

INTRODUCTION

CITING/SITING AFRICA IN THE INDIAN POSTCOLONIAL IMAGINATION

Race was much more than just a tool of Empire: it was (in the Kantian sense) one of the foundational categories of thought that made other perceptions possible.

From Ghosh and Chakrabarty, *A Correspondence on Provincializing Europe*, 2002¹

The apparatus is . . . always linked to certain limits of knowledge that arise from it and, to an equal degree, condition it.

Michel Foucault, *Power/Knowledge* (1980)²

Recent attention to the urgency of economic and political cooperation between the Indian government and African states—otherwise known as south-south globalization—suggests that the time has come for new histories of “Afro-Asian solidarity.” That term gained currency at the famous meeting of over two dozen Third World representatives in Bandung, Indonesia, in 1955 and refers to the story of affinities and exchanges between people of African and South Asian descent which both ensued from and predated that celebrated marker of postcolonial history. Since then, the term has enjoyed popularity as a metaphor for the fraternal connections between ex-colonial people in the wake of decolonization, when Africans and Indians (and others) joined forces to create a non-aligned movement in contradistinction to the two major superpowers, the USA and the USSR. Bandung and the

notion of Afro-Asian solidarity with which it is associated have become touchstones for understanding how postcolonial history unfolded in the Cold War world. Taken together, they are most often cited as the very foundation of postcolonial politics in a global frame.

And yet the term solidarity can be misleading. There is every indication that the terms of endearment between African and Indian communities were strained at best across the landscapes of decolonization. This was true for colonial-born Indians in Durban, for Kenyan students in Delhi and even for politicians like Jawaharlal Nehru and Kwame Nkrumah seeking to navigate the postcolonial world system after 1945. Wherever they shared space, real and imagined, Indians and Africans undoubtedly worked and played together; they also fought with and against each other, sometimes with fatal consequences. *Africa in the Indian Imagination* is an attempt to come to grips with the ins and outs of these relationships, in part by breaking with the redemptive narratives we have inherited from Bandung. Such narratives presume a transracial solidarity *and* a racial confraternity that are belied by the hyphen between Afro and Asian: a hyphen that compresses and elides even as it cuts a variety of ways, ranging from China to Africa to Indonesia, from Kwame Nkrumah to Abdul Nasser to Sukarno to Jawaharlal Nehru. This is especially true when it comes to the question of who was to be on top in the newly postcolonial scene: a pressing issue in a rapidly decolonizing world where racial hierarchies old and new remained consequential to the shape of the postcolonial world order in symbolic and material terms.

As scholars of the period are wont to remind us, there are good reasons for these histories of difference, resentment and suspicion in the Afro-Indian context, among them racialized capitalist relations, colonial-era racial hierarchies, and entrenched practices of racial endogamy.³ Indeed, the fate of postcolonial power entailed questions of interracial sexuality that were critical to, if not constitutive of, the very idea of Afro-Indian relationships (as they were of nationalist

aspirations) in fantasy and in reality. However easily they have tended to slip below the radar of historians and anthropologists, concerns about race mixing between Indians and Africans recast the “inferior” and “superior” bloodline script of colonialism. As they had been before the end of empire, brown-black friendships were danger zones as well as spaces of possibility in the wake of Bandung.⁴ How, exactly, we situate Afro-Asian solidarity in the age of Bandung—*how we cite it*—depends on how attentive we are to race, sex and the politics of citation mobilized by a variety of postcolonial writers and activists grappling with the lived experience of, and in, the jagged hyphen. The role of India and Indians in shaping that citationary apparatus and the work of Africa and Africans in shaping Indian postcolonial imaginaries are the chief subjects of this book.

What is a politics of citation? The writers I dwell on here—Ansuayah R. Singh, Francis Moraes, Chanakya Sen (pen name for Bhabani Sen Gupta) and Phyllis Naidoo—routinely call upon Africa and Africans to stake their claims about India or “Indian” politics in the post-1945 period. In so doing they figure Africa as a pillar of Indian identity: a buttress that gives definition to Indianness and that gives Indians, in turn, their local, regional, national, and global significance in the late 20th century world. Despite what we know about the ideological and material work of a tripartite racial system in the pre-postcolonial and post-imperial worlds of India-Africa, whites do not, in the main, enter the frame, and when they do it is not as a centerpiece but rather as an allusive reference. Whether they are working in Durban or Delhi, as journalists or novelists or activists, the writers here rely on Africans either to testify to the coherence of Indian identity in all its gendered, classed, racialized and sexualized dimensions, or to measure the progressive character of Indian political commitments; or both. This shared citationary practice—which takes various discursive forms but typically involves recurrent references to African history, African “personality,” African labor and even African

sodality—is not simply a recurrent incantation or a nod to a vague set of referents. It is a locative maneuver that serves as a racializing device, positioning Africans as black and Indians as brown, or at the very least as not-African and not-black.⁵ To borrow from the feminist theorist Sara Ahmed, it's a mode of representation that tends to racialize as it relegates, locating people of African descent both below Indians in civilizational terms and behind them in temporal terms.⁶ One effect of this citing/siting maneuver as the subjects of this book mobilize it is to materialize a set of power relations that are deliberately, insouciantly or accidentally vertical. As such, it enables us to see what we might call a top-down approach to Africa and Africans. It's a verticality that can obtain even when the authors desire, or aspire to, horizontal connections and solidarities.

With the partial exception of Naidoo's work, the presence of Africa and Africans in these writings helps to shore up and consolidate an Indian self dependent on a set of racial/izing hierarchies—a citational dynamic that points to a larger set of questions about the circulation of Africa, and of blackness, as a trope of the postcolonial Indian imagination. That Naidoo is from a family of indentured workers, and a communist, surely complicates her citational practice: like many other people of South Asian descent in South Africa of her generation, she expressly rejects polarizing, racialized identities.⁷ In South Africa more generally, merchants and “coolies” have had distinctively different relationships with Africans. Here as elsewhere, questions of caste are as indispensable to histories of race as they are to those of gender and sexuality, leaving a differential mark on Afro-Asian possibility depending on by whom and for whom they are articulated.⁸ As a grid, “brown over black” in Naidoo's Durban is particularly unstable, reminding us in salutary ways of the impediments to generalization across space and time: reminding us, in short, of the tension between the general case and the specific citation. As important, and because of the dynamism inherent in all systems of

power, the effect of the citational practices I've identified across this book is not necessarily to stabilize racial difference or even to ratify Indian claims to progressive politics. For even when they function as the foundation for new developmental hierarchies, Africa and Africans in the texts under consideration repeatedly demonstrate how structurally dependent Indians were on them for their own political and economic fates, thereby showing up the limits of brown-over-black as a strategy for self-making in the process. If Indians strove to imagine themselves as Indians through disavowal of and/or disidentification with blackness, then, they ended up revealing—often unawares—how thoroughly entangled and profoundly interdependent their stories are with histories of African subjects of all kinds.

Although some attention has been paid to the question of race and South Asian postcoloniality, scholars have tended to think that relationship mainly through references to late 20th century blackness in the US, with African-Americans serving as an index in and for theories about the global economies, symbolic and real, of neocolonialism and minoritization. As Malini Johar Schueller has argued, Homi Bhabha, Arjun Appadurai and Gayatri Spivak have all, with different degrees of specificity, cited African American writers (W.E. B. DuBois, Langston Hughes, Toni Morrison) as evidence of the viability of race as an analytical category for postcolonial politics in ways that invoke a theoretical “world target” yet ultimately redound to an Americo-centric frame.⁹ There is a neglected history to these citational practices, outside the immediate ambit of US power, that we cannot afford to ignore. In each of the essays below I make a case for re-materializing how and why people of South Asian descent in a variety of locations used Africa and Africans as referent points for imagining and consolidating a distinctively Indian identity in a Cold War context where the US was part of a superpower paradigm but was, at least in the 1960s and early 1970s, arguably marginal in and to conceptions of Afro-Asian alignments. Though the authors I focus

on are not as famous as the likes of Mohandas Gandhi or Jawaharlal Nehru—figures famous in their own right for siting/citing Afro-Indian connections—they were well known to their contemporaries. Their work is an alternative archive for postcolonial histories that are perhaps over-reliant on the tropes of US racial formation. As such, it offers a contrapuntal history to celebratory accounts of political and affective connection in the age of Bandung.

Of course, histories of Afro-Asian connection predate the 20th century, as Vijay Prashad and others have been at pains to show.¹⁰ There is also a deep history of linkages between African Americans and Indians in 20th century political struggle, what Gerald Horne has called “a lengthy umbilical cord” connecting Black America and post/colonial India.¹¹ That cord was attached to the makers of US Cold War policy, men who kept a nervous eye on postcolonial events in India and Africa and who had trouble comprehending the nature of Afro-Asian tensions except through crude and mainly indiscriminating comparisons of race and caste.¹² There is no denying the impact of US racial formations on these issues—or, as many scholars have explored, the reverse as well.¹³ What I am struck by is how comparatively under-explored the social and cultural history of relationships (political and otherwise) between Indians and Africans actually is, in contrast to the amount of energy that has been spent on tracking a kind of US-global civil rights communitarianism via the analog of race and caste. Even allowing for western prejudices, the fact that contemporary observers felt compelled to puncture the “Bandung myth” by the mid-1960s suggests how overwrought the concept of “a unified, moralizing, crusading Afro-Asia” was—and, to some extent, remains among postcolonial scholars.¹⁴ As Christopher J. Lee and others have shown, the struggle between Afro-Asian nations was on from the very moment of the Bandung itself.¹⁵ If it is to serve as a historiographical pivot, Bandung needs to be re-imagined less as an emancipatory lesson than as a cautionary tale about the racial logics

embedded in postcolonial states from the moment of their inception: about the enduring power of “blood and nation,” in other words. This is true even and especially when we acknowledge that Bandung invariably casts a long—and as Isabel Hofmeyr and others remind us, a decidedly Indian ocean world—shadow over 21st century histories of the postcolonial condition *tout court*.¹⁶

One persistent legacy of Bandung is the presumption that racial confraternity was a characteristic feature of “Afro-Asian” experience in its wake: a horizontal network of affiliations rooted in relationships between leaders in the new world of promising postcolonial men, untroubled by conflicts over race, space, women, family or politics. As the work of Elleke Boehmer and Maria Josefina Saldana-Portillo has so persuasively shown, the heroic anti-colonial movement narrative is precisely a masculinist—and a developmentalist—one, shared by colonialists and revolutionaries alike. Boehmer calls this “the syntax of postcolonial nationalism”: a kind of grammatical usage akin to citation that is taken up by Nehru, Nkrumah, Nelson Mandela and Benjamin Azikiwe in their movement autobiographies. Following this lead, I suggest that we need more accounts that break from the implicitly fraternal narratives underpinning what remains of the romance of Bandung and by extension, of postcolonial politics in its triumphalist, utopian mode.¹⁷ Relationships between African and Indian men were often fraught, vexed not by racial difference in any essential way but by the ways that political economy, domestic habits and political exigencies gave race fractious meanings across the later 20th century world. Nor were men the only players in “Afro-Asian” contexts: women experienced and participated in these tensions in various capacities, though their histories have been deeply submerged in and by accounts of Bandung. It’s time, arguably past time, then, for unsentimentalized histories of cross-racial, interracial community. I seek company with histories that acknowledge racial difference and conflict as full-bodied dimensions of the postcolonial condition in all

its worldly, combative variety, and that, frankly, resist conscription by narratives of overcoming, salvation and redemption as well as of solidarity per se.¹⁸

The point here is not simply to linger on the tensions of Afro-Asian encounter and politics in all their intercontinentality, or to discount the work that Indians and Africans in South Africa and elsewhere did to resist segregation, fight apartheid, or contest the Cold War order in the 1960s and 1970s. Nor is my purpose to excavate or, for that matter, to hypostasize, “Indian” forms of racism or racial thinking. In postcolonial as in colonial contexts, racial logics “were never linear, consistent, or straightforward and were anything but immutable.”¹⁹ Rather, I hope to help to nuance the story that students of postcolonial history tell about post-1945 Afro-Asian friendship, and to materialize some of the citationary practices that continue to inform contemporary histories of decolonization during the Cold War.²⁰ No mere syntactical convenience, the citationary apparatus made visible here—a politics of citation that racializes as it relegates—offers a new vantage point on mid-to-late 20th century histories of India and Africa that requires our critical attention. Such histories are not just genealogies of south-south encounter but, given contemporary political alliances and frictions between Africa and India, they are part of the toolbox of postcolonial geopolitics in all its global ambition as well. With the rise of institutional nodes of exchange and encounter like the Center for Indian Studies in Africa at the University of the Witwatersrand and the Indian Ocean World Centre at McGill, academics north and south and east and west are increasingly part of this complex. As Zeenews.com (an India-based online news source) put it in the run-up to the 2010 World Cup, India and Africa are “joint stock holders in the new emerging dynamics of the world system.”²¹

Whereas postcolonial histories have either emphasized Indians’ relationship with Britons or have glossed their solidarity with Africans, I argue that concerns about south-south racial and sexual politics

need to be (re)integrated into narratives of postcolonial Indian culture and history. Indeed, debates about Africa and India's relationship to it preoccupied postcolonial Indians seeking to be "at home" in an independent nation. One of the tasks of the Nehruvian state was to establish a place for India not simply between two superpowers, but in relationship to the whole of the African continent as well. Nehru echoed the *prima inter pares*, India-over-Africa ethos that had characterized British imperial policy since the late 19th century. For despite his rhetorical support of Afro-Asian solidarity, he did not break entirely from the superstructures of intracolony interdependence that the British empire had created, and from which India was poised to create a new postcolonial empire, with client states and a set of racialized views of the world beyond independent India. Africa was preeminently subject in this Nehruvian vision of an India-centered world order: a function, perhaps, of the new nationalizing imperatives but a vision with a deeper subcontinental history nonetheless.²² In the immediate postcolonial period Africa occupied a civilizationally subordinate position in that vision that reports of Mau Mau's "savagery"—cast as expressions of excessively brutalizing black masculinity—could be seen to underscore. If Nehru was one of the architects of the Africa policy of independent India, he was also a carrier of gentlemanly models of statesmanship that contrasted sharply with those of his African contemporaries—like Jomo Kenyatta, whose rough manner and bootstrap past the postcolonial Indian writer Rama Rau invoked to contrast, unfavorably, with Nehru's Harrow/Cambridge education in her coverage of Kenyatta's trial in 1953, on the threshold of Bandung. Such a comparative frame is not expressly racialized, but it suggests what I have elsewhere called "a competitive politics of . . . postcolonial masculinity that was threaded through hierarchies of race and class even as it helped to produce, by fixing, those categories themselves."²³ Notably, his particular form of gentlemanliness helps account for the fact that Nehru sketched portraits of his fellow delegates at Bandung

for Edwina Mountbatten which included two “hefty and giantly persons” from Gold Coast.²⁴

Nor was Nehru by any means the first to have designs on Africa. Though it is little remarked on in recent work on the globality of 1919, the East African Indian National Congress “respectfully” requested the League of Nations to reserve Tanganyika an “Indian” territory “for the purpose of Indian colonization.” This came on the heels of massive demonstrations by Indians in Nairobi who favored such a plan. In her presidential address at the EAINC in 1924, Sarojini Naidu supported this colonial ambition for India, arguing that “East Africa . . . is the legitimate Colony of the surplus of that great Indian nation.”²⁵ This recourse to anti-imperial moral authority “which masks a patrician disdain for Africans” — when they are considered at all in the landscape of the African continent, that is — has echoes in Nehruvian geopolitics, especially (though not exclusively) where Indians in South Africa were concerned.²⁶ We must begin to complement this high geopolitical story with attention to the writing, thinking and political work of “lesser” figures like Singh and Moraes, Sen and Naidoo, so that we can have a richer, fuller picture of what Indians’ postcolonial imaginary was, both in and outside India itself. We also need histories of its colonial antecedents, given how dispersed they were across the world, in subimperial regions and supra-regional spaces equally, if distinctively. And here I play, obviously, with the kind of citationary apparatus that privileges some voices over others as the repository of Indian histories, whether regional, national, diasporic or global.²⁷

When in the course of working through this project I described it in brief to colleagues, the assumption was that I must be working exclusively on South Africa. Scholars interested in Afro-Asian solidarity have dwelt at length on Gandhi’s early South African history, and understandably so. And yet the preoccupation with Gandhi in South Africa also models some of the critical challenges at the heart of my study. For even when historians note his attitudes towards Africans

(his use of the pejorative “kaffir,” his social and political distance from contemporary African leaders like John Dube, the communalist character of his satyagraha campaign in the Transvaal), there is little recognition that this is but part of a larger story. South African Indians’ commitments to anti-apartheid were rooted in powerfully India/n-centered idioms that shored up communal identities and rarely acknowledged the material conditions that subordinated Africans to most if not all Indians in the streets, marketplaces and neighborhoods under the apartheid state and its predecessors. Even less attention is paid to how heteronormative the Gandhian legacy in South Africa is, or how the early satyagraha campaigns depended on notions of Indian women’s honor that in turn, played on pollution complexes with race and caste subtexts.²⁸

Work that brings all these structural questions into the same frame of analysis is frustratingly rare, for South Africa as elsewhere, and never more so perhaps than where Gandhi is concerned. The sacrality with which his South Africa career tends to be treated, together with an understandable yet nonetheless selective Indian diasporic struggle/heritage narrative, means that seeing both his relations with Africans *and* the landscape of Indian-African relationships more generally is a huge challenge.²⁹ Indeed, until quite recently, our knowledge of relations between Indians and Africans in places like Durban was much “shadowier” than of those between Indians of different classes. As Jon Soske’s work has shown, Indians and Africans mingled in a variety of urban domestic spaces in 20th century Durban, navigating class and race and sexual difference through tense and tender ties. And memoirs like Ismail Meer’s testify to the cosmopolitan worlds of early political activities beyond Durban per se, differences of color, class, community and ideology between South Africans notwithstanding.³⁰

Yet while our understanding of interaction between Africans and Indians in the inner circles of political activism is becoming fuller, we still need accounts that map its complexities and challenge

the endogamy of Indian and African anti-apartheid histories.³¹ This is especially true given the way that South Africa is cited in Indian diaspora studies: as a space of racial trauma and triumphant struggle in which Africans are either seen and not heard or assumed to be self-evident comrades in the fight against apartheid. The Passive Resistance campaign of 1946–48 and its assimilation to global narratives of what we might call U.N. postcolonialism—as evidenced by Vijay Lakshmi Pandit’s representation of the “South African Indian question”—is critical to this citational move, though the complex histories of African-Indian relations on the ground in South Africa rarely inform it. Equally critical is the relationship of postcolonial Indian histories to diasporic ones, especially as those terms are variously mobilized by folks in the US, in India, in South Africa and elsewhere. This is a question so huge that I can, alas, only gesture to it here. But it needs to be teased out in the long run if we are to appreciate when Africa gets cited, when it does not; what gets cited as “Indian,” what does not; and where, when and under what conditions those citational moves matter, and for whom.³²

The asymmetry between Africa as a continent and India as a nation-state is also a huge terminological and conceptual problem. A similar challenge obtains for Durban, both in postcolonial accounts and in this book as well: for just as South Africa is not the whole of the South Asian diaspora in Africa, Durban is also but a slice of the whole as well. Mindful of the selectivity of all citational apparatus, I take up the conversation by suggesting that even as we acknowledge the work that some Indians did and the sacrifices they made in the 1946–48 South Africa campaign, we must begin to dislodge that story from its pride of place in the interracial romance of Bandung or, at the very least, cite it differently in our narratives of the 1950s and after. As Ansuah R. Singh’s 1960 novel *Behold the Earth Mourns* dramatizes, spaces in which colonial-born Indians and indigenous Africans did coexist in the heat of political struggle were rife with tension and its

possibilities: evidence of the yoked histories of Indian and African freedom fighting yet to be fully written, and of the ways that threats to endogamous conjugality helped inexorably to shape them.

South Africa is clearly critical to questions of Afro-Asian solidarity, and I have book-ended this volume with two South African writers of Indian descent, beginning with Singh and ending with Phyllis Naidoo's 2002 auto/biographical account of Indian/African relations in the context of the late 20th century anti-apartheid struggle, *Footprints in Grey Street*. Yet even rethinking South Africa in the history of Afro-Asian "solidarity" beyond Gandhi does not tell the whole story of its convulsive histories in the post-1945/post-1947 period. For that we must look to the heart of the subcontinent itself. Whether from the window of an airplane (as in Moraes' 1965 *The Importance of Being Black*) or via the inner chambers of the postcolonial bureaucracy (as in Sen's 1973 novel, *The Morning After*), Africa was on the minds of Indians in India in the decades following independence—in part because Africans were in India proper as students of both Gandhi and "development," in part because the demands of new African states had to be reckoned with in a decolonizing world. Even more mundanely, Africa came to the sightlines of Indians in India through a variety of newspaper accounts, family stories, educational experiences and commercial transactions. This is a phenomenon worth lingering on, given the communities of Africans—Habshis, Sidis—who have peopled India through the centuries and who have been largely elided in general histories of India or in postcolonial accounts of race in/and India, including those I deal with here.³³ They are part of the politics of color—and of reproduction—that was being worked out in postcolonial India and they merit fuller attention in their own right, as well as alongside the histories of brown over black I am seeking to engage. And while these entanglements remain to be fully historicized for the post-1947 period, let alone for the whole 20th century, Indians were undoubtedly consumers of Africa, literally and figuratively, in

many dimensions of their social, political and domestic lives. Even when it took the shape of colonial-born Indians or indentured laborers, “Africa” invaded their dreams, as the vivid images from Subbalakshmi’s fragmented, teeming archive so provocatively remind us.³⁴

Taken together, what each of the essays here indicates is that the will to a color-blind account of solidarities between Africans and Indians in the service of a transnational or global history of political resistance is in danger of disappearing important and often painful histories of racial dis-ease—histories that were the result of Gandhian legacies, British imperial policies, caste politics and local interactions between communities of color on the ground in various parts of Africa itself. The vertical force of the British empire and its racializing apparatus at multiple levels clearly deserves attention, not least because determining where colonial categories and labor practices end and “local” apprehensions of racial difference and communal identity begin is so notoriously hard. But the embeddedness of that imperial legacy in the global system of a post-1945/post-1947 UN world cannot be discounted either. For it was this interdependent frame—postcolonial but not quite (ever?) post-imperial—that was on the horizon as ex-colonial leaders like Nehru and Kenyatta and Nkrumah all looked ahead to what they knew would be at once discrete and interlinked futures.³⁵ In this sense, provincializing empire—or, rather, calibrating its historical and explanatory weight with care—is an important challenge for all postcolonial histories.³⁶

The visions and the histories that postcolonial nation-states produced have, crucially, been shot through with presumptions, largely unacknowledged, about the link between heteronormativity and the socio-political order. *Africa in the Indian Imagination* aims to historicize the role of Africa and of blackness in the emergence of a postcolonial Indian identity that was both transnational and diasporic, but no less conscious of or invested in racial and sexual difference for being both. Tracking Indians’ embrace and disavowal of racial

solidarity—what Thomas Blom Hansen calls an “unwieldy fetish”—through articulations of postcolonial sexuality is indispensable for understanding late 20th century ideas about Africa “in the world” and for beginning to historicize the contours of a racially differentiated post-1945 landscape beyond the shadow of western racial formations and as crucially, contiguous with but not contained by US-centric discourses of race.³⁷ Even allowing for the validity of the claim made by John D. Kelly and Martha Kaplan that “anticolonial movements . . . were a condition of possibility for the success of the American plan for reorganizing the world”—indeed, even allowing for the ways in which many elites and non-elites came to grips with Indian postcolonial history via the example of the US—I want to keep the US in proportion here, because there is much to be gained by re-scaling the role of the US in accounts of postcolonial politics and imagination as well. I take this to be an extension, in fact, of Kelly and Kaplan’s call for more careful attention to the specific iterations of US power in the making of the neo-imperial worlds of the late 20th century. Given the ways that historians of the US and South Africa have cited a shared exceptionalism to link histories of Jim Crow and apartheid, taking careful account of the proportionality of American influence and connection seems prudent. Given the traffic, analogical and otherwise, between Dalits and African Americans, doing so is arguably crucial to being able to measure its density against the examples of nationalist/high caste citationary practice I make visible. And given the role of South Africa in that traffic—the centrality it has had in US-based postcolonial narratives of postcolonial history—figuring the impact of American struggles to size might allow us room to see other spaces of Indian-African encounter in diaspora (Uganda, Guyana, Trinidad) more clearly, and to afford them their rightful place in more meaningfully global postcolonial histories as well.³⁸

This is not to say that we can or should seek a global narrative of race or diaspora which seeks to draw discrepant histories and contexts

into a single frame of analysis—though for some theorists of Asia, globalization represents a kind of non-national alternative that is at once a critique and a legacy of Bandung.³⁹ I want rather to suggest that postcolonial and diaspora histories might be read as positing a universal story while using specific cases as shorthand—another form of citation—for a set of global conditions that is as variegated as it is, perhaps, ungeneralizable. Nor would I, in offering this interpretive challenge to the normative, masculine, caste Hindu nationalist and apparently racially disinterested subject of postcolonial Indian history, like to be misread as homogenizing either Indians or Africans, brown and black, or as claiming post-1945 India/Africa per se as the only axis along which it is possible to read racialized citations. Still less do I relish being taken to imagine that Indian diasporans were the only ones preoccupied with misrecognition at the site/sight/cite of skin. I am reminded of a story that the founder of Black British Studies, Stuart Hall, told me: when his mother first presented him, newborn, to the family in Jamaica in 1932, his sister, noting his comparatively dark complexion, asked “Where did you get that coolie baby?” And, following up on the story in an interview with Tim Adams in 2007, he explained: “not black baby, you will note, but low-class Indian.” And “my father’s side was not pure African either, it had Indian in it, and probably some English somewhere.”⁴⁰ Schemas of brown and black and white and inbetween circulate promiscuously and emerge from very specific conditions of material and symbolic production, of course. The burden of proof about the purchase, and the tenacity, of the particular citationary apparatus I have identified rests on the case studies that follow. Despite the monographic pressures of even a volume of essays like this, whether they add up to anything like portable interpretive framework is, for me, a genuinely, provocatively, open question.

In offering these specific examples, I nonetheless hope to complicate the horizons toward which we tend to look in order to

apprehend postcolonial Cold War histories of Afro-Asian connection. Reading vertically, below the sightline of dominant narratives—especially those which privilege Gandhian and/or Nehruvian legacies—gives us an opportunity to engage a variety of histories of the tense and tender relationships between Indians and Africans and, more broadly, of the role of Africa and blackness in the Indian postcolonial imagination. Using fiction and other non-canonical forms of evidence may allow for different kinds of histories than History (capital H) typically ramifies.⁴¹ Think here of M.G. Vassanji's *The In-Between World of Vikram Lall* (2005), Abdulrazak Gurnah's *Desertion* (2005) or Peter Nazareth's *In a Brown Mantle* (1972)—the latter having not simply described Indian life in Uganda but predicted Idi Amin's rise to power and the infamous expulsion of Asians from Uganda, the very same year the novel was published, no less. Think as well, of course, of what Amitav Ghosh has been able to do with India's wide-ranging, cosmopolitan histories in his novels, most recently *Sea of Poppies*. Though far from exceeding the grasp of postcolonial history, these writers seem to know they are not innocent of it either. And they certainly are not: evidence of the work of racism and its endogamous histories leaves its trace in late 20th century in literary work from Africa and India and diaspora equally.⁴² Perhaps this is because, as Neville Hoad has written, "in fiction, one can find an archive for the complex lived and felt experience of never completely determining social abstractions"—the abstractions and complexities of postcolonial history no less than any other.⁴³

By no means prophets, Singh, Moraes, Sen and Naidoo were well known in their own time as, indeed, they are now in communities closer to home than India proper, perhaps. As I write Naidoo continues to lend her voice to post-apartheid political struggles and to defy its romances and its pieties as well. Indeed, her disavowal of a conventional Indian identity is a provocative challenge to the notion of extra-national belonging—a notion that her account of interracial

struggle history arguably queers, and which the term “Afrindian” (to describe the Africanization of Indian selfhood) also evokes.⁴⁴ And because her work and that of the others is not widely available beyond university libraries and second-hand bookshops (if there), I have quoted, sometimes at length, from their texts. Even if we concede that they are no more representative of “Indian” opinion or its imaginaries than Gandhi or Nehru, the work of these writers complicates our understanding of the geopolitical landscapes of racial solidarity in late twentieth century considerably. Viewed in the same frame of analysis, their writings illustrate some of the ways that India and people of Indian descent participated in the production of developmentalist narratives which, while borne of western imperial conquest and commercial traffic, continued to accrue to African polities and peoples in the post-war period, shaping not just the fate of emergent states like Kenya, Uganda and Zambia in the so-called Third World arena but that of Africa more generally as a player in the global south as well. Critical to this history was and is the struggle for a culturally particularistic and highly gendered postcolonial Indian self, reliant on the twin consciousness of racial superiority (brown over black) and its correlative, sexual purity (fear of miscegenation), both inside the new nation and beyond it. Inevitably, the scalar frame of such a project is at once local, regional, national, diasporic and global—in part because the history of independent India is a story of racial and sexual politics across shifting boundaries, in part because the terms of that embodied politics helped to shape the spatial parameters of the postcolonial Cold War world.

This project is part of three historiographical turns: one, toward the Indian Ocean world among South Asianists; two, toward histories that link the postcolonial experience and the Cold War among students of the later 20th century; and three, toward analyses that insist on the impact of sexuality and gender in global politics among feminist scholars. Standing as I do at the crossroads of all three, I seek to site/

cite postcolonial histories of Afro-Asian solidarity as manifestations of uneven and competing social, and racial, status between and across extra-national spaces rather than simply as the result of global “flows”—a critical observation derived in part from the work of Africanist anthropologist James Ferguson.⁴⁵ Despite the seduction of the horizontal, despite its emancipationist promise, we also have to attend to the historical realities of power relations—what Ahmed, again, calls “the force of the vertical”—which crosscut postcolonial and/or global flows and, in some cases, stopped them in their tracks.⁴⁶ Indeed, despite the presumption of transnational connection that has undergirded postcolonial studies, according to Kelly and Kaplan, postcolonial theory itself “tends to diagnose impasse”—impasse thrown up not only by ideas, but by “structures in the world.” Even when it produces sparks that nurture collaboration, as it arguably does in the case of Naidoo, this kind of friction is what we should be alert to. As friction, it is akin to what Jasbir Puar calls *conviviality*—that space between the quest for belonging and the exigency of critique.⁴⁷

Such friction produces communities that are no less affective for being fraught with “ugly feelings,” no less tightly bound—or historically postcolonial—for being irritative, chafing, edgy, uneasily friendly. Friction is sometimes bloody, sometimes fatal, though never predictably or teleologically so; in any case, it is one of the conditions of fraternity and sorority itself. Which is to say that solidarity can happen through friction; through struggle between and among as well as against; through “tangled, braided . . . and knotted” lives. *This* is Afro-Asian solidarity in “the grip of worldly encounter”; *this* is the grip of postcolonial critique on the postcolonial past; *this* is the object of my study and the apparently discrepant histories it juxtaposes.⁴⁸ This is arguably one of the many yields of feminist postcolonial method as well, especially when it remains open to the possibility that it is not the final word. Nor could it be, given that as method, it leaves its own citationary apparatus—the good, the bad and the ugly—so patently

in its wake. I am once again in sync with Sara Ahmed in my desire for histories that have the capacity to estrange us from, as much as attach us to, celebratory, “happy” narratives of the past.⁴⁹ This is not because I don’t believe solidarities are possible, but because I want us to think our histories of them differently as one method for doing them differently in the contemporary present. As a critique of postcolonial work that presumes a sentimentalized, fraternal history of Afro-Asian solidarity, then, I hope this book offers one example of the form that a critically postcolonial feminist method might take, limitations and all.

Notes

- 1 Amitav Ghosh and Dipesh Chakrabarty, “A Correspondence on *Provincializing Europe*,” *Radical History Review* 83 (2002): 146–172.
- 2 Cited in Giorgio Agamben, *What is an Apparatus? And Other Essays* (Stanford University Press, 2009), p. 2.
- 3 Thanks to Jim Brennan for help with this formulation.
- 4 Viranjini Munasinghe, “Dougl’a Logics: Miscegenation and the National Imaginary in Trinidad,” *South Asian Review* [Special issue on “Empire and Racial Hybridity,” edited by Deepika Bhari] 27, 1: 204–32.
- 5 I am aware of what a volatile and centrifugal term “brown” is: that it has multiple meanings in discrete and discrepant places. Even at the risk of flattening out its contingent meanings and its historicities, I use it heuristically here to connote the uneasy, uneven sense of color difference that a politics of racial citation can illuminate. Nor do I want to suggest that Indians are a homogeneously racialized group, without hierarchies of color embedded in communal identities. I have taken up this question a bit in my work on K.G. Naidoo, the Tamil doctor and anti-apartheid activist, in “The Pain of Racism in the Making of a ‘Coolie Doctor,’” *Interventions: International Journal of Postcolonial Studies* 13, 2 (2011): 228 (“the semiotics of Tamil blackness”).
- 6 Sara Ahmed, *Queer Phenomenology: Orientations, Objects, Others* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2006), pp. 3 and 8. For a different use of the citation as device see Russ Castranovo, “On Imperialism, See . . . : Ghosts of the Present in Cultures of United States Imperialism,” *American Literary History* 20, 3 (2008): 427–38.

- 7 For another example from a later generation see Jon Soske, “The Life and Death of Dr. Abu Baker ‘Hurley’ Asvat, February 23, 1943–January 27, 1989,” forthcoming in *African Studies* and provided courtesy of the author.
- 8 Thanks to Jon Soske for sharpening this point for me. The differential of which I speak is a phenomenon that uncritically Gandhian accounts of Gandhi in South Africa can obscure—for challenges see Maureen Swan, *Gandhi: The South African Experience* (Johannesburg: Ravan Press, 1985) and Sukanya Banerjee, *Becoming Imperial Citizens: Indians in the Late-Victorian Empire* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2010)—and that the life and work of B.R. Ambedkar (1891–1956) throws into bold relief. For a superb feminist/queer account of caste and the making of modern Indian self see Shefali Chandra, *Domesticating English: Sexuality, Caste and the Language of Desire in Modern India* (Duke University Press, forthcoming).
- 9 Malini Johar Schueller, “Articulations of African-Americanism in South Asian Postcolonial Theory: Globalism, Localism, and the Question of Race,” *Cultural Critique*, No. 55. (Autumn, 2003), pp. 35–62. Thanks to Dave Roediger for recommending this essay to me.
- 10 Vijay Prashad, *Everybody was Kungfu Fighting Afro-Asian Connections and the Myth of Cultural Purity* (Beacon Press, 2002); Dhruva Gupta, “Indian Perceptions of Africa,” *South Asia Research* 11, 2 (1991): 158–74.
- 11 Gerald Horne, *The End of Empires: African Americans and India* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 2008), p. 1.
- 12 Nico Slate, “Translating Race and Caste,” *Journal of Historical Sociology* 24, 1 (2011): 70–76.
- 13 For an excellent account of these impacts, their intellectual and historical power see Kamala Visweswaran, “India in South Africa: Counter-Genealogies for a Subaltern Sociology,” in Balmurli Natrajan and Paul Greenough, eds., *Against Stigma: Studies in Caste, Race and Justice Since Durban* (Delhi: Orient Black Swan, 2009), pp. 326–71. The essays in See Seng Tan and Amitav Acharya, eds., *Bandung Revisited: The Legacy of the 1955 Asian-African Conference for International Order* (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 2009) nicely summarize and re-orient “what actually happened” at Bandung, as well as before and after (quote is Itty Abraham, “Bandung and State Formation in Post-colonial Asia,” p. 48).
- 14 G.H. Jansen, *Non-Alignment and the Afro-Asian States* (New York: Praeger, 1966), p. 248; [no author], *Afro-Asian Solidarity Against Imperialism: A Collection of Documents, Speeches and Press Interviews from the Visits of Chinese Leaders to Thirteen African and Asian Countries* (Peking: Foreign Language Press, 1964); and Jamie Mackie, *Bandung 1955: Non-Alignment and Afro-Asian Solidarity* (Singapore: Editions Didier Millet, 2005).

- 15 Christopher J. Lee, ed., *Making a World After Empire: The Bandung Moment and its Political Afterlives* (Athens: Ohio University Press, 2010).
- 16 For “blood and nation” see See John D. Kelly and Martha Kaplan, *Represented Communities: Fiji and World Decolonization* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2001), esp. chapter 3 (on Fiji and Hawaii); and Pamila Gupta, Isabel Hofmeyr and Michael Pearson, eds., *Eyes Across the Water: Navigating the Indian Ocean* (Pretoria: UNISA, 2010).
- 17 Elleke Boehmer, “The Hero’s Story: The Male Leader’s Autobiography and the Syntax of Postcolonial Nationalism,” in her *Stories of Women: Gender and Narrative in the Postcolonial Nation* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2005), pp. 66–87 and Maria Josefina Saldana-Portillo, *The Revolutionary Imagination in the Americas and the Age of Development* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2003). I am grateful to Manu Vimalassery for re-animating this book for me. See also Vijay Prashad, “Amitava Kumar’s Excellent Adventure,” *Z Space*, July 3, 2007. <http://www.zcommunications.org/amitava-kumars-excellent-adventure-by-vijay-prashad> (last accessed September 21, 2010) and Antoinette Burton, “The Sodalities of Bandung: Toward a Critical 21st Century History” in Lee, ed., *Making a World After Empire*, pp. 351–361.
- 18 I am indebted here to David Scott, *Conscripts of Modernity: The Tragedy of Colonial Enlightenment* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2004); in many ways, citation functions for me as conscription does for him.
- 19 Renisa Mawani, *Colonial Proximities: Crossracial Encounters and Juridical Truths in British Columbia, 1871–1921* (Vancouver: UBC Press, 2009), p. 12.
- 20 Thanks to Jon Soske for urging me to think carefully about this question.
- 21 For assessments of a variety of contemporary India-African cooperation projects (including in Sudan, Ethiopia and North Africa) see Ajay Dubey, ed., *Trends in Indo-African Relations* (New Delhi: Manas Publications [in collaboration with the African Studies Association of India], 2010); for zeenews see <http://www.zeenews.com/FIFAWC2010/story.aspx?aid=634703>; last accessed March 2011. Despite even the critique of “Africa chic” in China, the literature on China in Africa does not presume romance; see Chris Alden, *China in Africa: Partner, Competitor or Hegemon?* (London, Zed Books, 2007); Ali Askouri et al., *African Perspectives on China in Africa* (Pambazuka Press, 2007); and Firoze Manji and Stephen Marks, ed., *African Perspectives on China in Africa* (Cape Town: Fahuma, 2007).
- 22 Thanks to Isabel Hofmeyr for insisting on this; see also Gupta, “Indian Perceptions.”
- 23 Antoinette Burton, *The Postcolonial Careers of Santha Rama Rau* (Duke University Press, 2007), p. 64.

- 24 Cited in Judith M. Brown, *Nehru: A Political Life* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2003), p. 261. For more detail on contemporaries' views of Nehru see Dipesh Chakrabarty, "The Legacies of Bandung: Decolonization and the Politics of Culture," in Lee, ed., *Making a World*, p. 49 and Rahul Mukherji, "Appraising the Legacy of Bandung: A View from India," in Tan and Acharya, eds., *Bandung Revisited*, p. 169.
- 25 Cited in Gupta, "Indian Perceptions," p. 163. The rest of the quote is: "I stand, therefore, today before you as an Indian speaker on Indian soil—that your forefathers have dug—cities that your forefathers have built in a land which your ancestors gave to the cities of the country—citizens by the right of heredity, citizens by the right of tradition, citizens by the right of patriotic love which has been nurtured, fostered and developed by the sweat of the brow and the blood of the heart of the pioneers exiled from India, so that Indian interests may grow greater." Indian workers are visible here, though there is nary an African in sight. See also Robert Gregory, *India and East Africa: A History of Race Relations within the British Empire, 1890–1939* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1971).
- 26 My thanks to Isabel Hofmeyr for helping me map this formulation; see her "Universalizing the Indian Ocean," *PMLA* 125, 3 (2010): 721–9 and her "The Idea of 'Africa' in Indian Nationalism," *South African Historical Journal* 57 (2007): 60–81. Even the Indian princes had an eye on Africa; according to Barbara Ramusack, "In February 1917 the maharaja [Ganga Singh] of Bikaner wrote to Lord Chelmsford requesting that the princes be given land grants, in India or in conquered areas abroad such as German East Africa, as rewards for their war services as had been done in appreciation for princely support during the Revolt of 1857." See her *The Princes of India in the Twilight of Empire: Dissolution of a Patron-client System, 1914–1939* (Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 1978), p. 61.
- 27 I've dealt with the question of "minor" writers in *The Postcolonial Careers of Santha Rama Rau*. For Ramayana colonialism see John D. Kelly, "Fiji's Fifth Veda: Exile, Sanatan Dharm and Countercolonial Initiatives in Diaspora," in Paula Richman, ed., *Questioning Ramayanas: A South Asian Tradition* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2000), pp. 329–51.
- 28 Thanks to Shefali Chandra for pressing me on some of these points, which I deal with in greater length in Chapter 1; see Radhika Mongia, "Gender and the Historiography of Gandhian *Satyagraha* in South Africa," *Gender & History* 18, 1 (2006): 130–149 and Goolam Vahed, "The Making of 'Indianness': Indian Politics in South Africa During the 1930s and 1940s," *Journal of Natal and Zulu History* 17 (1997): 1–36.
- 29 This is true beyond the case of South Africa as well of course: see <http://www.thehindu.com/news/national/article1597266.ece> (last accessed April 2011).

- 30 “Shadowier” is Bill Freund’s term. See his *Insiders and Outsiders: The Indian Working Class of Durban, 1910–1990* (London: James Currey, 1995), p. 38. See also Jon Soske, “Navigating Difference: Gender, Miscegenation and Indian Domestic Space in 20th century Durban” in Gupta et al, *Eyes Across the Water*, pp. 197–219; Ismail Meer, *A Fortunate Man* (Cape Town: Zebra Press, 2002); and Nelson Mandela, *Long Walk to Freedom* (Boston: Little Brown, 1994). “Tense and tender ties” evokes Ann Laura Stoler, “Tense and Tender Ties: The Politics of Comparison in North American History and (Post) Colonial Studies,” *Journal of American History* 88, 3 (2001) and her edited collection, *Haunted by Empire: Geographies of Intimacy in North American History* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2006).
- 31 For ethnographic studies of such contact in the Caribbean see Aisha Khan, *Callaloo Nation: Metaphors of Trace and Religious Identity among South Asians in Trinidad* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2004); Tejaswini Niranjana, *Mobilizing India: Women, Music and Migration between India and Trinidad* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2006); and Munasinghe, “Douglas Logics,” 204–32. For calls for attention to the yoked histories of Indians and Chinese in South Africa, see Karen L. Harris, “Gandhi, the Chinese and Passive Resistance” in Judith M. Brown and Martin Prozesky, eds., *Gandhi and South Africa: Principles and Politics* (New York: St. Martin’s Press, 1996), pp 69–94 and Melanie Yap and Dianne Leong Mann, *Colour, Confusion and Concessions: The History of the Chinese in South Africa* (Hong Kong University Press, 1996).
- 32 For an excellent set of reflections on this see the special issue of *South African Historical Journal* 57 (2007), especially the Isabel Hofmeyr and Uma Duphelia-Mesthrie, “South Africa/India: Re-Imagining the Disciplines,” pp. 1–11. For a methodological approach that upends the time/space frame of diaspora and nation see John D. Kelly and Martha Kaplan, “Diaspora and Swaraj, Swaraj and Diaspora,” in Dipesh Chakrabarty, Rochona Majumdar and Andrew Sartori, eds., *From the Colonial to the Postcolonial: India and Pakistan in Transition* (New Delhi: Oxford University Press, 2007), pp. 311–31.
- 33 Thanks to Madhavi Kale for pressing me on this point. See Shihan de Silva Jayasuriya and Jean-Pierre Angenot, eds., *Uncovering the History of Africans in Asia* (New York: Brill, 2008); Kenneth X. Robbins and John McLeod, eds., *African Elites in India: Habshi Amarat* (Ahmedabad: Mapin, 2006); Shihan de Silva Jayasuriya & Richard Pankhurst, eds., *The African Diaspora in the Indian Ocean* (Trenton, NJ: Africa World Press, 2001); and Shanti Sadiq Ali, *African Dispersal in the Deccan: From Medieval to Modern Times* (London: Sangam, 1996).
- 34 Mythily Sivaram, *Fragments of a Life: A Family Archive* (New Delhi: Zubaan, 2007), pp. 143–49. In her case the image is of a Tamil servant woman, not an African. Thanks to Urvashi Butalia for this reference.

- 35 I draw here on John D. Kelly and Martha Kaplan, "My Ambition is Much Higher than Independence: US Power, the UN World, the Nation-State and their Critics," in Prasenjit Duara, ed., *Decolonization: Perspectives from Now and Then* (New York: Routledge, 2004), pp. 131–151.
- 36 I have addressed this question for British imperial history per se in an essay called "Getting Outside the Global: Re-Positioning British Imperialism in World History," in Catherine Hall and Keith McLelland, eds., *Race, Nation and Empire: Making Histories, 1750 to the Present* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2010), pp. 199–216.
- 37 Thomas Blom Hansen, "The Unwieldy Fetish: Desire and Disavowal of Indianness in South Africa," in Gupta et al., *Eyes Across the Water*, pp. 109–21. This is something akin to what John Hawley, citing Gwenda Vender Steele, suggests about the ongoing Indian-African relationship vis a vis Europe and America today. See Hawley, ed., *India in Africa, Africa in India: Indian Ocean Cosmopolitanisms* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2008), p. 7.
- 38 Kelly and Kaplan, "My Ambition," pp. 141, 144. I'd include the postcolonial studies world, which is notoriously considered to be about the non-west from the location of the west, in this formulation. For one of the best diagnoses of this question see Paul T. Zeleza, "Historicizing the Posts: The View from African Studies," in Zine Magubane, ed., *Postmodernism, Postcoloniality and African Studies* (Trenton, NJ: Africa World Press, 2003), pp. 1–38. For dalit-African American traffic see Visweswaran, "India in South Africa"; Vijay Prashad, "Afro-Dalits of the World, Unite!" *African Studies Review* 43, 1 (2000): 189–201 and his <http://www.nondomesticatedthinker.com/2010/03/the-story-of-an-afro-dalit-of-india/> (last accessed March 2011); and Gyanendra Pandey "The Politics of Difference: Reflections on the African American and Dalit Struggles," *Economic and Political Weekly* XLV, 19 (May 2010). Thanks as ever to Jon Soske for helping me think this through, and to Herman Bennett for his insight as well.
- 39 See Hee-Yeon Cho, "Revitalizing the Bandung Spirit," in Kuan-Hsing Chen and Chua Beng Huat, eds., *The Inter-Asia Cultural Studies Reader* (London: Routledge, 2007), p. 585. Adeke Adebajo sees the end of apartheid in 1994 as "the culmination of Bandung." See his "From Bandung to Durban: Whither the Afro-Asian Coalition," in Tan and Acharya, eds., *Bandung Revisited*, p. 105.
- 40 For a fuller account see Stuart Hall, David Morley, Kuan-Hsing Chen, *Stuart Hall: Critical Dialogues in Cultural Studies* (Psychology Press, 1996), p. 487; and Tim Adams, "Cultural Hallmark," *The Guardian* 23 September, 2007.
- 41 See Antoinette Burton, *Dwelling in the Archive: Women Writing House, Home, and History in Late Colonial India* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2003).

- 42 Elleke Boehmer, “Without the West: 1990s Southern Africa and Indian Woman Writers—A Conversation?” *African Studies* 58, 2 (1999): 157–14; Simon Gikandi and Evan Mwangi, *The Columbia Guide to East African Literature in English since 1945* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2007), p. 111; Amitav Ghosh, *Sea of Poppies* (London: John Murray, 2008); and Abdulrazak Gurnah, “Imagining the Postcolonial Writer,” in Susheila Nasta, ed., *Reading the ‘New’ Literatures in a Postcolonial Era* (DS Brewer, 2000), pp. 73–86.
- 43 Neville Hoad, *African Intimacies: Race, Homosexuality and Globalization* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2007), p. 22.
- 44 Pallavi Rastogi, *Afrindian Fictions: Diaspora, Race and National Desire in South Africa* (Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 2008).
- 45 James Ferguson, *Global Shadows: Africa in the Neoliberal World Order* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2006), especially the introduction and chapters 1 and 7.
- 46 Ahmed, *Queer Phenomenology*, p. 159.
- 47 Kelly and Kaplan, “Diaspora and Swaraj, Swaraj and Diaspora,” in Chakrabarty, Majumdar and Sartori, eds., *From the Colonial to the Postcolonial*, p. 311; Jasbir Puar, *Terrorist Assemblages: Homonationalisms in Queer Times* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2007), p. xiv.
- 48 See Mawani, *Colonial Proximities*, p. 203; Leela Gandhi, *Affective Communities: Anticolonial Thought, Fin-de-Siecle Radicalism and the Politics of Friendship* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2006) and Sianne Ngai, *Ugly Feelings* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2007). For metaphors of friction and grip I borrow from Anna Lowenhaupt Tsing, *Friction: An Ethnography of Global Connection* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2005).
- 49 Thanks to Minnie Sinha for reminding me that the story nonetheless remains open to new research, interpretation and conclusions. For the dilemma of the citation and its reproductive capacities, see Mieke Bal, “The Politics of Citation,” *diacritics* 21, 1 (1991): 25–45, which is a review of three books on racial images in postcards, painting and other colonialist iconography. For happiness see Sara Ahmed, “Killing Joy: Feminism and the History of Happiness,” *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society* 35, 3 (2010): 571–574. I am grateful to Siobhan Somerville for taking me back to this essay.