Check for updates

SECURITY DIALOGUE

Special issue on Elizabeth Dauphinee's The Politics of Exile

Go west, go east: War's exilic subjects

Security Dialogue
44(4) 315–329
© The Author(s) 2013
Reprints and permissions:
sagepub.co.uk/journalsPermissions.nav
DOI: 10.1177/0967010613492839
sdi.sagepub.com

Michael J. Shapiro
Department of Political Science, University of Hawai'i, USA

Abstract

This article is a commentary on Elizabeth Dauphinee's book *The Politics of Exile*. Its focus is on her displacement – her dual sojourn that is, on the one hand, a physical migration (from Canada to Bosnia for research) and, on the other, a genre migration (from academic to literary writing). The main part of the analysis situates Dauphinee's contribution among the Balkans War reflections of diverse exilic artists from the former Yugoslavia (writers and a film director), and the article ends by situating Dauphinee's method within two analytics: Jacques Rancière's concept of indisciplinarity and Cesare Casarino's concept of philopoesis.

Keywords

Dauphinee, exile, Bosnia, indisciplinarity, philopoesis, storytelling

Introduction: Displacements

As Elizabeth Dauphinee's (2013) *The Politics of Exile* attests, the experiences of both physical and discursive displacement are among the conditions of possibility for critical analysis. However, although Dauphinee's movement back and forth between her academic venue and postwar Bosnia contributed to the perspectives in her book, the ultimate critical effect came from a series of events of encounter. Her skeptical friend/interlocutor, Stojan Sokolovic, provided much of the incentive for her to rethink her approach to the Balkans War, its participants, responsibilities for atrocities, and the policy problematics that followed in its wake. As a result of the encounters, the scaffolding she had erected to build her career was disassembled. Dauphinee was taken out of herself in such a way that the self involved in her inquiries had to be displaced from its usual place *vis à vis* her subject matter. Her book is among other things a chronicle of her rebuilding. Ordinarily, 'displacement' has a negative valence because the word evokes an image of displaced persons who long for their original homeland, lament the disruption of their lives from being forced into exile, and struggle to adapt to an unfamiliar place. However, it has a positive valence in Dauphinee's case, because the narrative of Dauphinee's becoming in *The Politics of Exile* illustrates the way in which events that move bodies across juridical and sovereign boundaries provide a critical politics of

Corresponding author:
Michael J. Shapiro
Email: shapiro@hawaii.edu

identity/difference. To be displaced is to be invited into an aesthetic experience, into a reorientation and reframing of one's sensible world. From the point of view of a radical politics, a displacement-engendered aesthetic experience disturbs authoritative distributions of social identity. In Jacques Rancière's (2008a) apposite terms,

> Aesthetic experience has a political effect to the extent that … it disturbs the way in which bodies fit their functions and destinations…. It is a multiplication of connections and disconnections that reframe the relation between bodies, the world where they live and the way in which they are 'equipped' for fitting it.

There are various other critical philosophical idioms that enable a discernment of the critical political resources deployed by displacement. For example, the term 'appears everywhere in criticism influenced by the idea of the diacritical character of language', for example in Derrida's (see Krupnick, 1983: 1–20) concept of 'dissemination' and Deleuze's concept of 'nomad thought' (Deleuze and Guattari, 2010). Effectively, 'displacement is an exile from older certitudes of meaning and selfhood, a possibly permanent sojourn in the wilderness' (Krupnick, 1983: 5). My main focus in this article is on Elizabeth Dauphinee's displacement, her dual sojourn that is, on the one hand, a back-and-forth physical migration (from Canada to Bosnia and back) and, on the other, a genre migration (from academic to literary writing). However, before examining the implications for political thinking of the specific forms of movement she has experienced and analyzed, I want to look at a piece of literature that captures what the above-noted philosophical idioms leave out. While Rancière, Derrida, and Deleuze supply *concepts* that enable a grasp of the political significance of displacement as a form of critically enabling conceptual exile, one must follow the protagonists in literary texts to grasp *percepts* and *affects*, and thus the micropolitics that attends exilic experience. As Gilles Deleuze and Felix Guattari (1994: 163–199) point out, whereas philosophy is an art of concepts, literature and other arts traffic in 'blocks of sensations', in percepts and affects.

For the purpose of illustrating what the arts can illuminate about the critical displacement afforded by exile, I turn first to a novel I have analyzed elsewhere, Milan Kundera's *Ignorance* (see Shapiro, 2009: 113–124), because the experience of Kundera's protagonists bears comparison with Dauphinee's. In *Ignorance*, the two main characters – Irena, living in Paris, and Josef, in Denmark – went into exile after the Russian tanks suppressed the Dubcek-led attempt to reform the communist system in Czechoslovakia in the late 1960s. Although both had established fulfilling lives in their places of exile, they are encouraged by spouses and friends to return to 'their own country' after Czech independence is achieved (Kundera, 2002). In Irena's case, the suggestion is a 'disruption to [her] hard-won sense of self as a French citizen with a French "structure of feeling"' (Shapiro, 2009: 119). In Josef's case, before his brief return to Czechoslovakia, he was well settled in Denmark (although his Danish wife had died) but felt compelled to return to cope with having been unsettled by his inability to get through the communist censors who had blocked news of his relatives remaining in Czechoslovakia. Both characters (who have a brief affair when they meet during their sojourns in the newly independent Czech Republic) have their lives affected in a positive way. They manage degrees of self-mastery against demands from friends and relatives that they alter their geopolitical allegiances.

However, rather than focusing on the psychological changes in the characters, I want to draw on the insights of Leo Bersani and Ulysse Dutoit, who, in their reading of Jean-Luc Godard's (1963) film *Contempt*, in which two lovers become estranged, suggest that rather than seeing contempt as a psychological phenomenon, we should observe what contempt does to cinematic space. They

argue that Godard's characters, Camille (Brigitte Bardot) and Paul (Michel Piccoli), are best understood as aesthetic rather than as psychological subjects. Their movements and dispositions are less significant in terms of what they reveal about their inner lives than in what they allow the viewer to understand about the world in which they are inserted (Bersani and Dutoit, 2004: 21–22).

Similarly, we can look at the way in which the emotional forces affecting the characters in *Ignorance* shape a novelistic space that reflects the conflicting demands levied by their bi-country life-worlds. While Kundera's protagonists evince a psychological resistance to the allegiances that a sovereignty-oriented cartography implies, I suggest that the novel's political sensibility is better understood if they are treated not only as psychological subjects who manage effective self-fashioning but also as aesthetic subjects whose process of becoming is marked by what it does to the literary geography of Kundera's novel. As Kundera stages 'the affair between the two émigrés … his narrative discharges passions that challenge the geopolitical matrix of national allegiances [so that] a rarely heeded cartography emerges. Kundera's map is vertical as well as horizontal; in addition to a set of geopolitical boundaries … the map has emotional depth' (Shapiro, 2009: 123); it's a cartography of affective investment.

Ultimately, the movements of the characters and the spaces of their encounters provide a micropolitics of identity/difference, a dynamic of political becoming that operates *within* the macropolitical world of static allegiances. Kundera's novel thus constitutes a political treatise, not primarily through the use of concepts (although he does conceptualize nostalgia, as well as showing how characters are affected by it) but by mobilizing subjects, sending them across boundaries, and registering how encounters alter their percepts and affects, turning them into subjects who manifest a political becoming by reflecting on and taking over the forces that shape their lives.

Certainly, the politics of exile in Dauphinee's text provides a parallel to the politically relevant experiences of Kundera's protagonists. Dauphinee becomes present early in her text when the reader is introduced to her main aesthetic subject, the unnamed professor (a Dauphinee avatar). What her text provides in addition to what can be gathered from Kundera's is articulated in its literary form. To appreciate the form-contribution of that text and, more generally, to illuminate the micropolitics of literary texts that treat exilic subjects, another becoming subject has to be included, the literary author. In *The Politics of Exile*, Dauphinee's political becoming is registered partly by proxy, through the ways in which her invented characters manage their struggles, and partly through the ways in which Dauphinee herself becomes present, not only through direct reference but also through the grammatical play of her text, in which she (through her avatar) is alternatively a subject and object of sentences. Before treating some of the specifics of Dauphinee's text, I want to frame her authorial experience by considering what is involved in the difference between those who write social science texts and those who write literary ones.

Social science investigators versus literary writers

Elsewhere I pose the question, 'What is the difference between the social science investigator – whose text reports and interprets the results of interview protocols or other data collected from or about individuals and collectives – and the fiction writer who invents her/his subjects and their experiential data?' (Shapiro, 2012a: 15). 'Among their differences', I have suggested, 'is the presumption of the social science researcher that her/his subject position is irrelevant to inquiry' (albeit not universally; social science texts involving autoethnography make that subject position part of the knowledge problematic). In contrast, the fiction author presumes her/his practice of a mobile subjectivity that develops in the writing process. The genre theorist M. M. Bakhtin conceives that mobility with reference to the way authors are open to themselves by seeing themselves

as ‘unconsummated’, as subjects who are always becoming; who are, as he puts it, ‘axiologically yet-to-be’. That mode of self-recognition articulates itself through the ways in which they fashion the ‘lived lives’ of their protagonists as ‘dynamics of accommodation to a complex world’ (Bakhtin, 1990: 13). Implicitly acknowledging Bakhtin’s perspective as it applies to the flood of writing that has emerged from the Balkans War, Dubravka Ugrešić (a Croatian émigré living in Amsterdam) writes, ‘The identity of the writer, the intellectual is called into question in the turbulent times of the destruction of old values and the establishment of new ones’ (Ugrešić, 1998: 45).

It is evident that Bakhtin’s conception of the author as a becoming subject and Ugrešić’s remark about the nature of the times apply to Elizabeth Dauphinee, who is a character by proxy, functioning in the threshold and final chapters of her novel. She had already constructed herself as a becoming subject in her earlier text, *The Ethics of Researching War*, where she often enters the research narrative and marks the process of becoming an ethical subject, treating, for example, her developing awareness of her responsibility to those about whom she was writing as her inquiry proceeds. She thereby provides a demonstration of how, to the extent that it contains autoethnographic codes, a social scientific inquiry can manifest an authorial becoming (Dauphinee, 2007).

In the subsequent novel version of her inquiry, as an avatar of herself, Dauphinee begins with a recognition of what she refers to as ‘the narrow confines of my own life’ (Dauphinee, 2013: 1) and her experience of an emotional poverty – ‘I was bankrupt of love’ (Dauphinee, 2013: 4) – and goes on to describe how she is affected by her personal, amorous, and intellectual encounters with a Bosnian, Stojan Sokolovic, whose personal experience of the Balkans War constitutes an edifying challenge to her academic approach to the ethics of war. Affected by the encounter (both emotionally and conceptually), the I-subject, Dauphinee, temporarily leaves the text at the end of Chapter 3, and, in the story of love and exile that ensues (before she re-enters the text off and on by Chapter 18), her narrator, using a third-person grammar, dramatizes the percepts and affects of the story’s aesthetic subjects, Bosnians who lose loved ones to the war, try to restore their ability for intimacy and love, and are forced into exile to survive. The story Dauphinee tells is an implicit riposte to her earlier more distancing attempt to conceptualize, with a philosophy of social science idiom, what was happening in Bosnia during the war.

Dauphinee’s characters register a historical diaspora that Dubravka Ugrešić calls the ‘Balkans express’, a flood of intellectual exiles from the war made up of ‘those who could manage it … those who had the opportunity, those who made that choice, those who had no choice, the terrified, the confused, those who were sickened by the events around them, by the events around others, or both’ (Ugrešić, 1998: 45). As Dauphinee reports in the early section of her novel, she has been part of those who moved in a counter flow (going east instead of west), some of whom have been tourists involved in war tourism (pleasure-seeking voyeurs) and some of whom have been scholars trying to make sense of the war (intellectual voyagers), but what distinguishes Dauphinee as a scholar is her plasticity, her willingness to leave open the problem of making sense of herself and, accordingly, her openness to becoming a different kind of scholar/subject. I address the implications for political thinking of the way Dauphinee has gone east (and gone literary) in the last section. Before that, I want to address some of the politically illuminating artistic texts that have emerged from the cross traffic out of and back to the former Yugoslavia.

The war: Cross traffic and the arts

In the opening section of *The Politics of Exile*, Dauphinee (2013: 23) laments her early position in favor of the partition of Bosnia, reporting how a member of the audience in Sarajevo, where she delivered a scholarly paper, challenged her on the position, asking if she had ‘a chainsaw in her

briefcase'. Certainly that 'chainsaw' imagery fits much of the literary/discursive outpouring that justified the 'national deconstruction' (Campbell, 1998) of the former Yugoslavia. As Ugrešić (1998: 4) summarizes it:

> they set about dismantling the country. Well-equipped teams (composed of writers, sociologists, political scientists, psychiatrists, philosophers and … generals!) began to produce hatred, lies and madness. In order more easily to dismantle the country, multinational as it was, multicultural as it was, the great Manipulators and their teams offered the most effective formula, a new Utopia: the nation.

There are many literary responses to that 'culture of lies' that had militated in favor of partitioning, among which is that expressed by the exilic Bosnian poet Semezdin Mehmedinović, who has lyrically treated the imaginary ethnic fault-lines that fueled a violent ethno-nationalism during the war. He does so with a blues aesthetic, one that is pervasive among Bosnia exilic writers. For example:

> I saw things no one wanted to see
>
> From the day I was born to my
>
> Judgment day
>
> When I'm to get a reward or pay my dues
>
> And no matter what it takes
>
> I'll keep my Bosnian blues. (cited in Beso, 1996: 18)

Pointing out that 'on the basis of … a Bosnian ethnic inventory, any racist idea – of necessity – becomes grotesque', Mehmedinović traces the lived experiences of those forced to migrate *within* Bosnia during the war: 'leav[ing] one part of town for another, seeking cover in "less threatened areas," in quieter neighborhoods' (Mehmedinović, 1998: 78). And he challenges the discourses that seek to naturalize ethnic separation by noting that, 'in the case of Bosnia, you simply could not say that the literature written in Sarajevo or Bosnia-Herzegovina was Bosnian or Croatian or Serbian' (Mehmedinović, 1998: 107). Lamenting the impoverished language with which (pseudo-)ethnic violence is legitimated, Mehmedinović articulates a blues aesthetic by shifting the political focus from national-level geopolitics to the micropolitics of his family's experience of the war – for example, noting that 'in terms of suffering, my son and I are twins', inasmuch as 'the lines in our skin are the same depth' (Mehmedinović, 1998: 90).

The bizarre circumstances of a war based on a new 'culture of lies' (Ugrešić, 1998: 217) and the 'confiscation of memory' (Ugrešić, 1998: 235) had encouraged Mehmedinović to turn to the blues, an aesthetic that both expresses suffering and articulates a bond of solidarity among the oppressed. The prewar aesthetic, in which he had participated, was shared among cultural groups: for example, 'the late 1970s and 1980s saw a great interest in comic books art, rock music, and film, that's what me and my generation educated ourselves on … there was intense communication between like-minded people because we were essentially brought up with similar aesthetic interests' (Mehmedinović, 1998: 110). Inasmuch as the blues addresses not only the pain of victimization but also the redemptive exercises of memory that recover forms of solidarity against attempts to impose antagonistic difference, Mehmedinović's writing is an anti-violence poesis, a politically sensitive aesthetic that refigures the war by restoring memories of experiences that nationalists have tried to efface.

While Mehmedinović stayed in Sarajevo during the war, emigrating only afterwards to the USA, others joined the ‘Balkan express’. However, one Bosnian writer, Ismet Prcic, managed to leave the war zone physically but stay behind fictionally (through an alter ego) in a way that captures the ambivalences and fraught political sensibilities of exilic Bosnians. Whereas the eastbound Elizabeth Dauphinee manages a becoming ethical by changing her idiom and genre, a westbound Ismet Prcic manages a becoming ethical by inventing a character who stays behind to fight. Among the things that are especially notable about Prcic’s novel is the way it registers the on-the-ground experiences, the lived lives of those in the war zone, in contrast with how the war mobilizes the official policy initiatives noted in the media:

> Somewhere behind me the radio murmured about no fly zones, cease-fire agreements, and what Richard Holbrook had said at a press conference about the Srebrenica massacre. And like that, it is a week earlier my mother wakes me and asks me to get dressed…. We go outside and she’s carrying this ochre plastic bag. What’s in that? I ask. Food she says. Look she says. I look and see a UN truck pass down Juzna Magistralia and, for a second, cannot fathom what’s in it. We walk closer as we watch. It disappears but another one appears – it’s a convoy – and I look closer and still cannot see. I see movement. Things are moving on these trucks…. Up close we see people, all women, so packed in the back of open trucks that they look like solid, uniform blocks of human meat…. We can hear wailing here and there. But mostly they don’t wail. They are so compressed that there isn’t enough air for breathing and wailing. Just breathing. Barely. What is this? I ask. Refugees from Srebrenica, my mother says. (Prcic, 2011: 177–178)

As is the case with Dauphinee, Prcic is a character is his novel. However, he also invents a shadow of himself, Mustafa:

> In wartimes, when his country needed him most – his shooting figure for defending, his body for a shield, his sanity and humanity as a sacrifice for future generations, his blood for fertilization of its soil – in these pressing times, Mustafa’s special forces combat training lasted twelve days…. He did countless push-ups, chin-ups and squats, lunges and curls, mindless repetitions designed not to make him fit but to break him, so that [he became] … one who was too scared not to follow orders and who would fucking die when he was told to fucking die. (Prcic, 2011: 1)

Late in the novel, Prcic, as himself, laments his flight from Bosnia and explains why he needs a Mustafa:

> I was never forced to eat human testicles or shoot another human being or watch pigs eat my fellow citizens. No, I ran away instead. That’s what I did. That’s *my* story. I left my mother behind, my father, my brother, my first love. That’s it. The end. That’s why Mustafa is here, the shadow under the house. (Prcic, 2011: 349)

Like Prcic, another Bosnian exilic writer, Aleksandar Hemon, invents an aesthetic subject, a character who stands in for him and animates his experience of the siege of Sarajevo. Hemon’s character, Jozef Pronek, is, like him, an exiled writer with a menial job (in a sandwich shop in Chicago). Serving as a vehicle for Hemon’s complex, bi-city identity, as he seeks to become at home in Chicago, Pronek observes his new city by walking all over it, as at the same time he is thinking about the letters he receives from a Sarajevo that is under siege and is reflecting on what Sarajevo was about before the inter-(pseudo-)ethnic violence occurred. Taking advantage of how

fiction can deliver precepts and affects, Hemon (2002: 49) recalls the sensations of the city, for example describing an encounter with 'sensuous signs' (Deleuze, 2000):

> Sarajevo in the eighties was a beautiful place to be young – I know because I was young then. I remember linden trees blooming as if they were never to bloom again, producing a smell that I can feel in my nostrils now…. I remember the smell of the apartment-building basement where I was making out with my date, the eye of the light switch glaring at us from the darkness.

Thus, to understand what is lost and/or disrupted for exiles, one has to treat not the macropolitical dynamics of official decisionmaking and war strategies, but what modes of sensation have characterized the way the life-world was formerly experienced. In a passage about the problem of narrating a life, Hemon (2002: 41) addresses that issue of inclusion in a passage that captures the essence of what fiction can do, as he recalls aspects of the minutiae of the everyday sensible world:

> The hard part in writing a narrative of someone's life is choosing from the abundance of details and microevents, all of them equally significant, or equally insignificant. If one elects to include only the important events: the births, the deaths, the loves, the humiliations, the uprisings, the ends and the beginnings, one denies the real substance of life: the ephemera, the nethermoments, much too small to be recorded (the train pulling into the station where there is nobody; a spider sliding down an invisible rope and landing in the floor just in time to be stepped on …). But you cannot simply list all the moments when the world tickles your senses, only to seep away between your fingers and eyelashes, leaving you alone to tell the story of your life to an audience interested only in the fireworks of universal experiences, the rollercoaster rides of sympathy and judgment.

One of Dauphinee's characters, Jelena, registers a similar sensibility. She is reluctant to leave Bosnia, even though her presence there as a Serb is no longer viable, because 'she knew there was something left in Bosnia' (Dauphinee, 2013: 96). Like Dauphinee's aesthetic vehicles, who struggle to hold onto their pasts as they head toward a future lacking in familiar cultural props, Hemon creates a vehicle to recover his own life moments, an aesthetic subject, Pronek. He has Pronek represent his own return to Sarajevo, making himself a witness of his own experience through Pronek. Like Dauphinee, who uses grammatical changes to treat changing subjective experiences, Hemon's texts contain grammatical play – for example in *The Question of Bruno*, in which he gives us a Pronek in the third person at some moments and then, in others, gives him back his voice. Thus, at one moment, as an object of discourse in the third person, Pronek, in the USA, watched television and 'changed the channel from The Dukes of Hazzard to CNN and saw a crowd of people in front of the parliament building in Sarajevo, cowering and hastening to find cover' (Hemon, 2001: 167), while later, as an I-subject, he narrates his experience of a return to his former city, now devastated from the artillery fire from the hills:

> As the plane was descending, I saw ochre patches. Like scars in the greenness of the mountains…. The houses along the runway were bullet-ridden, and as the plane was touching down, I felt as if I were inside of a bullet speeding toward a target. (Hemon, 2001: 201)

Just as Dauphinee details the ways in which her avatar/professor undergoes an intellectual self-fashioning, Hemon supplies details of how Pronek is fashioned as an aesthetic subject – for

example in his *Nowhere Man*, where he refers to him, in one of the stories, as a 'hero' whose life is 'not particularly exceptional' inasmuch as this 'gangly youngster', like most coming-of-age young men, struggles to manage romantic intimacies and vocational aspirations (Hemon, 2002: 47). Inasmuch as, like Mehmedinović (and many other exilic Bosnian writers), Hemon employs a blues aesthetic, we can see his Pronek as what Albert Murray famously calls a blues hero, the kind of subject that characterizes some of Dauphinee's characters, whom she invents when she turns from a social science idiom to a literary genre. In his analysis of the epistemic difference between the blues and Euro-American social science protocols, Murray suggests that because the social science hero is typically involved in a melodramatic success story, the genre is unable to acknowledge what the blues hero references, 'the fundamental condition of human life as being a ceaseless struggle for form against chaos, of sense against nonsense' (Murray, 1996: 35).

Just as Hemon's Pronek is a 'blues hero', a 'nowhere man' who is both sadly poignant as a man separated from a city in which he grew up and came to love, and redemptive, inasmuch as he has managed to be at home again in a new place, Dauphinee's characters – also involved in an intercity traffic as some go west while some go east (as does she herself) – are the blues subjects who in Dauphinee's case evoke experiences of a sensible world that call into question the social science discourses within which she had affectively distanced herself as she screened the subjects, objects, and venues of her investigation through social science abstractions and explanatory methods.

However, to appreciate the reframed sensibilities that Dauphinee's aesthetic subjects expose, we have to recognize another aspect of the novel-as-genre, one that becomes evident when we heed two aspects of temporality that are articulated in Dauphinee's writing. For this purpose, I refer to an experience of the late Mexican writer Carlos Fuentes, which I have quoted elsewhere:

> Fuentes reports a conversation that took place while he and friends were lost while on a driving trip in the Morelos region of Mexico. Assuming that the local map had a unitary set of addresses, he asked a local *campesino* the name of the village where they had stopped. The *campesino*'s reply astounded him: 'That depends, we call the village Santa Maria in times of peace. We call it Zapata in times of war.' In reaction to the surprising answer, Fuentes reflected upon the plurality of temporal presences in the contemporary world. As he reports, 'the old *campesino*' possesses a knowledge that 'most people in the West have assiduously ignored since the seventeenth century: that there is more than one time in the world, that there is another time existing alongside, above, underneath the linear calendars of the West.' (Shapiro, 2012a: xvi)

Fuentes then suggests that the novel is the genre best able to capture that temporal multiplicity. Reflecting on his vocation as a novelist, he says that 'literature' is especially well suited for appreciating that multiplicity; it can bring to presence

> our forgotten selves [because] … the West, through its literature, elaborated a plurality of times in stark contrast to its eternal adherence to one time, the future-oriented time of progress. (Fuentes, 1962: 72)

Accordingly, to situate the genre-inspired political sensitivity that Dauphinee's *The Politics of Exile* offers, we must heed the way her encounters affected her location in time and the way in which her turn to a literary method articulated an appreciation of that location. Specifically, Dauphinee emerged as an academic in an era in which a scientific version of social analysis had been hegemonic and had constructed a version of explanation in which the particular historical moment of an inquiry is irrelevant to the analysis. For example, as I have put it elsewhere, such a wholly technical approach to inquiry, which developed most elaborately in the USA in the

mid-20th century, paid no heed to its historical context (Shapiro, 2012a); it emerged within what has been appropriately designated as 'the color line century' (Gilroy, 2010: 27) and proceeded, without acknowledging that the historical moment contained racialized fault-lines, to recycle unreflectively what Clyde Woods (1998: 97) referred to as 'plantation block explanation', an orientation that was insensitive to a history of racial oppression.

In her encounter with Stojan Sokolovic, Daupinee had an epiphany akin to the one that alerted Fuentes to the temporal sensitivity of literature. She was able to recognize that her prior understanding of Bosnia emerged from the history of her discipline rather than from the multiple histories of inter-ethnic relations that had rendered the concept of national identity (a primary one in the subdisciplines of international studies and comparative politics) inappropriate. Seeing herself situated in multiple temporalities – career time, social science/international studies time, global time, ethnic times, and a wide variety of regional times – she turned to an autoethnographically oriented literary method that illuminates both the tragic and the farcical aspects of the violence that attended the breakup of the former Yugoslavia. Her diverse aesthetic subjects (including herself) disclose the complex temporalities that her prior disciplinary method had obscured – for example in this conversation she (as her character) has with Stojan:

> 'Do you like this city?' I asked him, looking around. He nodded. 'I do.' 'Me, too. I like how it wakes up in summer.' Stojan nodded. 'I like how it's full of foreigners,' he offered. 'I feel less homesick.' This was a point I did not feel, but thought I could understand. 'Are you homesick?' I asked in response to his statement. 'Yes,' he answered easily. Then he qualified, 'I'm homesick for something that doesn't exist anymore, though. I don't know if I would go back now, but I wish I could go back to the time before the war.' He trailed off. 'It's strange.' He shrugged. 'Do you feel at home here?' I asked. 'I don't really know,' he confessed. 'Sometimes I do, and other times I feel confused a lot. When I'm translating things sometimes, I forget English words, and then I forget Serbian words. I feel like I'm losing my Serbian, but then I think my English will never improve enough. You know?' he asked. I didn't know.
>
> 'It's like being trapped between two worlds,' he went on. 'But more than that, it's like being trapped in two different times. It's strange.' (Dauphinee, 2013: 112)

Although the different times cannot be reconciled, they can be thought in a way that generates an appreciation of ways to manage displacement creatively. Hemon's experience testifies to that. In one of his non-literary essays, he indicates how his bi-city experience (which he had articulated in his fiction through his character, Jozef Pronek) gave him an effective way of coming to a comfortable accommodation with both his past in Sarajevo and his present in Chicago. As he reports in a brief autobiography of his bi-city experiences, 'converting Chicago into my mental space, developing a new personal urban infrastructure, became psychiatrically urgent, metaphysically essential' (Hemon, 2011). Evoking Walter Benjamin's aesthetic subject, the *flaneur*, he went 'to movie theaters all over Chicago and walk[ed] circles around all of them', all the while with his 'head in the clouds of fear and longing for Sarajevo' (Hemon, 2011). At the outset, Chicago was simply his place of asylum; it embodied an unfamiliar and seemingly impenetrable life-world from the point of view of how he had made Sarajevo his habitus. For him, Sarajevo was a haptic space, a place of sounds, smells, and other sensory experiences: he refers to 'its indelible sensory dimensions, its concreteness [which had] seemed to defy the abstractions of war' (Hemon, 2011) (just as, for Dauphinee, it defied the abstractions of her methodological/philosophical idiom).

Nevertheless, like Daupinee, Hemon managed to turn his displacement and his travels, east to west and west to east, into a critical conceptual resource. Unable initially to replicate the lost

familiarity of a life-world in which, as he puts it, ‘the geography of my city was the geography of my soul’ (Hemon, 2011), in his new city, which seemed to resist gestures of familiarity, he allowed his encounters with the city to impose the necessary transition while, at the same time, using his sense of displacement as a critical thought vehicle. The transition was not easy, as Hemon (2011) writes:

> Because … your fellow-Sarajevans knew you as well as you knew them. If you somehow vanished, your fellow-citizens could have reconstructed you from their collective memory and the gossip that had accrued over the years. Your sense of who you were, your deepest identity, was determined by your position in a human network, whose physical corollary was the architecture of the city. Chicago, on the other hand, was built not for people to come together but for them to be safely apart. Size, power, and the need for privacy seemed to be the dominant element of its architecture.

Hemon did manage the transition after visiting Sarajevo in the spring of 1997, returning ‘to places I had known my whole life in order to capture details that had been blurred by excessive familiarity. I collected sensations and faces, smells and sights, fully internalizing Sarajevo’s architecture.’ Rather than deepening his sense of loss, the visit made him aware of the phenomenology of his adjustment to his new city. Realizing that he had managed to feel equally at home in Chicago, he ends his bi-city meditation with the remark: ‘The Chicago I came back to belonged to me. Returning from home, I returned home’ (Hemon, 2011). At a minimum, the positive displacement experience that Hemon chronicles articulates itself in his creative writing, which delivers a powerful politics of exile. As I suggest at the outset, displacement has a similar effect on Dauphinee. However, before turning to both the analytic and the political implications of Dauphinee’s migrations, both physical and genre-wise, I want to summon an additional artistic text that addresses the forced movement – in this case going west – of those whose lives became precarious during the war in Bosnia and Herzegovina, because, as is the case with the east–west traffic of Dauphinee’s characters, it involves a love story.

In Ahmed Imamović’s (2005) film *Go West*, a Bosnian cellist, Kenan (Mario Drmac), and a Serb military recruit, Milan (Tarik Filipovic), are clandestine gay lovers who must escape from Sarajevo when the war begins in 1992. Because Kenan is at risk from Serbian militiamen, who check to see if men are Bosnians by pulling down their pants to look for circumcisions, Milan decides to disguise his lover as a woman and bring him to his family enclave, a Serb stronghold in a village in eastern Bosnia.

The film exposes a level of precariousness that exceeds what results from ethnic antagonisms. Added to the already complex interstitial identity forces of ethnicity, religion, political history, and nationalist aspirations is a sexual identity that is anathema to the macho male cultures that cut across the other identity markers and that, if discovered, would not only imperil Kenan and Milan’s relationship but threaten their lives. When Milan goes off to war, Kenan resides as his wife in the village, managing the impersonation until he is discovered by a woman, Ranka (Mirjana Karanovic), who forces him into sexual relations. After Milan dies in the war, and his father, Ljubo (Rade Serbedzija), the village patriarch, discovers Kenan’s secret, rather than rejecting him or treating him violently, he protects him (a gay Bosnian in the midst of an exceedingly macho and nationalist Serb stronghold), gives him his blessing, and helps him to go west.

The film, which adds a dimension to the east–west traffic provoked by the war (another kind of precarious life), gives the viewer a palpable sense of the danger that Kenan and Milan face as encounters in the village – for example, the boisterous intimacy of Milan’s friend Lunjo (Haris Burina) and the suspicious lurking of Ranka – continuously threaten to expose the lovers’

subterfuge. By situating such an added and imperiled identity issue in the midst of the already fraught identity issues that drive the war, the film exposes the tensions between individual and collective identities and the pressures one experiences in attempting to negotiate one's place in a situation in which all identities are receiving special scrutiny. In such circumstances, the exposure of a fraudulent (and culturally abjured) one provides a crucial test. It can invite a violent or a tolerant and forgiving reaction. In opting for the latter in the last scenario, the film offers a moment of redemption. It's title, *Go West*, has a double resonance. On the one hand, it refers to the reprieve that Milan's father provides for Kenan, helping him to head toward a space with more tolerance. On the other, it refers to the art of cinema, to Imamović's turn to an art that developed in the West to challenge the oppressive identity matrix (including the taboo subject of homosexuality) that has led to and exacerbated the violence in the Balkans.

At the very end of the film, Kenan, who begins the film with a documentary-style commentary (in what turns out to be an interview) about fleeing from the hatred that had descended on Bosnia, where Serbs hate Muslims, Muslims don't like Serbs, Croatian Catholics are ambivalent aout Muslims, and they all hate homosexuals, resumes the interview. After enumerating his losses, he states that he still has his music. When the interviewer asks how that can be so when he no longer has his cello, he begins a simulation of playing the cello, which the soundtrack picks up. When the interviewer apologizes, saying she was unable to hear it, he ends the film by saying he should have played more loudly.

That last scenario is doubtless inspired by the famous cellist of Sarajevo, Vedran Smajlovic, a former musician in the Sarajevo Opera and Philharmonic Orchestras, who played his cello in public space in defiance of the snipers in the hills in order to commemorate some of their victims. As Smajlovic puts it, 'I never stopped playing music throughout the siege. My weapon was my cello' (Shapiro, 2012b: 491). Imamović's weapon against hatred and intolerance is his film. In an early scene, he juxtaposes a multi-ethnic audience enjoying a concert, which is introduced with remarks by the organizer about the cultural sharing that has characterized Sarajevo, with scenes in which Milan and another Serb are grappling in a karate dojo. In contrast with the remarks at the concert about sharing culture, when Milan's overly aggressive Serb sparring partner goes too far and injures him, the man remarks that a Serb cannot fight a Serb but that Milan had better watch out for the others. Here, Imamović is taking advantage of cinematic technology, its cross-cutting capacity or parallel editing, to enact his 'weapon' against hatred. More generally, as I have noted elsewhere, 'in the case of Sarajevo, the arts (words, images, imaginative reconstructions, and so on) are a weapon of history; they are radically changing the ways in which the siege of Sarajevo *will have been*' (Shapiro, 2012b: 491).

Dauphinee's exile from academic discourse

Elizabeth Dauphinee is also contributing an artistic text to the future anterior, the will-have-been of the Balkans War. In contrast with Imamović's Kenan and others in the 'Balkans express', Dauphinee has gone east, adding her body to the cross traffic that the Balkans War has effected. After the initial trip, which resulted in her *The Ethics of Researching War: Looking for Bosnia*, as I have noted, a series of encounters encouraged her to look inward and reflect on the academically oriented discursive practices through which she has been screening her apprehensions of her research materials. It's important to note the sense in which Dauphinee had an encounter. When she writes at the outset of *The Politics of Exile*, 'I built my career on the life of a man called Stojan Sokolovic' (Dauphinee, 2013: 1), she is asserting that the 'man' is an object of encounter, not one of recognition. He is not merely a representative of Bosnian manhood, one who can

report on what he has lost in the war. The difference between the two kinds of objects is accessible within a distinction that is at the heart of Gilles Deleuze's contribution to critical analysis. This summary by Simon O'Sullivan (2006: 1) is succinct and apropos with respect to Dauphinee's experience:

> An object of an encounter is fundamentally different from an object of recognition. With the latter our knowledges, beliefs and values are reconfirmed as that which we already understood our world and ourselves to be. An object of recognition is then precisely a representation of something always already in place. With such a non-encounter our habitual way of being and acting in the world is reaffirmed and reinforced, and as a consequence no thought takes place…. With a genuine encounter however the contrary is the case. Our typical ways of being in the world are challenged; our systems of knowledge are disrupted. We are forced into thought.

Accordingly, Dauphinee had her scholarly practices disrupted when faced with Sokolovic's skepticism and interrogations. Unable to convince *him* about the value of her approach to the war, she found she could no longer convince *herself*. As a result, she effects an exile from the genre of social science explanation to a literary production, framed within a spatial Odyssey. While *Go West* juxtaposes the multicultural concert venue with the Serbian stronghold, Dauphinee juxtaposes the austere setting of her book-laden office, to which she keeps returning, with what she learns in Bosnia, where her conceptual armature becomes dented and her academic discourse as a whole rings hollow in the face of challenging engagements. Her office has become defamiliarized and must be encountered within an altered set of expectations:

> The difference between day and night in the office was the difference between loneliness and absolute solitude. Solitude, I thought, was a prerequisite for true success in this profession. I was a lonely shadow, writing philosophy out of necessity and compulsion. I walked up to my shelves full of books in the semi-darkness, some of which were now ornamental, it had been so long since I opened them – the sad result, I thought, of having accumulated too many. I ran my fingertips along the avenue of spines – hardback, paperback, thick and thin, some of them dog-eared and bent with angular lines of commentary penciled in their margins. They seemed to speak to me in some secret, silent language that I had not yet mastered. (Dauphinee, 2013: 12)

To do her work, she realized that she had to be in exile from her office, or at least to see its contents within a different frame. Rather than theorizing the ethics of her research (with resort to all the social science method and philosophy she had absorbed) – guided by various protocols about justice, fairness, tolerance, and the law in a place that becomes obviously recalcitrant to those protocols – she invents a realistic scenario that reflects the ones she has observed, and creates aesthetic subjects who play it out.

Another exilic Bosnian, Jasmina Husmanović, has implemented the difference between approaching justice and fairness within a legal discourse versus within a literary approach, drawing her rationale from a passage by Shoshana Felman:

> Literature is a dimension of concrete embodiment and a language of infinitude that, in contrast to the language of the law, encapsulates not closure but precisely what in a given legal case refuses to be closed and cannot be closed. It is to this refusal of the trauma to be closed that literature does justice. The literary writers [can] stand beyond or in the margin of the legal closure, on the brink of the abyss that underlies the

> law, on whose profundity they fix their vision and through whose bottomlessness they reopen the closed legal case. (Felman, 2002: 8)

In a hybrid text that contains both conceptual and literary tropes, Husmanović seeks what she calls 'literary justice' in response to the trauma produced by the Balkans War because, she argues, 'literature can do what the law cannot'. Countering what she refers to as the 'mythologization' of trauma, she, like Dauphinee, invents herself as an aesthetic subject, 'a dislocated, traumatic kernel of the always-already liminal Balkans' – metaphorically as a displaced 'face/body', 'truly an alien life inhabiting the earthly political communities of our times [asking] What is her voice, where is her space, how is her politics?' (Husmanović, 2004: 15). Heeding her sense of dislocation, Husmanović, like Dauphinee, is effectively in exile from social science method. It is clear that, for both, exile is a condition of possibility for critical thinking about the politics of the Balkans War and its aftermath. What remains is the need to supply methodological concepts that can capture the implications of Dauphinee's exile from her former disciplinary protocols.

Conclusion: Dauphinee and method

The first idea that I suggest is Jacques Rancière's concept of 'indisciplinary thought', which is the kind of thought that breaks disciplines in order to deprivilege the distribution of (disciplinary) territories that control 'who is qualified to speak about what', the kind of thought that he derives from what he calls an 'artistic modernity' that 'makes art and aesthetic perception into a specific sphere of experience, disconnected from the rules that operate in other spheres [and which] feeds on interchange between the arts and spheres of experience and converts art's ways of making into collective ways of life' (Rancière, 2008b). The second is Cesare Casarino's equivalent concept, articulated in his treatment of the 'interference' between philosophy and literature. Casarino (2002a: 86) asserts that thinking becomes possible when the interference between genres opens up 'emergent potentialities that disrupt the status quo of the history of forms'. He takes the concept of interference from Deleuze's (1989: 280) suggestion that the thinking produced in cinema results from the way in which philosophy interferes with the cinematic text, the way 'philosophical theory', as a practice of concepts, engages cinema, a practice of 'images and signs', to produce critical thinking. Applying Deleuze's idea of the engagement between philosophy and cinema to the philosophy–literature engagement, Casarino delivers a methodological manifesto under the rubric 'philopoesis', which he states 'names a certain discontinuous and refractive interference between philosophy and literature' (Casarino, 2002a: 86). That 'interference' is one between an 'art of forming, inventing, and fabricating concepts' (philosophy) and an art constituted as the production of a 'bloc of sensations … a compound of percepts and affects' (literature) (Casarino, 2002a: 67). In a more hyperbolic statement, Casarino suggests that the political force (or, perhaps better, the meta-political force) of philopoesis derives from the interference between philosophy and literature because: 'in questioning each other, philosophy and literature put the whole world into question' (Casarino, 2002b: xxv). I want to make a more modest intervention and suggest that in creating a text in which philosophical concepts engage literary percepts and affects, Dauphinee offers a challenge to canonical social science approaches to political thinking in general and security studies in particular.

Funding

This research received no specific grant from any funding agency in the public, commercial, or not-for-profit sectors.

References

Bakhtin MM (1990) Author and hero in aesthetic activity. In: Holquist M and Liapunov V (eds) *Art and Answerability: Early Philosophical Essays by M. M. Bakhtin*. Austin, TX: University of Texas Press, 1–32.

Bersani L and Dutoit U (2004) *Forms of Being*. London: BFI.

Beso A (1996) Bosnian blues. In: Berson M (ed.) The Bosnia blues. *American Theatre* 13(1): 18.

Campbell D (1998) *National Deconstruction: Violence, Identity, and Justice in Bosnia*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.

Casarino C (2002a) Philopoesis: A theoretico-methodological manifesto. *boundary 2* 29(1): 65–96.

Casarino C (2002b) *Modernity at Sea: Melville, Marx, Conrad in Crisis*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.

Dauphinee E (2007) *The Ethics of Researching War: Looking for Bosnia*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Dauphinee E (2013) *The Politics of Exile*. London: Routledge.

Deleuze G (1989) *Cinema 2: The Time Image*. Translated by H Tomlinson and R Galeta. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.

Deleuze G (2000) *Proust and Signs*. Translated by R Howard. London: Athlone.

Deleuze G and Guattari F (2010) *Nomadology: The War Machine.* Seattle: WA: Wormwood.

Felman S (2002) *The Juridical Unconscious*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Fuentes C (1962) Writing in Time. *Democracy* 2: 69–77.

Gilroy P (2010) *Darker than Blue: On the Moral Economies of the Black Atlantic Culture*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Hemon A (2001) *The Question of Bruno*. New York: Vintage.

Hemon A (2002) *Nowhere Man*. New York: Vintage.

Hemon A (2011) Mapping home. *New Yorker*. Available at: http://www.newyorker.com/reporting/2011/12/05/111205fa_fact_hemon (accessed 15 November 2012).

Husmanović J (2004) Reckoning with the ‘Bosnian troubles’: Trauma, witnessing, and politics. *The Anthropology of East Europe Review* 22(4). Available at: http://scholarworks.iu.edu/journals/index.php/aeer/article/view/297/373 (accessed 20 November 2012).

Krupnick M (1983) Introduction. In: Krupnick M (ed.) *Displacement: Derrida and After*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 1–20.

Kundera M (2002) *Ignorance*. Translated by L Asher. London: Faber and Faber.

Mehmedinović S (1998) *Sarajevo Blues*. San Francisco, CA: City Lights.

Murray A (1996) *The Hero and the Blues*. New York: Vintage.

O’Sullivan S (2006) *Art Encounters: Deleuze and Guattari*. New York: Palgrave.

Prcic I (2011) *Shards*. New York: Black Cat.

Rancière J (2008a) Aesthetic separation, aesthetic community: Scenes from the aesthetic regime of art. *Art & Research* 2(1). Available at: http://artandresearch.org.uk/v2n1/ranciere.html (accessed 30 August 2010).

Rancière J (2008b) Interview. *Art & Research* 2(1). Available at: http://www.artandresearch.org.uk/v2n1/jrinterview.html (accessed 23 June 2009).

Shapiro MJ (2009) *Cinematic Geopolitics*. New York: Routledge.

Shapiro MJ (2012a) *Studies in Trans-Disciplinary Method: After the Aesthetic Turn*. London: Routledge.

Shapiro MJ (2012b) Bosnian blues. *Peace Review* 24(4): 490–497.

Ugrešić D (1998) *The Culture of Lies*. Translated by C Hawkesworth. University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State University Press.

Woods C (1998) *Development Arrested: Race, Power, and the Blues in the Mississippi Delta*. New York: Verso.

Michael J. Shapiro is a Professor of Political Science at the University of Hawai'i at Manoa. Recent publications include *The Time of the City: Politics, Philosophy and Genre* (Routledge, 2010) and *Studies in Trans-Disciplinary Method: After the Aesthetic Turn* (Routledge, 2012). An anthology collecting some of his work, interpreting his contributions, and including an interview was published in 2012: Terrell Carver and Samuel Chambers (eds) *Michael J. Shapiro: Discourse, Culture and Violence* (Routledge, 2012).