:

- Conceptual framework
- Research methodology
- Conclusion

3.2 Conceptual Framework for this Study

This research work is primarily based on the concepts of French philosophers Deleuze and Guattari, especially their notions of micropolitics and nomadology, developed in their book, *A Thousand Plateaus* (1980). A supporting theoretical perspective for this reading comes from Linda Hutcheon, specifically her definition of history and fiction, presented in her book, *A Poetics of Postmodernism* (1988). Deleuze

and Guattari describe how the modern state creates itself on the first line through compartmentalising people and space and suggest how nomads resist by evading these segments of man/citizen, insider/outsider. I have deployed their concepts to describe the nomadic resistance in the novels. Hutcheon does not differentiate, ontologically, between history and fiction. I have attempted to show how this understanding allows for challenging the narrative of the state. In the following pages, I have presented a comprehensive discussion on the ideas of these theorists. I have tried to explain that Nomad does micropolitics by challenging the compartments– citizens/aliens, insiders/outsiders– created by the modern state. Because of this challenge, the nomadic flow (movement) is fixed towards fluid identity. I have outlined below my attempt to substantiate my point by using the theories developed by Deleuze and Guattari and Hutcheon.

3.2.1 Deleuze and Guattari and Micropolitics and Nomadology

Deleuze and Guattari, in their book *A Thousand Plateaus*, postulate that 3 lines characterise our lives. Macropolitics happens on the first line and micropolitics on the other two lines. They argue that on the first line, the line of rigid segmentarity,

> We are segmented, our houses according to rooms, our factories according to the type of work, our cities according to the type of area, our lives according to the different environments; we are in binary segmented between men and women, on a linear line between episodes (home, school, work, army) and in ever-widening circles (our affairs, our sector's affairs, our city affairs, our country's affairs) (208-209).

The first line superimposes the logic of dualism on multiplicity so that humans become: citizens/aliens and natives/immigrants (Deleuze and Guattari 210). Deleuze and Guattari assert that the modern state is created on the first line as it swallows each aspect of individuals and reduces them to a number, a sign, or a label; as a result, they are no longer humans, but citizens or aliens (210). This subsuming of individuality by the first line allows the logic of dualism to produce an internal coherent self and an external threatening other. Both a homogeneous population at home and an implacable enemy outside are essential to the formation of national identity.

Deleuze and Guattari call the second line the line of supple segments. It is the line of the tribe where reality is heterogeneous, and territoriality is itinerant and therefore situational (209). The line of supple segments is between the total control of the state and complete annihilation caused by the "War Machine," between rigid segments and absolute flight. In the ancient world, it was the line of the tribe that operated between Rome and the barbarians. Now it is represented by the nomad in his wanderings, physical and mental alike. On this line, the nomad, through his wandering, exposes cracks in the territoriality of the modern state by not submitting to the logic of dualism, the binary machine. Refusing to be subsumed under the label of nationality, the nomad retains his individuality. The will of the state does not emanate from the nomad, nor is he prevented, "From forming his own sequences" (Deleuze and Guattari 211). The nomadic resistance does not manifest in overt political acts: joining a party, protesting on the streets, not paying taxes, or any other acts that would attract the notice of the modern state. He resists through micropolitics through what Deleuze and Guattari call "Forming his own sequences:" Wandering through the city, a meeting with the immigrants, and by refusing to be segmented by the machine of territoriality of the modern state.

The nomadic resistance is made possible by the fact that the modern state is not able to suppress the second line completely. The "State has the supple edges, and tribe has the germs of the rigid, which deterritorialise and anticipate the state (213-215). Deleuze and Guattari argue that the binary of men and women is structurally contaminated by the presence of man in woman and woman in man, so the rigid segments (citizens and aliens) necessary for the continuous creation of the modern state can be deterritorialised by the presence of individuals (206). The categories of citizens and aliens appear to be monoliths, but these monoliths comprise individuals and individuals, conscious of their own identity, can destabilize them. The macropolitics of the states cannot exist without the micropolitics of the individuals, but micropolitics can unravel macropolitics (Deleuze and Guattari 216). Deleuze and Guattari are conscious of the fact that the nomad can tip over onto the third line while he engages in resistance against the modern state (256-57, my paraphrase). This line is full of dangers because it brings the nomad to the notice of the modern state, which ends in complete reterritorialisation (Deleuze and Guattari 203). I have used this description of the 3

lines, the modern state, and the nomadic resistance as a theoretical lens to read my primary texts.

Deleuze and Guattari bring a different approach to phenomenology of the modern state as they stress the need to reject the notion that the modern state is natural, given, or the endpoint of human development. In their understanding, the smooth space and multiplicity are the prior conditions; the modern state is created when the smooth space is striated, and multiplicity is metamorphosed into binaries (210). Hens, their theory offers a way to reverse these striations and deterritorialise the segments. This way is the way of the nomad who, through his resistance on the second line, unravels the macropolitics of the state. Such an approach has the potential of questioning and deterritorialising the modern state, and it is helpful in my research project as I have tried to demonstrate through my reading how both of my selected novels, Teju Cole's *Open City* and Joseph O'Neill's *Netherland*, portray nomadic characters who resist the territoriality of the modern state. Deleuze and Guattari's celebration of deterritorialisation and their concept of the nomad is a productive intervention in the understanding of the modern state.

Although Deleuze and Guattari express these ideas while discussing politics in general, their concepts can be used to carry out my analysis in the field of literature. First of all, they do not differentiate between the books based on the contents, but on the intensity that those books create (3). Secondly, they base their explanation of the 3 lines on Henry James' novel, In the Cage. Thirdly, various other scholars have applied their theories in literature and film studies.

Deleuze and Guattari's theoretical perspectives are likely to help analyse the selected texts. I have invoked their concepts to explore how my primary texts construct nomadic identity and detterritorialise the modern state. Their discussion of the challenge to the logic of dualism on the second line is likely to be particularly useful in analysing both novels. Reading the novels through their lens helps me critique the division of humans into categories of citizens and men. This stance is likely to present a more pluralistic, inclusive perspective and postnationalistic view. Their ideas have helped me form my thesis statement. I have harked back to their concepts in the analysis of my primary texts.

3.2.2 Linda Hutcheon and Historiographic Metafiction

As I have already explained, Hutcheon's ideas support the theoretical lens I have drawn from Deleuze and Guattari. She offers a way to challenge the internal coherent self, central to the formation of the modern state. Rene, the renowned nation-state theorist, asserts that nations are born because they forget the violence of their origin. This act of forgetting is carried out by the history of the modern state, which is considered to provide access to the past. Hutcheon dismisses the notion that history is an objective discipline that enables the historian to access the past. She does not doubt the existence of the historical referent, but she doubts our access to it. Hutcheon asserts that our knowledge about the past comes from newspapers, archives, or books, which are part of a signifying system; these signifying systems, which include history and fiction, amount to all our knowledge about the past (94). She considers history and fiction to be similar in nature if not in function.

History and fiction both "Seem to derive their force more from verisimilitude than any objective truth; they are both identified as linguistic constructs, highly conventionalized in their narrative forms, and not at all transparent either in terms of language or structure" (120).

This stress on the similarity of history and fiction allows aesthetics to engage in the serious work of historical inquiry, which is necessary for problematizing the internal coherent self. Hutcheon further argues that meaning and shape are not in the events, but in the systems which make those past "events" into present historical "facts" (89, 93). Choosing a subject, history and fiction both focus on it over other subjects and events. Male historians ignore women when they write about wars, and Charlotte Brontë, a white novelist, downplays the history of Bertha Mason. It does not mean that fiction is an accurate representation of the past. "Naturally, in denying the primacy of history, it does not claim primacy for itself; playing on the postmodern contradiction, it also abandons its claim to the truth (Hutcheon 90-91). In fact, in her understanding, overarching truths do not exist, so there does not arise any question of claim to the truth (1-2). Historiographic metafiction challenges the assumptions about history: objectivity, impersonality, neutrality, and transparency by situating historical referent in the novel and contaminating it with the situational or the fictive element (Hutcheon 92). I have used her ideas in the analysis of the selected works.

Hutcheon's idea that history and fiction are the system of signification is helpful in this research. It has helped me highlight in fiction the voices overlooked by the history of the USA. Furthermore, it has allowed me to consider my novels as a means of historical inquiry. I have referred to her ideas in the relevant part of my analysis of the selected works. Using her theoretical perspective helps me understand how the nomad engages in historical inquiry to challenge the internal self and deterritorialise the modern state.

3.3 Research Methodology

Keeping the theoretical framework in view, my research employs a qualitative approach to analyse the primary texts, and my analysis of the texts is largely interpretative and exploratory. As my research seeks to explore the nexus between nation and narration through exploring an interplay of meaning and ideas is best suited to this critical study.

I have employed Alan McKee's method of textual analysis as presented in his article–A Beginner's Guide to Textual Analysis, published in Metro Magazine–to read *Open City* by Teju Cole and *Netherland* by O'Neill. McKee's textual analysis allows for subjective interpretation based on the context of literary production. Moreover, his method can produce multiple interpretations of a work depending on the personal experience of the interpreter and the context of the work. "There is no such thing as a single, 'correct' interpretation of any text. There are large numbers of possible interpretations, some of which will be more likely than others in particular circumstances" (McKee 140). His argument is based on the view that texts do not correspond to reality; what we take as a version of reality to measure the text against is but "Another representation – another text" (140). In line with McKee's position, I have tried to avoid any essentialist interpretation.

An inductive, largely exploratory position is likely to give me room for forming subjective interpretation. The argument that meaning-making varies from reader to reader and is different in different contexts is the basis of textual analysis. Since McKee's model is not deconstructive, it is helpful to me in the analysis of the primary texts. Furthermore, it complements Deleuze and Guattari's position, which emphasises the experience of the individual. Nomad as an individual in his resistance to the modern state, and the researcher as an individual making sense of the texts. McKee's textual

analysis is based on the context of the text: the rest of the text, genre of the text (comic or tragic), and the broader public context (145-146). Situating the texts in the context of 9/11, I will try to find out how leading characters in the selected works construct nomadic identity and how they deterritorialise the modern state. His reference to Cathrine Lumby's analysis of a Sidney newspaper establishes the authority of the reader over the interpretation of the text. Using secondary sources to analyse the selected works of fiction is well in line with McKee's model of textual analysis, as they inform my approach to the texts. The secondary resources help me make meanings that were otherwise not possible for me.

3.4 Conclusion

I have employed the theories proposed by Deleuze and Guattari in *A Thousand Plateaus* and Linda Hutcheon in The Poetics of Postmodernism to investigate how *Open City* by Teju Cole and *Netherland* by O'Neill deterritorialise the modern state. This deterritorialisation is preceded by the construction of the nomadic identity of Julius in *Open City* and Chuck in *Netherland*. Furthermore, Alan McKee's model of textual analysis is likely to be helpful in making sense of the novels in a new way. Both the conceptual framework and research methodology are likely to help in carrying out the analysis of my primary texts. In light of the concepts discussed in this chapter, I set out to critically analyse the selected texts. I have tried to find answers to my controlling questions in the following chapters.

CHAPTER 4

THE NOMAD: CREATING SUBJECTIVITY BEYOND THE MODERN STATE

4.1 Introduction

In this chapter, I have analysed *Open City* by Cole and *Netherland* by O'Neill to find out how both the authors have depicted nomadic subjectivity in the novels. Primarily, this chapter seeks an answer to the question of how Julius in *Open City* and Chuck in *Netherland* deterritorialise themselves and in the process evade capture by the logic of dualism used by the modern state to categorise them as citizens or exclude them as aliens. Using the concept of nomadology and micropolitics by Deleuze and Guattari, in this chapter, I propose that both characters achieve their nomadic subjectivity by slipping through the cracks in the segments on the first line. This resistance seems political because Julius and Chuck show political consciousness, yet it is not political in the usual sense of the term. It is subtle and expressed through the performance of daily life. It is not organised by a party, which is a macropolitical institution. Nor does it rely on protests for the achievement of its goals. Thus, their resistance against the modern state appears to be micropolitical.

Julius creates his nomadic subjectivity in several ways. He deterritorialises psychology by going beyond the patient/doctor dichotomy. He deterritorialises the striated space by his aimless wanderings through the city. He deterritorialises race by refusing to submit to racial categorisation. He deterritorialises culture by his lover of Mahler. As a result, he is able to weaken the pull of territoriality, which allows him to have a nomadic flow; he moves in the modern state, yes is not captured by it.

Chuck manifests his nomadic subjectivity differently. He replaces Julius's caution with contingencies. He deterritorialises friendship by developing relations that resist precise definition. He deterritorialises romantic relationships by forming a passionate complex, slipping through the categories of husband/wife, girlfriend/boyfriend, and client/companion. He deterritorialise postcolonial identity by refusing to have nostalgia for Trinidad and emphasising on his presence in New York

instead. These Choices define Chuck as a nomad who problematises the binaries used by the modern state to control belonging.

I have used McKee's method of textual analysis to read the selected novels in this chapter. Since McKee emphasises the role of context in making sense of the literary production, it is useful for me to describe the context of the novels. My interpretation of these texts is based on their socio-political context, which is shaped by the 9/11 attacks. For a detail discussion of 9/11 and its fictional responses, refer to chapter one. In the wake of the terrorist attacks, the modern state has tightened its control over the flow of people across the borders. Consequently, the dreams of the 90s that globalisation would weaken the modern state and create a borderless world has been shattered by strict border control, heightened surveillance, and the politics of exclusion. The right of exclusion that has been central to the formation of the modern state began to be used with relentless intensity, dividing citizens from suspects, innocents from terrorists, and those who belonged from those who did not. As discussed in Chapter 1 of this thesis, the literature situated in this context deals with this reality. Some works reinforce the boundaries in narratives, others register the painful implication of this transformation for those who are excluded, and still others imagine the possibility of resistance. *Open City* and the *Netherland* can be classified under the third category. Both depict nomadic characters who refuse to submit to the operation of the right of exclusion.

4.2 Julius

4.2.1 The Psychiatric Nomad

Psychiatry segments people into "the tribes of the normal and the tribe of the abnormal," doctor and patient, the former listening to the latter speaking (Cole 161). What they speak about is not important; what disease their speech hint at is. But for Julius, the nomad, they are not only patient to be treated, but humans to be heard. In his narrative, he reports B's who is a native American, speech not to psychoanalyse her but to understand her trauma and the history of her people. Moreover, after her death, he buys her book on the monster of Amsterdam that Narrates, in grisly detail, what is an insignificant, undiscussed event in the history of the USA, but was history of her tribe. He has "instinct for 'doubt and questions", the instinct helps him break away from the segments of "normal" and "abnormal" and allows him to see his patient not just that,

but human beings. Then, he is not only concerned about the mind of the patients, but is “One of a tiny minority,” “Who thought incessantly of the soul, or worried about its place in all this carefully calibrated knowledge” (164). He does not take “soul” to be the essence, separable from the body of the patients. “soul” is their individuality, the multiplicity of fear, desire, believes, values, and history that is the make-up of their identity. Julius' concern for the soul of the individual, instead of only the mind of the patient, makes him state, “psychiatry should be hesitant, and as kind as possible” (164). The Theories of psychiatry are fixated on the diseases of the mind because they can easily be categorised, stratified, and reterritorialised. “soul”, however, evades capture, and by doing so, it arouses the interest of Julius. Because it allows him to bring deterritorialisation, albeit in Quantas, into the field of psychiatry, this deterritorialisation of psychiatry assumes importance in the context of 9/11. Using the right of exclusion based on the logic of dualism, the modern state, in the pursuit of security, places people in the categories of normal/abnormal, suspects/citizens, and innocent/terrorists. But emphasis on individuality seems to allow Julius to reject such labels.

4.2.2 The Wandering Nomad

Still, there is only so much he can do, so far he can go in disregarding the regulation and prioritising the human over the patient without completely deterritorialising or utterly rejecting psychiatry, which may result in the loss of license and the loss of livelihood, respectively, which may not be appealing to Julius. Perhaps, they would to the ancient, tribal nomad, the nomad far excellence. But the modern nomad has to be a member of the society where he engages in its deterritorialisation. As Mundi argues, the modern nomad does not allow himself to be identified by marks: beard, haircut, uniform, or marked difference in lifestyle. His province is micropolitics, yet he has to live with the terrible power of macropolitics, of the society, of the state. He ought to be subtle lest he strays to the third line where reterritorialisation, if not an inevitable, is a likely result. Thus, Julius proceeds carefully, his flow is cautious, and he may not always come across as deterritorialise “far excellence”. My emphasis is on (coming across); Julius is deterritorialised par excellence while alone, but he conceals it from others in order to avoid betraying his position to the people segmented on the first line. Although he is a complete nomad in his tastes and choices, he is conscious of the potential harsh response to the expression of nomadism in its truest sense. He tries

as far as he can to weaken, to deterritorialise some of the segments of psychiatry, but, owing to that consciousness, not as much as he would have liked. He is forced to be content with the relative deterritorialisation of psychiatry.

Finding the “compromise” too onerous and the monotony unbearable, he takes to the streets to walk in the city.

> As interesting as my research project was… The streets served as a welcome opposite to all that. “The walks met a need: they were a release from the tightly regulated mental environment of work, and once I discovered them as therapy, they became the normal thing, and I forgot what life had been like before I started walking. (Cole 4)

Julius' wanderings are “therapeutic” not for his physical self, but for his nomadic sensibility, compensating him for the stifling environment of his job. On his walks, he can afford to be true to himself, not making compromises, living with a tinge of deterritorialisation. His wanderings seem to be a counterpoint to his job, where everything is segmented “in the binary” between normal and abnormal, disease and health, doctor and patient; in series, giving an appointment, providing a consultation, listening to the patient, discovering the disease, and curing the patient. At the hospital, every activity is ordered, done with a specific purpose. On the other hand, his walks have no purpose, his movements no given direction understandable to those on the first line. They are, in his words, “aimless wanderings” (Cole 2). “Aimless” for those who are segmented on the first line. As if he puts his feet on the streets, and lets them carry him away, away to some street, city block, junction on the road. Once he finds himself at the door to a music store, he enters yet remains aimless. The store, an outlet of a corporation, once prominent, but now swallowed up by a new business model in the music industry, cannot induce him, despite his sympathy, to buy any music record because it may divert him from his wandering. Then his walks take him to a Train station; he gets on the train, but there too he remains the “Aimless wanderer”.

> The car moved on past my stop, and momentarily, I tried to figure out what had happened. I hadn't been asleep. My staying on, I finally decided, “Was intentional, if not conscious. This was confirmed at the next stop, when again I failed to exit and instead

> sat there, with the feeling that I was watching myself, waiting to see what would happen next. (Cole 35)

This appears to be a deliberate choice on his part. On his walks, he is his own man, A nomad, not a psychiatrist, so he does not accept anything that even hints at order and direction. He seems to embrace everything that embodies spontaneity because in spontaneity, the first line, the line of order and segments, the line of theories and categories, the line of segments, and the modern state cannot get hold of him. The spontaneous and directionless puts Julius on the trajectory to cause slippage in the first line, the line of segmentarity, of order and purpose. And in those slippages, he seems to be able to deterritorialise and form resonance with other nomads.

Most importantly, the slippages appear to allow him to remain undetected by the "terrible telescope array "situated at the poles of the abstract machine of the state. Unless he falls onto the line of flight, but he does not. He appears to be too cautious for that. I believe I am right in asserting that Julius' wanderings through the cities, New York and Brussels alike, operate as a metaphor for his nomadic identity. This aimless wandering stands in opposition to the control of the modern state over the movements of people in the striated space. As mentioned above, control over people has been exerted by the modern state with increasing intensity in the aftermath of the 9/11 attacks. In the next chapter, I will develop on the analysis of his "aimless wanderings" and establish how it is the medium for deterritorialising the Modern state.

4.2.3 Nomad and Music

Julius also reveals himself as a nomad by the music he likes. Epstein has thoroughly explored the affinities between Mahler and Julius in their personal lives and cosmopolitan aesthetics. For the discussion of the Epstein study, refer to chapter 2 of this thesis. I am not interested in further discussion of the topic. What interests me is understanding the relation between Julius's choice of music and his nomadic subjectivity. Jaz is an African American musical genre, and Julius is "African American", so he is supposed to enjoy listening to the practitioners of the genre. All the more so when they love to play with the rules of conventional music, a characteristic Julius is not unfamiliar with, in his practice of psychiatry. However, Julius not only shows indifference to its appeal but also positively dislikes it. He would even occasionally worry about "why I seemed not to have a strong emotional connection

with this most American of musical styles. Too often, it merely sounded sweet to me, cloying even, and I especially disliked it as background music" (Cole 6). On the other hand, he has a strong "emotional connection" with Mahler, listening to his music and watching it performed in the concert. Perhaps this is the reason that Epstein claims that Mahler's music is woven through the narrative.

What Julius's aversion to Jaz, the quintessential African American Genre, and his love for Mahler, the Austrian Musician, tell us about Julius the nomad? Jaz has become an African American cultural artefact. African American culture is a subculture of American Culture. Moreover, Culture is an element of the nation and a tool of the Modern state to produce internal cohesion and conjure national identity. One of the 4 elements of a nation, as defined by the Montevideo Convention, is "people". individuals become "people" When they share a culture. If Jazz was nomadic in the beginning, after it became a part of American culture, it, undoubtedly, was captured by the first line. The American Modern state has been so successful in appropriating Jazz that it is considered to be a quintessential American musical genre and consequently an element of the American national identity. In this case, it would be counterproductive for the nomadic Julius, who engages in the resistance against the Modern state, by, if not outright rejecting, at least challenging the right of exclusion, to identify with it. As Molecular can become moral and vice-versa, so the deterritorialised Julius can be reterritorialized under the pull of Jaz. The Modern state does not use the threat of "the terrible telescope array" to capture the deterritorialised, when he is susceptible to being seduced on the first line. Consent and coercion, Gramsci argues, go hand in hand in the project of state-building. Moreover, Jazz is seductive enough even for Julius; therefore, he is, perhaps, unconsciously, on guard. Although towards the end of the novel, he acquires some tolerance for the sweetness of the genre, he continues to maintain his indifference in order to protect himself from its sway.

To strengthen this protection, he goes to the concert where Mahler is performed. The concert seems not only to prevent him from being reterritorialised, but it also allows him to engage in its deterritorialisation. The audience is usually white; A black man is, disruptively, unusual. "In the concert of Mahler, everyone, as almost always at such concerts, was white. It is something I can't help noticing; I notice it each time… The only thing odd, to some of them, is seeing me, young and black, in my seat or at the concession stand." (Cole 201). Mahler was white and old; his listeners may have been

white and old, not his music, though. People may have forgotten it, but Julius remembers, and he makes sure to make them remember that “Mahler's music is not white, or black, not old or young, and whether it is even specifically human, rather than in accord with more universal vibrations, is open to question” (202). It does not lend itself to the segments of old and young, white and black, modern and classic, eastern and western.

Mahler blends Eastern and Western musical traditions and instruments to produce a synthesis of the existing musical forms. He may even go beyond that to arrive at the music that strikes universal chords because it has been completely deterritorialised. So, the failure of the Modern state in reterritorialising it into a cultural artefact should not be considered a surprising phenomenon. It is too unruly in its production and elevated in expression for the strata of the Modern state to get hold of it. In the face of its magic, even the blackhole of territoriality appears to fail in the operation of reterritorialisation. In fact, His music and Julius' wandering follow a similar trajectory in escaping the first line. Of course, the dimension of their deterritorialisation of the first line is different, as Mahler challenges the strata of music and Julius that of the state, yet in embodying the flow of deterritorialisation, both become nomads.

4.2.4 Nomad and the Deterritorialisation of Race

People who are segmented, try to compartmentalise, reterritorialise Julius according to race, but he resists. He deterritorialises himself from the segment of race because of all the processes of the logic of dualism responsible for the right of exclusion, race can be the most effective. This is the reason that it is considered to be one of the elements of a nation. The Montevideo Convention requires the presence of people as one of the conditions, the fulfilment of which is necessary to acquire statehood. Individuals become people through several factors; race is one of them. Dr Gupta, recalling the injustice done to his people in Kenia at the time of independence and not finding anyone of Kenyan descent in the room, directs the rage he feels against Africans at Julius (Cole 33). “The detail of my background, that I was “Nigerian, made no difference, for DR. Gupta had spoken of Africans, had sidestepped the specific and spoken in the general” (Cole 33). Gupta takes A characteristic of Julius that he accidentally shares with the Kenyans (colour) and feeds it to the machine of

territoriality in order to reterritorialise him as a black, African man on whom he can heap all the insults he believes he is owed. In the process, Julius' individuality is disregarded, which is a common occurrence on the first line. It is the property of segments on the first line to sweep aside, subsume the individual, his fears, feelings, desires, his specificity, his background under a type or a characteristic or a function. Without this property, the logic of dualism used by the modern state does not work properly. The preteen Caucasian siblings appear to draw a similar line of reterritorialisation. Are you a gangster, mister? He's black, said the girl, but he's not dressed like a gangster. I bet he's a gangster, her brother said, I bet he is" (24). Gupta seeks to reterritorialise him as a black, African offender and the siblings as Black, African gangster.

Julius's resistance to segmentation according to race does not seem to spring from his rejection of the negative stereotypes associated with Africans. Nor his deterritorialisation of the American Modern state from so-called postcolonial sensibility. His response appears to remain the same even when the reterritorialisation is carried out by the so-called Africans. Because in both cases, the purpose is to expose him to the territorialisation machine of the Modern state. Once, A Black cab driver calls him "Brother", undoubtedly based on the sameness of their colour, he loses his patience with him, "I was in no mood for people who tried to lay claims on me" (33). And when Kennet tries to reterritorialize him with the query, "Are you Yoruba?" he begins, "To wish he would go away" (Cole 44). It can be argued that neither segmentation based on racial slurs nor on racial claims capture Julius. He is too slippery for the machine of territoriality. Usually, in our childhood, we are most vulnerable to the machine of territoriality. It is a stage of life where, under the influence of our parents and teachers, we form most of our prejudices and learn to place others and ourselves into categories. It could be a category of class or, more relevant to the discussion, race. However, Julius could not segment himself, nor could he be segmented by others into the category of race. It was not so because he consciously practiced the nomadic way of life. He could not. He was a child. But he was the child of a Nigerian father and a German mother. Although he is not on speaking terms with his mother, she, unconsciously and unintentionally, appears to have prevented his reterritorialisation into a Nigerian, African male by giving him a lighter colour, naming him Julius, and making him eligible for a German passport. And as he grows up and develops the nomadic

consciousness, he sheds off his ties to Nigeria, so nothing in his past life could be fed to the machine of territoriality. One such link is the Urabá language. He has purposefully let go of command over the language of his father to the extent that he can only "get by, though by now my English is much stronger" (Cole 114).

This section establishes the nomadic subjectivity of Julius. His attitude to his patients, love of wanderings, choice of music, and distance from his origins allow him to escape the categories proliferating on the first line. This escape is significant in the context of 9/11 because in the shadows of the terrorist attacks, the modern state, driven by the seeming mania of security and control, uses the segments to separate citizens from aliens and innocents from citizens. In the next section, I will examine *Netherland* to find out if Chuck is also a nomad.

4.3 Chuck in *Netherland*

4.3.1 Nomad and Contingencies

Chuck's nomadic intensity is perhaps greater than Julius's, but his tact is definitely lesser. Whereas Julius, recognising the benefits of caution, remains, in appearance at least, a relative nomad, if it is what the situation requires; Chuck remains persistently "deterritorialised par excellence" even at the cost of his life. There is an advantage of this stubborn persistence. The molecular intensities created by his nomadic flow vibrate so strongly in the molar that even the "terrible telescope" cannot completely wipe out its traces. The Narrator, for instant, is molar. He is on the first line, being constantly reterritorialized by his wife, on whom he relies "as a flashlight" to "illuminate things that he had thought perfectly illuminated," who speaks in "complete sentences and intact paragraphs" telling him what to eat and what to watch (O'Neill 91, 31, 80). Still, his narrative does not appear to be so, especially in places where he recalls Chuck. Chuck is so utterly deterritorialised that even in his absence, he seems to open cracks in the line of segmentarity and transfigures what was meant to be a record of the personal history of the narrator into a challenge to the right of exclusion (more on that in the next chapter). He does to the narrator of *Netherland* what Julius, the narrator of *Open City*, does not dare do to the characters he describes.

Chuck's flow of deterritorialisation is so prodigious because, in the words of Hans, he is "a lover of contingencies and hypotheses, a man cheerfully operating in the

subjunctive mood" (O'Neill 91). Where other people, their imagination impoverished by the strata they are reterritorialised into, see only limits and are content with their limitations. Chuck senses potential and would work relentlessly for its actualisation.

> Chuck had no permission to place any permanent construction upon the land. But he figured that if he built New York's first real cricket ground and installed some removable bleachers, the great India and West Indies teams would be lining up to play here; and once that happened, he reasoned, his application to the Park Service for permission to (1) transform the hangars into a clubhouse and an indoor sports centre, and (2) build grandstands for eight thousand spectators, would have every reason to succeed; and once that happened, the television companies would pile in; and once that happened… (O'Neill 73).

Sometimes he succeeds, sometimes he fails, but even in his failures, he seems to achieve the actualisation of the potential in unexpected ways. He tries to turn Hans into a nomad; he comes close, but ultimately has to yield him to Rachael, "the flashlight", who secures him on the first line. But perhaps it had been his attention all along. The strong pull of territoriality on Hans may not have escaped his notice. He, therefore, may have realised that Hans cannot achieve deterritorialisation. But after sending him to his wife, Chuck seems to leave "a taint of aftermath" in him, a crack in the glassy segment, an echo in his mind. That echo appears to resound through his writing, and perhaps not obvious to the narrator, continues Chuck's work of deterritorialisation.

What I am arguing is in keeping with Chuck's approach to life. We are told that his life's purpose is to do things in a straight way, if possible; if not, he is flexible enough to change the strategy. He believes "in owning the impetus of a situation, in keeping the other guy off balance, in proceeding by way of sidesteps" (O'Neill 63). To achieve his purpose of causing leaks in the strata of the Modern state, he desperately needs to affect the minds of the multitude. But he does not have the credibility to have people listen to him. So, he proceeds by "sidesteps" and insinuates himself into Hans's narrative. After all, his modus operandi is to wrong-foot the world. Run rings around it" (O'Neill 133).

4.3.2 Nomad and Friendship

Our society is segmented on the binary line between friends and foes, acquaintances, and strangers. The Modern state appropriates these segments and uses them to produce camaraderie among the soldiers and solidarity in the civilian population. Thus, Nomad takes it upon himself to deterritorialise the segments that regulate non-romantic relationships between humans. This deterritorialisation assumes significance in the context of 9/11. As we have seen in Mohsin Hamid's *The Reluctant Fundamentalist* in the aftermath of the terrorist attacks on America, the modern state uses the right of exclusion even against those people who were previously included in the state as citizens. Changez separation from his colleagues at the airport seems to be the manifestation of the right of exclusion. The right of exclusion works through the binaries of segments, which are created by the logic of dualism.

Were Chuck and Hans friends? Acquaintances? Business partners? Strangers? Their relationship does not appear to fall into any of the segments existing on the first line. It does not even develop in what could be called a usual way. Beginning unexpectedly, unexpectedly it ends. A black coolly turned sushi businessman from Africa and a Caucasian equity analyst from Europe, what are the odds? They lead lives so different from each other that only chance could have brought them together. And arguably chance does bring them together in a cricket match where Hans is playing, and Chuck is performing as the referee. On that day, A supporter of the opposite side comes inside the playing area with a gun in hand. Chuck impresses Hans greatly by handling the situation adroitly and bravely and by delivering, after the play, a speech on the importance and challenges of playing cricket in America. Chuck does not engineer the incident. It is not the way of the nomad. Chance appears to be also responsible for their second and third meetings, taking place on a ferry and in a restaurant, respectively. From that point onwards, Chuck starts cultivating him to make him resonate on the second or the third line. During their “relationship,” Chuck cajoles him into going on “driving promenades” around the city. And “Prompts” him to do what he was set against, changing his playing style. Not to mention, on his advice, Hans goes back to London to fight for his marriage.

For all the influence that Chuck has over Hans, he drops him very casually. Chuck invites him along with his mistress to Herald Square on Thanksgiving Day, but

cannot meet them there because the square is filled with people on parade. He gives them another meeting place, but there, too, he does not appear. Hans “Concluded that his Thanksgiving no-show was merely the newest manifestation of his whimsicality and didn't hold it against him, just as I didn't hold it against him, or me, that in the end all I got out of him was an e-mail: Good luck with everything” (Cole 219).

Hans's lack of shock can be explained by his impression that Chuck was interested in his potential, not in him. By potential, he and his wife mean the cover he provided for Chuck’s illegal activities. It is true that Chuck was interested in his potential—the potential of deterritorialisation. Unfortunately, Hans would never resonate with the nomad, and the nomad could not stop his flow for him. The friendship may have ended for Chuck, but not for Hans. “It is not quite true to say that Chuck out of sight was Chuck out of mind. I did think about him” (Cole 213). It can be argued that Chuck was counting on that. If he were thinking about him, he would remember the sights and scenes of New York City that Chuck showed him. Sights and scenes that expose microcracks in the strata of the Modern state.

4.3.3 Nomad and the Romantic Relationship

Romantically, we are “conjugated between” men and women, girlfriends and boyfriends, husbands and wives. These conjugations create family, and The Modern state appropriates the family to create the feeling of patriotism in its citizens. The love one feels for his father is projected onto the state; resultantly, he is happy to die for it when he is called on to do so. In the wake of the 9/11 attacks, the US used patriotism to create a unified subject against what President Bush described as the “evil actors.”

The nomad evades reterritorialisation into the segments of romantic relationship by forming what Deleuze and Guattari call “passional Complex.” Chuck appears to form the “passional Complex” by having his wife at his home, a mistress in the city, and an escort for his meetings. When Hans bumps into Chuck on the ferry, he meets his mistress, whom he mistakes for his girlfriend. “His girlfriend elbowed him… They laughed together, and of course it struck me that they made an unusual couple: she, American, white, petite, and fair-haired; he, a portly immigrant a decade older and very dark—like Coca-Cola…” (O’Neill 14). Hans is mistaken because, being conjugated himself, he cannot imagine anyone behaving differently. Later, of course, he understands that the lady on the ferry was his mistress (O’Neill 64). Hans achieves this

understanding when he becomes acquainted with Ann, Chuck's wife, who has come to America because of her husband. Chuck neither takes his wife nor his mistress to the meeting of the cricket clubs. Instead, he goes with Avalon. Some might call him an amoral womanizer. But he is the prudent nomad. He must form the "Passional complex" or be ready to be reterritorialize by the Modern state. Hans, after all, appears to be reterritorialised by his relationship with Rachael.

4.3.4 Nomad and Postcoloniality

Chuck's deterritorialisation of the American Modern is state does not appear to be the revolt of an alienated person tormented by colonial memories. The figure of the nomad is neither colonial nor postcolonial. For all its resistance and reversal of the colonial state, the postcolonial state is the triumph of similar machinic processes. It deterritorialises to reterritorialise. It is also the modern state. As a "deterritorialised par excellence," the nomad must cause leaks in the same state. This is the reason that neither Julius nor Chuck seems to have a postcolonial sensibility. Arguably, they are not waging a war in the centre of the empire on behalf of the countries of their birth.

Just like Julius, Chuck appears to maintain a distance from the country of his origin. He introduces himself to Hans as an American, to which his mistress objects. "What do you want me to say?" He wonders, "Trinidad," she replies (O'Neill 14). He does not appear to be nostalgic about Trinidad at all. "'That's Trinidad for you,' Chuck declared darkly. 'It's just full of people against this, against that. Negativity is a national disease'" (O'Neill 138). In fact, he forcefully instructs his wife to bury him in Brooklyn, "Not Trinidad, not Long Island, not Queens" (O'Neill 146). Any supposed argument about Chuck's nostalgia for Trinidad seems to lack foundation because he adapts well to a new society. His only problem is the rigid segments on the first line, which he tries to deterritorialise. His lack of nostalgia can be understood to be caused by his nomadic subjectivity. Nomad does not appear to make a difference between the modern state, regardless of its particular manifestation being a postcolonial or precolonial state. What he desires, above all, is the alternative conception of the mode of political organisation.

4.4 Conclusion

In this chapter, through a close reading of *Open City* and *Netherland*, I tried to explain how Julius and Chuck deterritorialise themselves and evade categorisation by

the rigid segments on the first line. Julius achieves his nomadic subjectivity by challenging the binaries of normal/abnormal, doctor/patient in his psychiatric practice, by his aimless wanderings through the city, by refusing to submit to racial labelling, and by enjoying the music that is deterritorialised. These acts and choices free him slowly and steadily from the territoriality of the modern state. Julius is cautious in the expression of his nomadism; therefore, he is invisible to the modern state.

On the other hand, Chuck creates his nomadic subjectivity through contingencies and improvisations. He deterritorialises friendship by forming relations that are not susceptible to definition, romantic ties by forming a passionate complex outside family, and postcolonial identity by a lack of belonging to his home country. His nomadism is bolder and more visible than Julius, which makes him more vulnerable to reterritorialisation. Despite his difference from Julius, he is able to slip through the categories that are used by the modern state to contain or exclude humans.

The difference between Julius and Chuck shows that nomadism is not a monolith, but a range of intensities. While some nomads are cautious, others are not, but they weaken the pull of categories of the modern state and suggest the possibilities of living differently. The analysis of this chapter shows how the practices of deterritorialisation prepare the ground for the next step, that is, a challenge to the modern state. The next chapter shows how the modern state is deterritorialised when the nomadic flow is directed outwards and turned against it.

CHAPTER 5

DETERRITORIALISING THE MODERN STATE

In the last chapter, I explained how Julius and Chuck deterritorialise themselves and construct nomadic subjectivity by avoiding capture by the segments on the first line. Nomadism, however, is not only a private act. It flows outward and challenges the machinic process, that is, the logic of dualism used by the modern state in its creation. As the modern state becomes increasingly reliant on the right of exclusion to maintain the internal coherent self against the external threatening other, the question of how the escape of the nomad exposes a crack in its structure acquires significance.

By deterritorialisation of the modern state, I mean, the problematisation the logic of dualism that creates the internal self against the external other. Julius achieves this deterritorialisation through his nomadic wanderings, which allow him to enact his historiography and provide him with encounters with the gray zone of the immigrants. Chuck uses cricket, whose unpredictability is unsuited for the stratification of the US. Both challenge the foundation of the modern state.

I have developed the analysis in three plateaus. First, I have explained how Julius's wander becomes a medium of deterritorialisation and suggest an alternative mode of political organisation. I have also discussed the role cricket plays for Chuck in deterritorialisation. In the second plateau, I have tried to show how Cole and O'Neill use historiographic metafiction to problematise the boundary between fact and fiction in order to challenge the history of the modern state and foreground the histories that were forgotten. The third plateau examines the gray zone of the immigrants where the binary of citizens/aliens collapses. This chapter also discusses the dangers of the line of flight.

5.1 The Medium of Deterritorialising the State

In the last chapter, I claimed that Julius' wanderings work as a metaphor for his nomadic identity. It is also a medium for deterritorialising the Modern state. In the context of 9/11 and the tightening control of the modern state over the movement of people within its territory, these wanderings emerge as an effective strategy to counteract state control over the state because they serve as a node of resistance, a

moment of smoothness in the striated space. During his walks, he covers the city blocks “as though measuring them with his stride” (Cole 3). In measuring them, he acquires a sort of transient ownership over them, the ownership he uses to “sort” them until “the forms” begin to morph into each other and assume abstract shapes unrelated to the real city (Cole 4). And here lies the power of the nomadic flaneur, the mere act of walking appears to put him in the position to form his imaginary of the city in particular and of the Modern state in general. The imaginary can be used to conceptualise an alternative form of the modes of political organisation. The modern state as a mode of political organisation is, after all, the mental reality of the few which becomes the dominant reality of all. There seems to be no reason, at least purely on ontological grounds, for objecting to Julius' mental reality becoming the dominant reality, his nomadic imaginary inspiring an imaginary alternate conception of political organisation that is not based on the logic of dualism. The nomadic wanderings enrich our imagination by suggestions of the alternative. The suggestion we readily receive all the more for emanating from a work of literature because literature, excellently written, enthrals our senses and delights our mind. The suggestion of the alternate is, without a doubt, a great victory in the present moment for the dwellers of the wasteland of possibilities. Julius's walks through the city seemingly enables him to comment on places and persons he finds on the way around him, exposing places beneath places and histories beneath the history. The sensitivity for the sufferings of his patients transforms into a compassion for the sufferings of men: Indians and blacks who suffered because they were not citizens. Thus, the configurative nature of violence at the heart of the modern state, systematically concealed, is definitely exposed.

Julius' walks are the nomadic transit taken on the ground in parallel with the migration of birds in the air. He himself affirms the connection at the beginning of the novel. “Not long before this aimless wandering began, I had fallen into the habit of watching bird migrations from my apartment, and I wonder now if the two are connected” (Cole 2). And this connection is extremely important for the flow of deterritorialisation and for suggesting, if not offering, an alternative conception of subjectivity and modes of political organisation. When Julius sees “the auspices… of natural immigration,” he wonders how things below would look from their “perspective, and imagined that, were they ever to indulge in such speculation, the high-rises might seem to them like firs massed in a grove” (Cole 2). Their perspective is

different because their way of life is different. In their "natural immigration," they reject all the boundaries artificially inscribed and do not prefer some birds over others, as the modern state does in its hierarchy of citizens over men. They are closer to nature, the deterritorialised state, where the smooth has not been reterritorialised by the strata. It is this quality of the birds that allows the nomad, in the words of Craig Mundi, to live "smooth in a city" (236-39).

When Julius cannot access this smoothness by watching the birds in the sky, he does it by listening to the voice of European radio announcers on the air. "Those disembodied voices remain connected in my mind, even now, with the apparition of migrating geese" (Cole 2). He is not interested in what they say, but what they represent to him. "Though I often couldn't understand the announcers…" (Cole 2). The phrase "disembodied voices" suggests that the voice is apart from the person sitting in the booth. The person in the booth may be reterritorialised into the segments of the Modern state, but not their voice traveling on air. Like the migrating birds, it flies over seas and plains and mountains, not recognising the arbitrary limits set by artificial boundaries of the state. This is the reason that Deleuze and Guattari contend that just as "there are women in men" and persons in the class, there is smooth in the state despite the stranglehold of its striation. In resonating with the migrating birds and the "disembodied voice," Julius, through his walks, causes cracks in the strata of the Modern state.

Chuck is neither the "physical walking" type whom Agnès Varda admires, nor the "neurotic lying on the couch" type whom Deleuze and Guattari disparage (Asli Özgen Tuncer 105). Cricket is his mode of deterritorialisation. Cricket, the unpredictable game, is strangely suited for Chuck, the unpredictable man. It is unlike baseball, the American sport where "conditions are very similar from match to match, from stadium to stadium;" in cricket, "conditions may be dissimilar from day to day and from ground to ground" (136). Who knows how a wicket will behave on a given day? Will grass stay true and offer seam and swing to the ballers, or will it dry up and reveal a batting paradise beneath it?

This unpredictability acquires a special intensity in the US. There, the "Outfield" is "overgrown;" the pitch is made of the "pale sandy baseball clay;" the team consists of immigrants; the trees are considered a part of the boundaries, and the batter is forced to play in the air (O'Neill 5-7). And there, it does not enjoy the support of the

majority of the populous; therefore, it does not receive the patronage of the government. On the contrary, cricket is only allowed to be played, according to Chuck, “as a matter of indulgence. And if we step out of line, believe me, this indulgence disappears” (O’Neill 12). This is definitely inconvenient for the players who cannot take the field when a baseball match is scheduled. But cricket out of favour means that the risk of deterritorialisation is sufficiently minimised, if not completely eliminated. Chuck can referee a cricket match, can deliver a speech on its importance, and can dream New York Cricket Club without fearing the pull of the machine of territoriality.

This is not the case in the cricket-playing countries. In India and Pakistan, for example, cricket is used as one of the processes to develop an internal coherent identity. In the US, through Chuck's nomadic flow, the bond between the spectators and players, used by the Modern state to strengthen the national bond, is turned against it. The bond between the players drives them to stay with Shiv when he is abandoned by his wife, and brings Hans to the ground when he is feeling lost because his wife, Racheal, has moved on. Chuck relies on this bond to deterritorialise Hans or insinuate himself into his narrative. As mentioned above, without this bond, they do not have anything in common. “I was having trouble sharing his vision of this ice and waste… But I was also drawn to Chuck…” (O’Neill 74, 91). Rachael is baffled by their friendship, especially after Hans witnesses his brutal way of conducting business. Racheal does not know that cricket activates the amygdala, as Hans declares, “moments of cricket are scorched in my mind like sexual memories” (O’Neill 42). With the amygdala activated, it is difficult to have a reasonable explanation for our actions. And in the absence of reason, the nomad can operate easily. Thus, Hans comes back onto the first lines, but his re-entry is not without the echoes of the nomadic flow.

Cricket also enables Chuck to engage in countering the official history of the Modern state. He considers the New York Cricket Club as a “new chapter in the history of US.” He is also conscious of the potential of cricket in providing an alternative perspective. “You want a taste of how it feels to be a Black man in this country?” Put on the white clothes of the cricketer” (O’Neill 12). Thus, for Chuck, cricket is not a sport, but it is a mode of deterritorialisation.

5.2 Nomad and Historiographic Metafiction

"A nation is a soul, a spiritual principle. Two things which, properly speaking, are really one and the same constitute this soul, this spiritual principle. One is the past, the other is present" (Renan 10). Renan means by past what Lenda Hutcheon understands to be history. He is right in asserting that the two— the common history and the present consent—are in reality one. The present consent comes out of the presence of the history of the nation-state. Nation-making is, therefore, history-making. Everywhere, important events in the history of the state are commemorated, and its heroes celebrated. Americans take pride in "government for the people they created," the Civil War they survived, and the domination of Europe they prevented twice by Germany and once by Russia. The British are so fond of their history that they cling steadfastly to what has become a relic of the past elsewhere, the Monarchy. But history-making is not specifically a Western phenomenon. When Hindus, in colonial India, felt the need for the formation of their own nationality, Sarvarkar, in "Hindutva," fell on Ancient India. M.A. Jinnah was not far behind. He pronounced, "Pakistan was created the day the first Indian entered the fold of Islam", as cited in (Rabbani 8). The evidence of the existence of the nation is drawn from what happened in the past. But our access to the past, Lenda Hutcheon argues, is doubtful. It only survives in the written word, and the written word, intentionally or unintentionally, may easily be distorted. This distortion transfigures into history, and history creates the nation through the right of exclusion. Those who share the glories of the past are embraced as citizens; the rest remain men. M.A. Jinnah, in his presidential speech to the Muslim League, pronounced Hindus and Muslims as two separate nations because they "derive their inspiration from different sources of history."

To challenge the internal self-created by the logic of dualism, the nomad is seemingly required to question the objectivity, transparency, and neutrality of history, so that history gives way to histories and truth to truths. History constructs the coherent self by having the violence forgotten that was committed to forge the national unity. Cole in *Open City* and O'Neill in *Netherland* appear to borrow some features of the historiographic metafiction because historiographic metafiction offers them a way to dislodge the history of the lofty position it occupies. In both novels, there is a marriage of the fictive and the "Historical referent." Both unfold in the shadow of the darkest chapter in the recent history of the US 9/11.

Cole in *Open City* appears to use the suffering caused by 9/11 to enable Julius to discover the suffering of other people in other places. Julius discovers the suffering of native Americans, the tribe of B. who suffered because they found themselves in the way of the "monster of Amsterdam." Implicit in their story is the story of other native tribes who found themselves at the barrel of the gun of others bent on colonising their land. Cole seems to suggest that such violence was not incidental, but constitutive of the modern state. As Bradley Klein argues in Genealogy of the State as strategic subject, "strategic violence not only patrol the boundaries," but constitutes them, creating a difference between the internal and external, a difference central to identity of the nation-state (Burchill 172). Since the modern state is always in a process of becoming, the role of violence as a constitutive principle is not restricted to its origin. Cole arguably underscores this point through the episode of internment experienced by Professor Seto in the Second World War, who was considered an outsider because of his Japanese nationality. "We were all confused about what was happening; we were American, had always thought ourselves so, and not Japanese" (Cole 9). It seems as if violence appears when the modern state feels threatened. Julius's visit to the cinema confirms this when he watches a movie about the life of Edi, who was one of the most violent dictators in Africa. This blend of the historic and the fictive makes *Open City* a historiographic metafiction. Julius is a fictitious character, yet the historical referents, the dislocation of Indians, the internment of Japanese, and the violence of the African dictators are real.

Cole seems to draw on the technique common to historiographic metafiction to situate Julius in the physical context of New York. Cole grounds Julius's wanderings in specific streets, parks, and neighbourhoods of New York, where his memory and history inform the readers about the violence perpetrated in the city. In walking from Morningside Heights to Central Park and from Harlem Street to the Hudson River, Julius comes in contact with the metropolis as a palimpsest. These layers of the city under the city allow him to foreground the voices that have been forgotten in the zeal of creating the internal self. Julius says, "New York City worked itself into my life at walking pace" (Cole 1).

In O'Neill's *Netherland*, the historical referent 9/11 creates personal consequences for Hans, a fictive person. He is married to his wife Rachel, who, on finding a job opportunity in New York, persuades him to shift to the US (42). They

appeared to be getting along nicely. Then, the terrorists destroy the two towers; the destruction of the two towers leads to the rupture of their marriage. Of course, there were latent problems in their relationship. If it was the “marriage of the true minds,” it was never the marriage of equal partners. As mentioned above, it was she who introduced him to the cinema and defined his taste in food. Yet they were happy; in subversion of the gender roles, Rachel was the giver and Hans was the taker. Things started going bad when living in fear of the next strike, the giver is no longer happy in her role. They drift apart because Rachel feels that Hans has left her alone in the city menaced by the terrorists. Failing to cope alone in the city, she decides to return to England and forbids Hans from doing the same. He came to the US because she wanted to come, but now that the giver is not happy in her role, she would not let him join him in her return. Although the separation was understood to last a short time, it developed into a rupture because of the politics of terrorism.

The only real argument in the novel takes place in the wake of the US and Britain's decision to go ahead with the pre-emptive attack on Iraq (O’Neill 85-87). Hans is undecided as usual, and Rachel is incensed so much that she cannot see herself living in a country that wages war on other countries. And to stop her own country from doing the same, she goes to anti-war rallies.

Apart from 9/11, there are other historical referents in both novels. In *Open City*, Julius's comments on Global Warming are based on scientific estimates, not the imagining of the author. The artists, musicians, and photojournalists mentioned in the narrative are real persons, historical referents. Any lover of music can recognise Mahler who is one of the modern musical giants. Henri Cartier's theory of the “decisive moment” is also real and has influenced the field of photojournalism for decades. These historical referents reported through the fictive medium blur the boundary between history and fiction.

In *Netherland*, the historical referents operate differently but create a similar effect. For example, the bursting of the dot-com bubble is mentioned briefly. Although it was a moment of economic disruption, not many may remember it. Jack B. Grubman and Henry Blodget, the architects of the tech and telecommunications scandal, are also recalled by Hans in the narrative. The Dutch presence in New York is also a fact.

The blend of the fictive and the real repudiate history's ability to represent the true past. Historiographic metafiction, however, does not make the same claim for itself. The nomad does not deterritorialise to reterritorialise what has been deterritorialised. The enchantment of history on men is not broken to ensorcel them again. *Open City* and *Netherland* simultaneously "install and subvert" their claim to the true version of the past. Julius, with his analytical voice and with the historical referent, certainly looks authentic. But this authenticity is shattered by Moji when she reminds him of the violence he had inflicted and conveniently forgotten. *Netherland* comes close to authenticity with the historical referents and the facts of Chuck, yet falls short because of Hans' indecisiveness and Chuck's criminality. But it is not the failure of the novels. It is rather their success. With history being discredited, the only truth remains in multiple forms. There is a truth told by history; there is a truth told by fiction; there is a truth told by Julius; there is a truth told by Chuck. All of them are wrong. All of them are right. None should be forgotten.

If historiographic metafiction challenges the authority of history, historical inquiry exposes the silences and erasures that are a part and parcel of the official history of the modern state. Once the novels have discredited history as the true version of the past, they enable the readers to ask the question of what has been forgotten and why.

5.3 Nomad and Historical Inquiry

> Forgetting, I would even say historical error, is an essential factor in the creation of a nation and it is for this reason that the progress of historical studies often poses a threat to nationality. Historical inquiry, in effect, throws light on the violent acts that have taken place at the origin of every political formation, even those that have been the most benevolent in their consequence. Unity is always brutally established (Renan 3).

With history being brought to the level of fiction, the nomadic hero of the fiction can now engage in inquiry into the history of the Modern state to unsilence the voices that have been systematically silenced and uncover the histories that have been deliberately covered. The narrative of the US celebrates "Manifest Destiny," the expansion of settlers across the North American continent that created the land of opportunity. This narrative conveniently forgets two things: who the continent was

taken from and whose labour created the opportunity. It also forgets to mention the true beneficiary of the opportunities. Perhaps, Renan is right in asserting that the act of forgetting serves the Modern state; however, it does not serve those who were forgotten, especially if the act of forgetting creates the false binary between citizens and men.

In both novels, the non-nomadic characters resort to historical inquiry to resist this systematic amnesia. Julius, through his nomadic wanderings, remembers Native Americans who were ethnically cleansed to free the continent for the expression of the "Manifest Destiny" and blacks who were kept as slaves in the "land of liberty." Chuck tries to point to the forgotten past of New York. By bringing attention to the Dutch presence, by asserting that Cricket was played in America before the twentieth century, he puts our access to the past under inquiry. The fact that Hans is surprised when Chuck gives him a book of nursery rhymes that was published in New York, but was written in Dutch, appears to confirm the success of the act of forgetting.

Nowhere is the act of forgetting more apparent than in the history of migration to the United States. Throughout the eighteenth and nineteen centuries, the US was a famous destination for migrants from the Old World. There were two types of migrants. The first type came in hopes of personal, economic, or religious freedom. The second was brought to the continent because they had lost their freedom in their homeland. The first group, mostly Europeans, became masters of the continent. The second, Africans, were brought in chains and in chains they remained even after the American independence.

"Ellis Island was a symbol mostly for European refugees. Blacks, "we blacks," had known rougher ports of entry: this, I could admit to myself now that my mood was less impatient, was what the cabdriver had meant" (43). Then the narrative of the US tells us that the North went to war against the South because of the immorality of the institution of slavery. Julius does not appear to accept such simplification. He suggests that North wanted to protect their way of life. Their opposition can be understood to be a version of MAGA's opposition to immigrant workers. As long as slavery did not affect the supply of labour to the industries, they looked the other way and lent the "area around Battery Park" to the shipping trade (Cole 137). The shipping trade was responsible for the huge supply of slaves to the South. What is ironic is that the "union

war against slavery" was financed by Moses Taylor, one of the primary beneficiaries of the slave trade.

Traces of the erasure of the slaves can be found in New York. Julius tells us, "Into this earth had been interred the bodies of some fifteen to twenty thousand blacks, most of them slaves, but then the land had been built over and the people of the city had forgotten that it was a burial ground" (Cole 176). This foregrounding of the alternative history of the US by Julius begs us to ask the question Who are the citizens united against men? Do Blacks, without sharing the glories of the past with the whites, qualify as citizens?

Blacks are undoubtedly the victims of the act of forgetting used by the Modern state to forge unity. Still, they are spared the worst that the state can do. A case in point is the native Americans. The continent that became the US through the "Manifest Destiny" was not an unpopulated region of the world ready to be conquered. We remember, Julius tells us, the two towers, but we have forgotten the streets that were "demolished to make way" for them; We remember New York as a state of the US, but we are completely amnesiac about the native people who had to be cleansed off to make way for it (Cole 46).

> There had been communities here before Columbus ever set sail, before Verrazano anchored his ships in the narrows, or the black Portuguese slave trader Esteban Gómez sailed up the Hudson; human beings had lived here, built homes, and quarrelled with their neighbours long before the Dutch ever saw a business opportunity in the rich furs and timber of the island and its calm bay (Cole 46).

Regardless of how strongly the state exerts the pull of territoriality, regardless of how forceful the official history is in performing the act of forgetting, it leaves traces of the other history. Traces from which an alternative version of the past can be created and the Modern state challenged. Especially when the traces are contained in living human beings. How could a member of the Delaware tribe and a university professor regard herself as a citizen of the US when she knows how the Northeast was depopulated by them? B., who is Julius' patient, vehemently tells him, "I can't pretend it isn't about my life; she said to me once, it is my life. It's a difficult thing to live in a

country that has erased your past" (Cole 43). It becomes doubly difficult when the Modern state does not recognise your pain and exhorts you to forget it. The language used in the newspapers of the day for the catastrophe of her tribe was "calm and pious language that presented mass murder as little more than the regrettable side effect of colonising the land" (20). Forgetting may serve the interest of some, but not of the victims of the violence. Foregrounding these traces is a strategy of the nomadic figures like Julius to challenge the binary of citizens/aliens and deterritorialise the modern state.

In giving voice to the voiceless, Julius questions the ethics of the Modern state. We have been told by Renan and others that it is, ethically, the right choice to support the Modern system because it is based on the consent of the citizens. But when the present consent is based on the false version of the past and when the national unity has come out of the violence that was later forgotten, it no longer remains ethical. The historical inquiry carried out by the nomadic Julius seems to show that violence created the Modern state, and Violence maintains it. And like any system created by violence, it is likely to give way to another. Whether the next system will be based on is the right of exclusion is an important to ask. To raise questions like Julius, we have to deterritorialise ourselves like Julius, or we will fail to grasp the importance of remembrance.

New York was a Dutch colony before it was ceded to the British Empire. Chuck, in his efforts to deterritorialise Hans, tries to remind him of this past by gifting him a book of nursery rhymes published when New York was called the New *Netherland*. The word "Yankee" itself, I was informed, came from that simplest of Dutch names—Jan (O'Neill 141). Unlike the histories of the Indians and Blacks, the past of the Dutch was not subject to the same act of forgetting. Their graves still carry the inscription of their names, "Jansen, van Dam, de Jong…" (O'Neill 141).

Hans, however, does not realise the importance of remembrance. Being segmented on the first line, he fails to understand how forgetting and remembrance lead to inclusion and exclusion in the modern state. Chuck's attempts at remembering the past can be interpreted as a strategy of resistance. Hans' failure to resonate with Chuck indicates the inability of those captured by the segments of the modern state to recognise the cracks through which the alternative histories may assert themselves.

"But then what? What was one supposed to do with such information? I had no idea what to feel or what to think, no idea, in short, of what I might do to discharge the obligation of remembrance that fixed itself to one in this anomalous place" (O'Neill 141).

5.4 Nomad and the Grey Zone of the Immigrants

With the postmodern inquiry into history, Julius in *Open City* and Chuck in *Netherland* combine access to what Richard Ashly calls the grey zone of the immigrants to deterritorialise the Modern state. The immigrants exist in the grey zone because they cannot be captured by the segments of citizens and men. They live their lives in between places, in limbo, divided between the home and host countries. With the former pushing them to the past and the latter pushing them to the future, none can call them citizens, and none can exclude them as men. They are neither the internal coherent self nor the external threatening other. The logic of dualism that empowers the right of exclusion fails in their presence. What attracts the nomad to the grey zone of the immigrants is its perceptibility to the least critical observer. Unlike the remembrance of the past that can be ignored easily, the gray zone of the immigrants encroaches on the first line. Despite Hans's indifference to remembrance of the past, he cannot unsee the gray zone when Chuck brings his attention to it on their driving promenades. Julius takes us to these zones through his walks, and Chuck takes Hans through the instructional driving, ending at the Bald Eagle cricket ground.

In Harlem, Julius encounters the grey zone for the first time. He finds the immigrants resisting the stratification of the US by rejecting its cultural values. And as already mentioned, culture, apart from history, is the machinic process involved in forging national unity. In the US, the American dream has been used to create a common link among its diverse population. The American dream as a value entails commitment to a certain lifestyle. There are some fortunate enough to maintain the lifestyle, and there are others clever enough to fake it. In both cases, fixation on the present allows for forgetting of the past. By forgetting the past, it is difficult to resist the machine of territoriality. Thus, the immigrants prefer to have "brisk trade of sidewalk salesmen: the Senegalese cloth merchants, the young men selling bootleg DVDs, the Nation of Islam stalls" (14).

The push and pull between the present and the past, between the host and the home country that the immigrants experience in the grey zone make them unsusceptible to the binary of the citizens/aliens. The immigrants live in the US, but in their lifestyle, they mimic those in African countries. They carry within them traces of their home countries, which are visible in the goods on display: "Bundles of incense, vials of perfume and essential oils, djembe drums, and little tourist tchotchkes from Africa" (Cole 14). This is their way of resisting the territoriality. It is the dilemma of the American Modern state that the immigrants might mimic African countries, but they are not Africans. Their resistance to the internal self does not automatically make them a part of the external, threatening others. They are living in the US and cannot or would not return to Africa for all their nostalgic sentiments. Indeed, they are Torn between America and Africa. Neither citizens nor men, they are immigrants. And this seems to be enough for Julius to find resonance with them.

Where the point of resonance is strongest, the pull of territoriality is weakest. It is at this point, Julius finds himself outside the boundaries of the space, even time.

> Standing there in that quiet, mote-filled shop, with the ceiling fans creaking overhead, and the wood-panelled walls disclosing nothing of our century, I felt as if I had stumbled into a kink in time and place, that I could easily have been in any one of the many countries to which Chinese merchants had travelled and, for as long as trade had been global, set up their goods for sale. (Cole 152)

The point of resonance between the grey zone of the immigrants and Julius reveals the boundaries of the Modern state as arbitrary. When the shop of the Chinese immigrants possesses an environment so different from the rest of the country, how could it be striated? How could it be lumped together with other generic shops, roads, and streets inside some boundary?

In *Netherland*, Hans' encounter with the grey zone happens when he is in the company of Chuck or thinking about him. "This miscellany was initially undetectable by me. It was Chuck, over the course of subsequent instructional drives, who pointed everything out to me and made me see something of the real Brooklyn, as he called it" (134). In the "Real Brooklyn," the grey zone of the immigrants resists the logic of

dualism with “assorted small businesses proclaiming provenances from Pakistan, Tajikistan, Ethiopia, Turkey, Saudi Arabia, Russia, Armenia, Ghana…” (O’Neill 134). In *Netherland*, the immigrants use the same strategy as used by the immigrants in *Open City*. They use the past in the countries of their origin to disrupt consent in the present in the new country. They create such a powerful resonance that even Hans is forced to admit, “I might have been in a cold Senegal” (O’Neill 66).

The combination of postmodern historical inquiry and encounters with the grey zone of the immigrants plays such an important role in both *Open City* and *Netherland* in deterritorialising the state. When exposing historical errors does not make us question the right of exclusion, the nomad must resort to describing their encounters with the grey zone. The dualism of men and citizens cannot account for the presence of the immigrants. The cry against Illegal immigrants in the US, the rage against Afghan immigrants in Pakistan, and the blocking of the borders in Europe are reactions to the deterritorialising nature of the grey zone of the immigrants. There are citizens; there are men. But there are also immigrants.

5.5 The Dangers of Deterritorialisation

Deterritorialisation taken too far can become perilous for the nomad. The line of flight is undoubtedly the ultimate expression of nomadism. But it is also fraught with dangers when used to cause leaks in the strata of the Modern state. Julius remains safe in his deterritorialisation of the Modern state because he is cautious. Chuck is reckless and has to pay the ultimate price. “The terrible telescope array” is unrelenting in smoothing the cracks in the line of segmentarity. For all the talk of consent, it is violence that configures the Modern state. Once the nomad is noticed by the “Terrible telescope array,” he is reterritorialised so completely that there is no further hope of resistance in the future. In *Netherland* and *Open City*, this reterritorialisation materialises in a number of ways. Chuck loses his life, Saidu loses his freedom and his hopes of making a life in US, Farouq his aspirations to follow in the footsteps of Edward Said. In all the cases, the grip of the machine of territoriality is complete.

In the case of Chuck, there are three instances taking the deterritorialisation of the Modern state to extremes. The first instance is a mild one; therefore, it may have been ignored by the “terrible telescope array.” I have chosen it because it is symptomatic. While meeting Chuck on one occasion, Hans notices that his Cadillac

“was illegally parked on the far side of the road” (134). This instance, while briefly mentioned by Hans, appears alarming. The man who wanted to “wrongfoot everyone” was determined to wrongfoot the Modern state; this determination would have fatal consequences for him. /When he organises the lottery, he crosses the red line. It is a punishable offense in the US. And he knows that. By bringing me into the restaurant, by telling me about his father and making me view his transaction with the Chinese/Koreans, and spinning me a yarn, Chuck was putting me on notice (O’Neill 152).

Chuck does not seem capable of stopping himself from tipping over the third line. The third instance is the one that makes the strongest impression on Hans. Asking him to wait in the car, Chuck enters a building. When he does not reappear, Hans decides to follow him. There he sees that Chuck and Abilski had “terrorised some unfortunate, smashed up his office, shoved his face in the dirt of a flowerpot, threatened him with worse for all I knew…” (O’Neill 199). Committing violence in the strata of the Modern state is defiance of what Max Weber calls its “Monopoly on violence.” For his absolute deterritorialisation of the Modern state, Chuck faces dire consequences. Agnès Varda's Mona ends up in a ditch and Chuck in “Gowanus Canal…” with “handcuffs around his wrists and evidently he was the victim of a murder” (O’Neill 3). Handcuffs are a tool used by the police to restrain criminals. In this case, they were used to reterritorialise Chuck. When the wrongfooter could not be stopped in life, death was the inevitable consequence.

It is unfortunate that the machine of territoriality does not stop at his death. He wanted to be buried in Brooklyn, but his wife, Ann, who herself is on the first line, refuses to honour his wishes in this regard. Hans tries to make her see reason, but she dismisses his plea by declaring, “I his wife. I waited for him for two years. Nobody else waiting; not you, not the police” (O’Neill 220). Chuck, the man of contingencies, in his death becomes a property of his wife. In the end, like Hans, he is reterritorialised by his wife. But he also loses his life.

The Modern state does not always turn to death to prevent the deterritorialisation of its strata. IN the case of Saidu, it deems it enough to imprison him. Finding life unbearable under the dictatorship of James Taylor and not wanting to serve in his army Because of the murder of his sister and mother, Saidu leave the

country with Nigerian soldiers but has to walk alone to reach Bamako; In Bamako he is forced to skulk “around the motor park, eating scraps at the marketplace” (Cole 50-52). After enduring a long journey by way of Tanjir, Spain, Portugal, he finally arrives at his destination at JFK, only to be taken prisoner (Cole 53-54). Just as Chuck's deterritorialisation does not avail him in the end, so does Saidu's journey. Because his wandering stands in outright defiance of the boundaries of the Modern state. Nadjiba Bouallegue believes that illegal immigrants like Saidu can resist striation of the state. The resistance, however, comes at the cost of their freedom.

In most cases, they do not realise their dreams. Saidu tells Julius, “Now they are sending me back, but there is no date, just this waiting and waiting” (Cole 50). Although Saidu temporarily deterritorialises the modern state, it entails permanent consequences. His life is likely to be in peril post deportation to Liberia, where his mother and sister lost their lives, and where he refused conscription in the army.

The case of Faruk is another instance of frustrated hopes caused by deterritorialisation on steroids. His thoughts, not his acts, bring him under the lens of the “terrible telescope.” With his support for Hamas and Hezbollah, his ambivalence towards Al-Qaeda, and his criticism of the “War on Terror,” he combines his philosophy of “Difference as in intrinsic value,” which turns out to be a deadly concoction in the wake of 9/11, crashing him into the wall of “Anti-terror state” (Cole 99-101). His thesis on “Gaston Bachelard's Poetics of Space is rejected and he loses every chance of fulfilling his dreaming of following in the footsteps of Edward Said. Faruk’s mistake is not to temper his views in the wake of 9/11. “There was something powerful about him, a seething intelligence, something that wanted to believe itself indomitable. But he was one of the thwarted ones” (Cole 103).

This is the peril of the line of flight. The power of the nomad comes to nothing if he is not careful in drawing the line of deterritorialisation across the strata of the Modern state. We are at a stage where the Modern system has remained, vastly, unchallenged. It has been so successful that it is difficult to imagine alternatives. Thus, we have to be happy with hints and suggestions for now. The nomad cannot physically resist the Modern state; therefore, he must be cautious in his resistance. Julius appears to know this fact, so he can continue to deterritorialise; to wait for the migration of the

birds soaring over the city. “At quiet moments, I will be able to take the auspices to my heart’s content” (198).

5.6 Conclusion

I have shown in this chapter how Julius in *Open City* and Chuck in *Netherland* deterritorialise the modern state by challenging the logic of dualism that creates, through a right of exclusion, the binary of citizens/aliens. Julius, through his wanderings, brings the smooth to the striated space, suggesting alternative modes of political organisation. Chuck uses cricket in creating connections that deterritorialise the modern state because it is unpredictable, an immigrant sport, and has no government patronage in the U.S. In the chapter, I have also explained how *Open City* and *Netherland* by drawing on the technique of historiographic metafiction, engage in historical inquiry to highlight the act of forgetting that underpins the internal, coherent self. Then, the chapter turns to encounters with the grey zone of immigrants, as portrayed in both novels. These encounters are important because in the gray zone, the binary of citizens/aliens fails to function. In the last section of the chapter, I have discussed how absolute deterritorialisation on the line of flight can be dangerous for the nomad. In *Open City*, Julius remains safe because his deterritorialisation is relative; he is not defiant of the authority of the modern state. On the other hand, Saidu and Farouq are completely reterritorialised because they go on the line of flight against the modern state. In *Netherland*, Chuck also takes deterritorialisation too far; consequently, he loses his life.

CHAPTER 6

CONCLUSION

The world is divided into territorial units, commonly referred to as modern states. These units continue to be created through acts of violence, boundary inscription, and the right of exclusion. The logic of dualism, through the right of exclusion, formulates national identity by creating the categories of citizens and men, so that the former will unite against the latter. My thesis examines Teju Cole's *Open City* and Joesph O'Neill's *Netherland* to determine how the nomadic characters, Julius and Chuck, deterritorialise the Modern state by challenging its right of exclusion.

The first question of my thesis asked how Julius and Chuck deterritorialise themselves. Julius, according to my analysis, achieves the deterritorialisation of the self in a number of ways. Firstly, in the practice of psychiatry, he breaks away from the segments of doctor and patient, normal and abnormal. He listens to his patients not to psychoanalyses them, but to understand them. Bringing hesitation to the field, he tries to prevent crushing of the soul under the burden of the theory. Secondly, he uses his walks in the city to deterritorialise himself. His walks are aimless and directionless, giving him the energy to resist the striation around him. Thirdly, He resists the territoriality of culture, which is one of the elements of the nation. He is indifferent to Jaz because it is an American cultural artefact and, therefore, can seduce him into the machine of territoriality of the Modern state. Since Mahler's music is deterritorialised, as it breaks away from the segments of old and new, east and west, he can love it without running the same risk. Moreover, to further minimize the risk of territoriality, Julius deterritorialises himself from the segment of race. As far as Chuck is concerned, he resists striation by remaining the “man of contingencies”. It is this quality that allows him to insinuate into Hans’ narrative in order to deterritorialise the state. Secondly, he breaks away from the distinctions between friend and foe, stranger and acquaintance. Thirdly, he deterritorialises the segments of romantic relations. This deterritorialisation is especially important because the segments of romantic and non-romantic relationships have been appropriated by the Modern state. As a result, the love we feel for our friends and families is transformed into comradeship among soldiers and patriotism among citizens. Fourthly, by refusing to have sentimental attachments to his

home country, he prevents the blackhole of territoriality from capturing him. Like Julius, Chuck's resistance against the Modern state is pure. It is not motivated by postcolonial sensibility.

The second question asked how Julius and Chuck deterritorialise the Modern state. After they have deterritorialised themselves, Julius and Chuck turn their nomadic flow against the Modern state by challenging the internal coherent self and the external threatening other created by the logic of dualism through the right of exclusion. Internal cohesion, consent in the present, is manufactured by the official history of the Modern state through the act of forgetting. Hence, Cole's *Open City* and O'Neill's *Netherland* first challenge the primacy of history over fiction, then utilise fiction for a postmodern inquiry into history, in order to reverse the national amnesia of the American Modern state. Moreover, encounters with the grey zone of the immigrants are recorded in both the novels where the binary of citizens and aliens, insiders and outsiders fails.

The third question asks how both novels depict the dangers of the line of flight. My analysis of *Open City* and *Netherland* shows that the line of flight poses the danger of complete reterritorialisation to the nomad. Its dangers can materialise in the loss of life, liberty, or ambition.

The study is significant on three grounds. Firstly, it offers a new way of reading 9/11 fiction that is not concentrated on violence, trauma, security, and identity. Secondly, it shows how, through the portrayal of nomadic characters, literature can challenge the modern state. Thirdly, this study combines nomadology with historiographic metafiction to demonstrate how they challenge the narrative of the modern state, allowing them to problematise the internal, coherent self.

6.1 Recommendations

My study expands the scholarly discussion on 9/11 fiction, which has revolved around the exploration of trauma, identity, and violence. It may be useful to explore deterritorialisation in South Asian fiction, which has been marked by resistance to the state's authority. The Scholarly interventions in the South Asian literature have been primarily informed by postcoloniality.

Furthermore, my research only highlights the danger of complete reterritorialisation present on the line of flight. However, Deleuze and Guattari also talk

of other dangers. It will be interesting to examine the danger of the deterritorialised figure, the nomad, becoming the instrument of reterritorialisation in fiction. In this respect, analysing fiction on the French, Russian, and Chinese revolutions is likely to reveal new insights.

WORKS CITED

Anderson, Benedict. "Imagined communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism." *The New Social Theory Reader.* Routledge, 2020. 282-288.

Anderson, Karyn H. "Dangerously Smooth Spaces in Cynthia Shearer's The Celestial Jukebox." *MELUS: Multi-Ethnic Literature of the US* 37.1 (2012): 199-217.

Bouallegue, Nadjiba. “The Modern Nomad in Laila Lalami’s Hope and Other Dangerous Pursuits.” حوليات الآداب واللغات 6.2 (2018): 102-112.

Brown, Chris, and Kirsten Ainley. *Understanding International Relations*. Macmillan International Higher Education, 2009.

Cole, Teju. *Open City: A Novel*. Random House Trade Paperbacks, 2012.

Crownshaw, Richard. "Deterritorializing the “homeland” in American Studies and American fiction after 9/11." Journal of American Studies 45.4 (2011): 757-776.

Debrix, François. “Deterritorialised territories, borderless borders: The new geography of international medical assistance.” Third World Quarterly (1998): 827-846.

Holland, Eugene W. "Deleuze and Guattari's' A Thousand Plateaus'." (2013): 1-192.

Gonzalez, Jeffrey. “The Globalizing Impulse of Post-9/11 Fiction: Open City and Netherland.” MELUS: Multi-Ethnic Literature of the U.S., vol. 41, no. 4, 2016, pp. 200–228. Oxford University Press, https://doi.org/10.1093/melus/mlw040.

Gray, Richard. *After the Fall: American Literature Since 9/11*. Wiley-Blackwell, 2011.

Hartnell, Anna. "Violence and the Faithful in Post-9/11 America: Updike's Terrorist, Islam, and the Specter of Exceptionalism." MFS Modern Fiction Studies 57.3 (2011): 477-502.

Hutcheon, Linda. *A Poetics of Postmodernism: History, Theory, Fiction*. Routledge, 2010.

Irom, Bimbisar. "Towards a Worldly Post-9/11 American Novel: Transnational Disjunctures in Joseph O’Neill’s Netherland." Journal of Transnational American Studies 7.1 (2016).

Islam, Mohammad Shafiqul. “The Ground Zero Novel: Terrorism, Counterterrorism, and Immigrant Literature.” Journal of Comparative Literature and Aesthetics, vol. 32, no. 2, Spring 2023, pp. 145–161.

Keniston, Ann, and Jeanne Follansbee Quinn, eds. *Literature after 9/11*. Routledge, 2013.

Leggatt, Matthew. "Deflecting absence: 9/11 fiction and the memorialization of change." Interdisciplinary Literary Studies 18.2 (2016): 203-221.

Lundy, Craig. "Who are our Nomads today?: Deleuze's political ontology and the revolutionary problematic." Deleuze Studies 7.2 (2013): 231-249.

Morey, Peter. "“The rules of the game have changed”: Mohsin Hamid’s The Reluctant Fundamentalist and post-9/11 fiction." Journal of Postcolonial Writing 47.2 (2011): 135-146.

O'Neill, Joseph. *The Netherland*. Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 2008.

Pisters, Patricia. "Micropolitics of the Migrant Family in Accented Cinema: love and creativity in empire." Shooting the Family: transnational media and intercultural values (2005): 197-212.

Rana, Subir. "The micropolitics and metaphysics of mobility and nomadism: a comparative study of Rahul Sankrityayan’s Ghumakkaṛ Śāstra and Gilles Deleuze/Félix Guattari’s “Nomadology”." Social Theory and Asian Dialogues: Cultivating Planetary Conversations. Singapore: Springer Singapore, 2018. 249-270.

Schaap, Tanya Geraldine. "9/11 Fiction and the Construction of Cultural Trauma." (2015).

Schoene, Berthold. *The Cosmopolitan Novel*. Edinburgh University Press, 2009.

Taylor, James. "When the ‘Buddha’s Tree Itself Becomes a Rhizome’: The Religious Itinerant, Nomad Science and the Buddhist State." Religions 14.2 (2023): 177.

Trendel, Aristie. “Nomadic Flânerie in Teju Cole’s Open City.” Transatlantica: Revue d’études américaines/American Studies Journal, no. 2, 2014.

Tuncer, Asli Özgen. "Women on the move: the politics of walking in Agnès Varda." Deleuze Studies 6.1 (2012): 103-116.

Van Der Ziel, Stanley. "Beneath the Surface: The Subterranean Modernism of Joseph O'Neill's Netherland." Critique: Studies in Contemporary Fiction 56.2 (2015): 207-222.

Williams, Ruth. “A poet's” canny acts of sabotage”: diasporic language in Cathy Park Hong's Dance Dance Revolution.” College Literature 43.4 (2016): 645-667.

Žukauskaitė, Audronė. “Multiplicity as a life: Deleuze, Simondon, Ruyer.” Deleuze, Guattari and the art of multiplicity (2020): 33-49.