PROOF COVER SHEET

Author(s):	Ana Cristina Mendes, and Lisa Lau
Article title:	Hospitality and Re-Orientalist Thresholds: Amit Chaudhuri Writes Back to India
Article no:	CSAS_A_1517638
Enclosures:	1) Query sheet 2) Article proofs

Dear Author,

1. Please check these proofs carefully. It is the responsibility of the corresponding author to check these and approve or amend them. A second proof is not normally provided. Taylor & Francis cannot be held responsible for uncorrected errors, even if introduced during the production process. Once your corrections have been added to the article, it will be considered ready for publication.

Please limit changes at this stage to the correction of errors. You should not make trivial changes, improve prose style, add new material, or delete existing material at this stage. You may be charged if your corrections are excessive (we would not expect corrections to exceed 30 changes).

For detailed guidance on how to check your proofs, please paste this address into a new browser window:
http://journalauthors.tandf.co.uk/production/checkingproofs.asp

Your PDF proof file has been enabled so that you can comment on the proof directly using Adobe Acrobat. If you wish to do this, please save the file to your hard disk first. For further information on marking corrections using Acrobat, please paste this address into a new browser window: http://journalauthors.tandf.co.uk/production/acrobat.asp

2. Please review the table of contributors below and confirm that the first and last names are structured correctly and that the authors are listed in the correct order of contribution. This check is to ensure that your name will appear correctly online and when the article is indexed.

Sequence	Prefix	Given name(s)	Surname	Suffix
1		Ana Cristina	Mendes	
2		Lisa	Lau	

Queries are marked in the margins of the proofs, and you can also click the hyperlinks below.

General points:
1. **Permissions:** You have warranted that you have secured the necessary written permission from the appropriate copyright owner for the reproduction of any text, illustration, or other material in your article. Please see http://journalauthors.tandf.co.uk/permissions/usingThirdPartyMaterial.asp.

2. **Third-party content:** If there is third-party content in your article, please check that the rightsholder details for re-use are shown correctly.

3. **Affiliation:** The corresponding author is responsible for ensuring that address and email details are correct for all the co-authors. Affiliations given in the article should be the affiliation at the time the research was conducted. Please see http://journalauthors.tandf.co.uk/preparation/writing.asp.

4. **Funding:** Was your research for this article funded by a funding agency? If so, please insert `This work was supported by <insert the name of the funding agency in full>', followed by the grant number in square brackets `[grant number xxxx]'.

5. **Supplemental data and underlying research materials:** Do you wish to include the location of the underlying research materials (e.g. data, samples or models) for your article? If so, please insert this sentence before the reference section: `The underlying research materials for this article can be accessed at <full link>/ description of location [author to complete]'. If your article includes supplemental data, the link will also be provided in this paragraph. See <http://journalauthors.tandf.co.uk/preparation/multimedia.asp> for further explanation of supplemental data and underlying research materials.

6. The **PubMed** (http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed) and **CrossRef databases** (www.crossref.org/) have been used to validate the references. Changes resulting from mismatches are tracked in red font.

AUTHOR QUERIES

Q1:   Please check this sentence, there seems to be something missing here.
Q2:   Note 8: Please provide the issue number for this journal.
Q3:   Note 24 [Lau]: Please provide the issue number of this journal.
Q4:   Please okay corrections to this sentence. Marwaris are usually found to the west of India, and Kolkata is in the east. Marwaris have traditionally been settlers in Kolkata.
Q5:   A disclosure statement reporting no conflict of interest has been inserted. Please correct if this is inaccurate.

How to make corrections to your proofs using Adobe Acrobat/Reader

Taylor & Francis offers you a choice of options to help you make corrections to your proofs. Your PDF proof file has been enabled so that you can mark up the proof directly using Adobe Acrobat/Reader. This is the simplest and best way for you to ensure that your corrections will be incorporated. If you wish to do this, please follow these instructions:

1. Save the file to your hard disk.

2. Check which version of Adobe Acrobat/Reader you have on your computer. You can do this by clicking on the Help" tab, and then About".

If Adobe Reader is not installed, you can get the latest version free from http://get.adobe.com/reader/.

3. If you have Adobe Acrobat/Reader 10 or a later version, click on the Comment" link at the right-hand side to view the Comments pane.

4. You can then select any text and mark it up for deletion or replacement, or insert new text as needed. Please note that these will clearly be displayed in the Comments pane and secondary annotation is not needed to draw attention to your corrections. If you need to include new sections of text, it is also possible to add a comment to the proofs. To do this, use the Sticky Note tool in the task bar. Please also see our FAQs here: http://journalauthors.tandf.co.uk/production/index.asp.

5. Make sure that you save the file when you close the document before uploading it to CATS using the Upload File" button on the online correction form. If you have more than one file, please zip them together and then upload the zip file.
If you prefer, you can make your corrections using the CATS online correction form.

Troubleshooting

Acrobat help: http://helpx.adobe.com/acrobat.html
Reader help: http://helpx.adobe.com/reader.html

Please note that full user guides for earlier versions of these programs are available from the Adobe Help pages by clicking on the link Previous versions" under the Help and tutorials" heading from the relevant link above. Commenting functionality is available from Adobe Reader 8.0 onwards and from Adobe Acrobat 7.0 onwards.

Firefox users: Firefox's inbuilt PDF Viewer is set to the default; please see the following for instructions on how to use this and download the PDF to your hard drive: http://support.mozilla.org/en-US/kb/view-pdf-files-firefox-without-downloading-them#w_using-a-pdf-reader-plugin

Routledge
Taylor & Francis Group

ARTICLE

Hospitality and Re-Orientalist Thresholds: Amit Chaudhuri Writes Back to India

Ana Cristina Mendes[a] and Lisa Lau[b]

[a]Faculdade de Letras, Universidade de Lisboa, Lisboa, Portugal; [b]School of Geography, Geology and the Environment, University of Keele, Keele, UK

ABSTRACT

In times of heightened, no-longer-linear migratory flows, when migrations oscillate and even double back on their own routes, this article interrogates the unwritten social contract of hospitality between host and guest. Taking as a case study Amit Chaudhuri's returnee narrative, *Calcutta: Two Years in the City* (2013)—his personal account of relocation to India—this paper juxtaposes the mismatch between hospitalities assumed and experienced, from India's lukewarm hospitality to the expectations of its elite (even celebrity) sojourner authors, now diasporic returnee migrants. The article highlights the tensions in negotiating host–guest roles, particularly when insider–outsider, stranger–native boundaries blur. It also raises the question of whether some degree of re-orientalism is therefore inevitable in the cosmopolitan returnee's perceptions and subsequent representations of what was once 'home' and now is 'home again'.

Introduction: Reviewing hospitality and cosmopolitanism

The demands on hospitality have increased in the early decades of the twenty-first century, with greater movements of economic and political migrants than ever before, enabled by technological advances in transport and communications, but also by those forced by untenable situations in home nations to seek the hospitality of host nations. Towards a site-specific understanding of diaspora, and considering the particularised perspectives of diasporic, returnee Indian authors writing in English as sojourners or cosmopolitan migrants, this article problematises hospitality theory through the lens of re-orientalism. Taking as a case study Amit Chaudhuri's *Calcutta: Two Years in the City* (2013)—a personal account of Chaudhuri's two-year stay in that city upon relocating to India—we analyse representations of the reception an imagined India extends to a cosmopolitan set of Indian diasporic returnee migrants—specifically its elite (even celebrity) sojourner-authors upon return—for the purposes of outlining re-orientalist perspectives of hospitality.

Since the 1990s, the affective state of the displacement characteristic of all subjects under the conditions of globalisation has been incessantly charted. Notably, Arjun

Appadurai described the emerging globalised world as one of displacement, de-territorialisation, repatriation, asylum and exile—a world marked specifically by non-territorial forms of allegiance and attachment.[1] However, while the embrace of transnationalism by literary and cultural studies has reshaped these fields,[2] this interpretive framework for cultural narratives is not without its critics. Varma and Moslund are among the scholars in the fields of post-colonial literature who are calling for a new politics for reading literature, claiming it should be re-politicised and territorialised rather than placed in the transnational and 'liquid' realm.[3]

Even though migration and hospitality have been extensively studied, there seems to be a theoretical gap in the study of hospitality associated with the reception experience of returnee migrants. By addressing the narratives written by diasporic individuals on returning to India, this article contributes to hospitality and diaspora studies in these times of heightened migration flows. Interrelatedly, it investigates the reception by the Indian host nation as experienced by the returnee writer, which differs markedly from the reception by the Western host nation when the migrant writer first journeyed from India. In this shift in perspective, understanding the (in)hospitable home nation one returns to is concurrent with an understanding of the arguably re-orientalised self. According to Said, discovering the 'Orient' was a fundamental step in the Occident's discovery and understanding of itself. The 'Orient', an abstract term for unchanging exotic non-European nations, was everything the Western world was not.[4]

Said argued that orientalism has more to do with understanding the European cultural politics of power during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries than with an attempt at an empirical understanding of the East itself. Following the logic of the global (or 'glocal') twenty-first-century economy, the 'Orient' has become an agent in and of its own orientalism. This article illustrates the natural tensions experienced by cosmopolitan returnees who are simultaneously insiders and outsiders, a tension which is perhaps intensified by the possible accentuating of elitist upper-caste and upper-class attitudes held by these individuals prior to their sojourns in the West. Elite returnees have confusing and sometimes conflicting expectations of hospitality from the home nation, in addition to already being slightly resentful at being cast into the guest–stranger role. It would not be far-fetched to assume that returnee writers, with their Western education and experiences and mixed East–West cultural affinities, would be applying what they conceive of as standards of hospitality of the East and West simultaneously, adding further layers of complexity to their responses and expectations.

The concept of diaspora, etymologically indicating movement across space, has historically been employed to denote religious and ethnic communities displaced from

1. Arjun Appadurai, 'Disjuncture and Difference in the Global Cultural Economy', in *Theory, Culture and Society*, Vol. 7, nos. 2 & 3 (1990), pp. 295–310.
2. Paul Jay, *The Transnational Turn and Literary Studies* (New York: Cornell University Press, 2010).
3. Rashmi Varma, 'Beyond the Politics of Representation: The Indigenous Subject of New Subaltern Politics', in Alf Gunvald Nilsen and Srila Roy (eds), *Reconceptualising Subaltern Politics* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014); and Sten Moslund, *Literature's Sensuous Geographies: Postcolonial Matters of Place* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2015).
4. Edward W. Said, *Orientalism* (London: Penguin, [1978] 1995).

their homelands.[5] Novel and increasingly nuanced forms of attachment to and/or estrangement from a homeland, however, call for a more inclusive framework to accommodate the increasing complexity of forced migration—such as refugee migration—and voluntary (often socially and economically privileged) return migration. Whereas the current refugee crisis gives new urgency to questions of displacement and hospitality, these very questions at the core of migration and diaspora studies also need to be put into perspective when considering diversely constituted diasporic movements, such as the burgeoning migration flows of return to South Asia. This involves a theoretical movement towards including in the semantic fields of migration and diaspora increasingly diversified groups and variously motivated individuals for whom these movements across space can be by choice. In migration and diaspora studies, an earlier focus on a diasporic longing for 'home' seems to have changed into cross-continental linkages and the prospect of '"making" one's home' away from the homeland.[6] Increasingly, such rethinking of the meaning of home draws on Massey's more fluid and hybridised redefinition of the meaning of place in a world where boundaries are more shifting and porous, and where the specificity of place is constantly being renegotiated and reproduced.[7]

Notably, even in the twenty-first century, we continue to reference Immanuel Kant's 1795 essay 'Perpetual Peace' for our foundational understanding of hospitality, according to which the state owes duties of hospitality to migrants.[8] Kant argued that in the sphere of cosmopolitan rights, given that this is a finite earth which we all must share, strangers entering foreign lands peaceably should not be treated with hostility. Kant's work has thus been of particular importance in 'testing out the moral and political implications inherent in the cosmopolitan willingness to accommodate difference'.[9] Globalisation has altered the geopolitical landscape of our world radically—almost beyond Kantian recognition over the last three centuries. Concepts of finance, nation-states, boundaries and mobilities, and 'crises' (such as the refugee crisis in the Mediterranean) have consequently also challenged our notions of transnational hospitality. At the same time, the unwritten contract between host and guest (which intrinsically rests more on communal bonds than on legalities or geopolitics) has shifted somewhat less.

The difference between conditional and unconditional (or absolute or pure) hospitality offered or deferred, or even outright refused, governs the diaspora condition.[10] Conditional hospitality—also known as tolerance, or regarded as an ethic of tolerance—is extended to the stranger whose identity is already attributed. Tolerance

5. Robin Cohen, *Global Diasporas: An Introduction* (London: Routledge, 2001).
6. Roza Tsagarousianou, 'Rethinking the Concept of Diaspora: Mobility, Connectivity and Communication in a Globalised World', in *Westminster Papers in Communication and Culture*, Vol. 1, no. 1 (2004), pp. 52–65; and Ana Cristina Mendes, 'Remembering and Fictionalising Inhospitable Europe: The Experience of Portuguese *Retornados* in Dulce Maria Cardoso's *The Return* and Isabela Figueiredo's *Notebook of Colonial Memories*', in *Journal of Postcolonial Writing*, Vol. 53, no. 6 (2017), pp. 729–42.
7. Doreen Massey, *Space, Place and Gender* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1994).
8. Nicholas Zavediuk, 'Kantian Hospitality', in *Peace Review: A Journal of Social Justice*, Vol. 26 (2014), p. 170.
9. Elisabet Langmann, 'Representational and Territorial Economies in Global Citizenship Education: Welcoming the Other at the Limit of Cosmopolitan Hospitality', in *Globalisation, Societies and Education*, Vol. 9, nos. 3–4 (2011), p. 399.
10. Wisam Kh. Abdul-Jabbar, 'Fictionalizing Hospitality in Ahdaf Soueif's Short Story "Knowing"', in *Women: A Cultural Review*, Vol. 25, no. 2 (2014), p. 149.

likewise represents a philosophical position that implies humility, understood as a way of acknowledging one's own limitations to being able to fully understand or empathise with the 'other', in this case the stranger or outsider. When this hospitality is offered, it is to the 'known stranger' and is, following a Derridean reading, 'premised on a logic of unrelinquished mastery over one's own space'.[11] In other words, the very exercise of conditional hospitality, the gesture of welcoming and the generous extension of shelter and refuge, of state-sponsored redistribution, absorption and assimilation, is at one and the same time a performance and reaffirmation of the host's territorial ownership and right of belonging, the staking of a claim to which the visitor–guest is not privy, while also constituting a strategy to restrict the potential risks posed by unconditional hospitality. Unconditional hospitality, then, is 'an ethical response … offered unconditionally to any anonymous stranger, before the other has even been identified as either guest or parasite, either human or barbarian, either friend or enemy'.[12] In this respect, Jelnikar highlights the call to society to extend its welcome and openness to the guest, and on the guest to adhere to the laws of the host as a form of conditional hospitality; such conditional hospitality is 'contrary to the true, open-ended spirit of [unconditional] hospitality' which 'demands a reception without reserve, calculation or expectation of reciprocity'.[13]

According to Derrida's conceptualisation of unconditional hospitality,[14] this inverts the notion of hospitality as being extended from host to guest; instead, unconditional hospitality involves the notion of hostage—that is, the host becomes a hostage of the guest—to the point of the positions being exchanged in an extreme event. Barnett points out that Derrida's conceptualisation of unconditional or 'pure hospitality' is a 'trauma' for the host because '[t]he unexpected visitor, as a figure of alterity, overwhelms the self-possession of the subject'[15] so that, as Jelnikar points out (and illustrates using the case of the character Nikhilesh, protagonist of Rabindranath Tagore's *The Home and the World*), the host *becomes* the guest, inverting the roles.

While both conditional and unconditional hospitality consider the role of the host, Derrida also reflects on the position of the guest, making a distinction between invitation and visitation; the invited guest is made welcome with the proviso of adhering to the rules laid down by the host, unlike the unrecognised stranger/'other' of an unsolicited, unforeseen visit. By way of correlation, Derrida points out the hostility inherent within the concept of hospitality whose root word, '*hostis*', simultaneously means 'host', 'guest' and 'enemy'. Claramonte provides an etymological explanation of Derrida's concept of 'hospitality'—which combines '*hostis*' (enemy of the state or

11. Clive Barnett, 'Ways of Relating: Hospitality and the Acknowledgement of Otherness', in *Progress in Human Geography*, Vol. 29, no. 1 (2005), p. 13.
12. Langmann, 'Representational and Territorial Economies in Global Citizenship Education', p. 404.
13. Ana Jelnikar, 'Hospitality and Worldliness: Tagore's Household Drama of Love and Responsibility', in *South Asia: Journal of South Asian Studies*, Vol. 39, no. 2 (2016), p. 353.
14. Derrida's conceptualisation developed from a response to Emmanuel Levinas' *Otherwise Than Being or Beyond Essence* (The Hague: Nijhoff, 1981), in itself a sequel to his 1961 *Totalité et Infini: essai sur l'extériorité*. See Emmanuel Levinas, *Totality and Infinity: An Essay on Exteriority*, trans. Alphonso Lingis (The Hague: Nijhoff & Duquesne University Press, 1969). For Derrida's deconstructive reading of Levinas' philosophy of the 'Other', focusing on issues of alterity, difference and the unconditional, see Jacques Derrida, 'Violence and Metaphysics: An Essay on the Thought of Emmanuel Levinas', in *Writing and Difference*, trans. Alan Bass (London: Routledge, 1995), pp. 79–153.
15. Barnett, 'Ways of Relating', p. 13.

stranger) and '*hospes*' (host, visitor or guest)—to underscore the self-contradictory nature of the concept.[16] Derrida even goes so far as to argue that the very identifying of a stranger—only after which can hospitality be logically proffered—is already a definitional exercise of exclusion: 'Hospitality is owed to the other as stranger. But if one determines the other as stranger, one is already introducing the circles of conditionality that are family, nation, state, and citizenship'.[17] Given that the conceptualisation of hospitality contains unresolved and confrontational dichotomies from the outset, it is unsurprising that the concept and practice of hospitality are always fraught with tension; as Langmann (drawing on the work of Rosello and Spivak) points out: 'there is no inclusion without exclusion … there is no knowledge and information without a certain "colonisation", and … in opposition to cosmopolitan slogans invoking openness to the other, there is no hospitality without hostility, no welcome without a limit to that welcome'.[18]

Because today visitors are increasingly turning into residents, the definitions and practices of hospitality are being increasingly challenged. By way of contemporary illustration, it is worth a brief digression to look at how the expected norms of European conditional hospitality have recently been pushed to the extreme by both givers and recipients. The unexpected influx of Syrian and Afghani refugees and asylum seekers into Europe from the summer of 2015 onwards has caused a breakdown in the long-held ideal of European cosmopolitanism and anti-nationalism, bringing to the fore the hostility contained within hospitality. Some hosts were overwhelmed to the point of barring guests from entering at certain points on the European Union (EU) border. Conventions of hospitality were strained to breaking point (by the numbers of refugees and lack of available resources within the EU with which to host adequately) within a post-colonial territorial governmentality headed by Frontex.[19] The cosmopolitan ideal of a European transnational citizenship,[20] and relatedly of an unconditionally hospitable Europe, urgently needs rethinking.

The British imperialists in India justified their actions through the Enlightenment project of bringing civilisation to the Indians; via orientalism, the knowledge the world had about the 'Orient' was the result of a European logic, the product of European philosophical, political and educational values and standards which governed Western politics and society. Orientalism served as a model for European thought about the 'Orient' and a discourse of power which was used to dominate Britain's eastern colonies. Hospitality, like orientalism, necessitates an othering, a status difference between 'us' and 'them', 'self' and 'other', 'insider' and 'outsider'. Diasporic Indians returning to India are both strangers and not strangers in India, whereas in the West, their status is arguably clearer—they are guests, looking for the hospitality of the host nation. In the West, as expatriates and cosmopolitans, the host

16. Carmen Africa Vidal Claramonte, 'Translating Hybrid Literatures from Hostipitality to Hospitality', in *European Journal of English Studies*, Vol. 18, no. 3 (2014), pp. 242–62.
17. Jacques Derrida, 'Hostipitality', trans. Barry Stocker with Forbes Morlock, in *Angelaki: Journal of the Theoretical Humanities*, Vol. 5, no. 3 (2000), p. 8.
18. Langmann, 'Representational and Territorial Economies in Global Citizenship Education', pp. 401–2.
19. Frontex is the European Border and Coast Guard Agency and it is an agency of the EU.
20. Étienne Balibar, *We, the People of Europe? Reflections on Transnational Citizenship*, trans. James Swenson (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2004).

nation extends a conditional hospitality to them because, as Langmann argues, they are not 'antagonistic to the cosmopolitan ideal, not the "racist", the "terrorist" or the "intolerant"'.[21] As the Indian elite in the diaspora clearly fall into the category of invited guests whose alterity is attributed and circumscribed, the welcome they receive is founded on these cosmopolitan discourses of the host nation. However, what happens when India becomes the 'host' nation once more? India is increasingly encouraging the relocation of diasporic Indian migrants to India after they have made lives in the West, in order to tap into their (social and economic) capital; however, on their return to India, their alterity or otherness is not as clearly delineated as their cosmopolitan identities were in the West, and thus the Indian welcome is mixed and conditional and, importantly, inconsistently so.

Derrida notes how the exercise of hospitality, instead of clarifying the identities of host and guest, blurs distinctions and definitions. He discusses this regarding thresholds—or boundaries—which are the very markers by which supposed identities are drawn up and clearly delineated:

> As a reaffirmation of mastery and being oneself in one's own home, from the outset hospitality limits itself at its very beginning, it remains forever on the threshold of itself … it governs the threshold—and hence, it forbids in some way even what it seems to allow to cross the threshold to pass across it. It becomes the threshold. That is why we do not know what it is, and why we cannot know. Once we know it, we no longer know it, what it properly is, what the threshold of its identity is.[22]

From the Derridean perspective, hospitality is regarded as the treatment which is expectedly extended from host to guest, from master (of house and/or nation) to visitor or traveller. However, returnee writers are not only guests in an 'other' nation, but become guests even in their native country of origin—they 'return' to India or come 'home', yet they seek the hospitality expected by a visitor or traveller while simultaneously staking their claim to belonging, and to India as the original home. Within this framework, categories of 'host nation' and 'homeland' can even be interchangeable. Derrida's blurred distinction between host and guest is particularly relevant to diasporic returnee Indians, who experience both roles concurrently when resettling in the original homeland. Studying Amit Chaudhuri's *Calcutta: Two Years in the City*, we track how one such returnee is received as visitor–guest in both his host nation (generally the UK, USA or Canada) and his home nation (India). This angle of analysis will highlight the connections between the politics of representation and the politics of reception in this context. By reflecting on Chaudhuri's *Calcutta*, we consider the converse of Langmann's 'dilemma of the cosmopolitan host'[23] by addressing the corresponding dilemma of the cosmopolitan *guest* who, in the person of the celebrity Indian returnee writer, needs *guest* status in the country of his birth and upbringing, but resents his status as *stranger*.

---

21. Langmann, 'Representational and Territorial Economies in Global Citizenship Education', p. 400.
22. Derrida, 'Hostipitality', p. 14.
23. The dilemma of the cosmopolitan host is that, to act as host, one needs to preserve self-identity and sovereignty to have a platform from which to extend a welcome to others. See Langmann, 'Representational and Territorial Economies in Global Citizenship Education', p. 407.

We argue that these returnee writers revisit and revise understandings of hospitality in the process of re-orientalising their homelands and their countrymen, defined as the practice and perpetration of orientalism by 'Orientals'.[24] Re-orientalism—where 'Orientals' represent 'the Orient'—is not exempt from being skewed, flawed and irredeemably Western-centric, thus perpetuating orientalism. This discourse may in effect challenge the metanarratives of the West, but is also complicit in setting up new metanarratives of its own, which at times subalternise the subjects of enunciation and other 'Orientals'. Its fallout affects both East and West.[25] As an analytical tool, re-orientalism has limitations in its tendency to reductiveness, but its use is not intended to indict all oriental self-representations; rather, it facilitates a consideration of the extent to which these self-representations may be penned through a Western lens. This article will therefore unpack how Chaudhuri, as a returnee, critically, thoughtfully and purposefully represents India's hospitality while re-orientalising India itself.

Positioning diasporic Indian returnees

Following the tradition of travelogues written in English by Indian authors such as V.S. Naipaul's trilogy, *An Area of Darkness* (1964), *India: A Wounded Civilization* (1976) and *India: A Million Mutinies Now* (1991), and Pankaj Mishra's *Butter Chicken in Ludhiana* (1995), twenty-first-century works of return writing continue to depict the material and affective difficulties migrants encounter in the homeland. More recently, Amitav Ghosh's *The Hungry Tide* (2005), Amitava Kumar's *Husband of a Fanatic: A Personal Journal Through India, Pakistan, Love and Hate* (2005) and *Bombay, London, New York* (2002), Aman Sethi's *A Free Man* (2011), Akash Kapur's *India Becoming: A Portrait of Life in Modern India* (2012), Amit Chaudhuri's *A New World* (2000) and *Calcutta: Two Years in the City* (2013), and Rana Dasgupta's *Capital: The Eruption of Delhi* (2014) blend memoir, reportage, extended biographical portraits and amateur ethnography, similarly to Naipaul's travelogues, to thematise the shock-of-arrival-upon-return. In particular, the cosmopolitan guest struggles with the issues of cultural and geographical dispossession, multiple claims to belonging which may go unrecognised, and diverse but simultaneous self-identifications, as well as issues of whether they can be recognised as a guest while still being received as an insider.

Celebrated in academia and at literary festivals, these migrant writers have the privilege of choice. They may be considered citizens of an invisible nation that is located in luxury Western-style hotels and malls. Many self-identify as cosmopolitan and global citizens, perhaps having homes in two countries or more. Nonetheless, despite their social capital and ease of mobility, these migrants still see themselves as struggling with questions of hospitality—extended and withheld. They constantly

24. Lisa Lau, 'Re-Orientalism: The Perpetration and Development of Orientalism by Orientals', in *Modern Asian Studies*, Vol. 43 (2009), pp. 571–90; and Lisa Lau and Ana Cristina Mendes (eds), *Re-Orientalism and South Asian Identity Politics: The Oriental Other Within* (London: Routledge, 2011).

25. Lisa Lau and Om Prakash Dwivedi, *Re-Orientalism and Indian Writing in English* (Houndmills, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2014).

travel between their bases, migrating for short and long terms,[26] and are thus more directly confronted with issues of hospitality because of their ambiguous and ambivalent state as visitors-cum-residents. In their case, the terms 'home' and 'host cultures' are not easily interchanged with 'origins' and 'new homes'.

Levinas aids us in considering the dilemma of the cosmopolitan host in explaining how we naturally identify with and favour those close to us, while regarding with suspicion those further away and less known to us, those who are literally 'strange' and therefore 'strangers'.[27] Returnees like Amit Chaudhuri are therefore uncomfortable, even disquieting guests to host, being neither strangers nor an unknown quantity, and still less would they wish to be considered rank outsiders. But according to Levinas' argument, the returnee is in fact closely aligned to the host/home in cultural and linguistic terms, by birthright and through kinship, as well as by intimate prior knowledge of the place. These close ties lead to expectations on the part of the returnees that India will demonstrate partiality towards them. However, in other ways, the returnees may have come from a long distance away—geographically, but also in temporal, cultural terms— in their lived experiences, values and expectations, and India may regard the returnees with a corresponding disinterest or even impassiveness.

The returnee may be said to be the *stranger insider*. They are not a stranger altogether, being of Indian origin, but are not a complete native either due to their extended temporal and geographical removal from India. For such a returnee, the homeland is not just different; it may not even be *the* homeland but one of several homelands: '[transnational] migrants do not necessarily substitute old homes for new in a straightforward transfer, but often create active social fields between the two'.[28] In this process of creating active social fields between their homes, which in turn inform and influence these homes, and '[b]y living their lives across borders, transmigrants find themselves confronted with and engaged in the nation building processes of two or more nation-states'.[29] Having a foot in two or more camps makes the positionality of the returnee even more ambiguous and harder to categorise, constituting yet again a reason for the host nation to receive the returnee with some degree of caution. On hosting a returnee such as Amit Chaudhuri, India has perforce to acknowledge the returnee's master position as well as guest position—one or the other would have been acceptable, but both simultaneously make for a mixed, wary reception at best.

In considering India's reception of returnees in the late 1990s, Kearney reminds us more generally that '[t]he laws of hospitality … reserve the right of each host to

---

26. In this sense, they cannot be considered as expatriates because expatriates have a home nation from which they migrate for a short-term fixed period before always intending to return to the original home. Sojourner migrants, by comparison, have homes in more than one country, sometimes in more than two countries, and oscillate rather than 'return'. They belong to a diasporic community that has lived in the West, or are even second or third generation migrants, but they elect to relocate back to India (or South Asia) on a short- or long-term basis, or even permanently.
27. Barnett, 'Ways of Relating', p. 6.
28. Hasmita Ramji, 'British Indians "Returning Home": An Exploration of Transnational Belongings', in *Sociology*, Vol. 40, no. 4 (2006), p. 646.
29. Linda Basch, Nina Glick Schiller and Christina Szanton Blanc, *Nations Unbound: Transnational Projects, Postcolonial Predicaments, and Deterritorialized Nation-States* (London: Routledge, 1994), p. 22.

evaluate, select and choose those he wishes to include or exclude—that is, to discrimi-nate'.[30] This right to discriminate would, however, be doubly hurtful to the returnee, who may well regard it not only as a lack of welcome but even a betrayal of long-standing (if slightly rusty) relationships and allegiances. Kearney goes on to point out that '[s]uch discrimination, indispensable to the "law of hospitality" (*hospitalité en droit*), requires that each other identifies and names him/herself before entering one's home. And this identification process involves at least some degree of violence'.[31] This need for the returnee to declare, even identify, themselves is a form of epistemo-logical violence that Chaudhuri and other returnees like him seem to feel keenly. Arguably they are being asked to categorise and label themselves, and not just in a way they might find most representative of themselves, but in a way the Indian homeland would find acceptable—as an asset to India, one which the homeland would be prepared to welcome back. The stranger needs to self-edit, to make himself palatable once again to the homeland, which renders the welcome highly conditional, in turn rendering India less like home and more like any other host nation whose hoops must be jumped through without the right of belonging by birth, language, ethnicity, culture and kin.

Moreover, there is a school of thought that the onus should be on the host to extend the welcome rather than on the visitor to blend in seamlessly. In discussing the integration struggles of British South Asian Muslims in a way that can extended (for argument's sake) to Narendra Modi's corporate, BPO (business process outsourc-ing) India, Tahir Abbas reasons that 'the problem is less of new or existing groups making better efforts to integrate rather than elements of the "host" society needing to work harder to ensure the confidence of new groups'.[32] Corporate India, similarly to anti-Muslim Britain, may expect its diasporic returnees to find their own footing, to re-adapt and re-integrate, rather than make efforts to extend a warm welcome or welcome back.

This may be a good juncture at which to raise the issue of the ethics of attune-ment, which Wilson argues is not only about considering encounters in less self-focused ways, 'but about attending to and embracing failure, unbecoming, ambiguity, ambivalence, rupture and the fleeting—which … is where the creative potential and political possibility of encounter lies'.[33] Wilson may have highlighted a very viable and profitable route for India to take in its strategy of receiving returnees, particularly given their considerable creative potential and the political possibilities they bring (back). However, whether India will be amenable to the concept of the ethics and practice of attunement will require it to interrogate its concepts of hospitality.

In questioning why India may, heretofore, have been less than entirely welcoming towards its returnees, Still reminds us that the imposition of restrictions or conditions on the stranger is a response to the potential for violence from the stranger.[34]

30. Richard Kearney, 'Aliens and Others: Between Girard and Derrida', in *Cultural Values*, Vol. 3, no. 3 (1999), p. 259.
31. *Ibid*.
32. Tahir Abbas, 'Muslim Minorities in Britain: Integration, Multiculturalism and Radicalism in the Post-7/7 Period', in *Journal of Intercultural Studies*, Vol. 28, no. 3 (2007), p. 298.
33. Helen F. Wilson, 'On Geography and Encounter: Bodies, Borders, and Difference', in *Progress in Human Geography*, Vol. 41, no. 4 (2016), p. 15.
34. Judith Still, *Derrida and Hospitality: Theory and Practice* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2010), p. 13.

(Ironically, the very imposition of restrictions perpetrates violence onto the stranger.) To some extent, India stands as the object of its celebrity diasporic authors' epistemic and ontological violence, via reputational damage and representational disfigurement. Nevertheless, Still observes that limitations to this figurative violence 'themselves may provoke transgression—if they are a gesture of mastery, reinforcing the imbalance of power that creates the need for hospitality in the first place'.[35] The ungracious welcome, or even lack of welcome, may irritate returnees and in turn make them feel less kindly towards India, which is both home *and* host.

However, an absence of welcome may turn out to be the lesser of two evils when we consider that there may be an insult inherent in India's offer of hospitality to its returnee writers. The hospitality offered by India is fraught and complicated because when, or if, it is offered, it would both signify and call attention to the outsider status of returnee Indians, thus making it a gesture of exclusion instead of the intended inclusion. Therefore, what returnees probably look for is less the hospitality of welcome and more the hospitality of *welcome back*. This is, possibly, a new type of hospitality, extended not to the stranger, but to the native-turned-stranger. Whether India is prepared to extend this conditional hospitality depends on many factors, but it primarily rests on a consideration of whether the returnee is likely to be an asset or a liability to the country.

Amit Chaudhuri re-orientalises Indian hospitality

There have always been a small number of Indian returnees going back to India, particularly in retirement, who regard the 'return home' as a reward for hard work. They gratefully sink back into the familiar and known, even though there are naturally some minor issues with the transition and readjustment to India.[36] Amit Chaudhuri's 'return' to India was not in retirement, however, nor did it correspond to the migrant's fantasy of returning home in triumph with a fortune made in the West that validates the migration adventure. Chaudhuri was 37 years old when he made his return in 1999: 'I'd had enough of Britain under Blair. I returned to India'.[37] Although he 'felt ready to surrender to the fantasy that had gripped [him] for almost two decades: of returning "home", to India', and fed up as he was with the Thatcher and Blair governments, he nevertheless tellingly left some belongings in the cellar of his college and kept his bank account on King Street open; he confesses: 'I wasn't ready to give it (the UK) up altogether'.[38] His attitude was prompted not only by a desire to maintain connections with the UK, but also his uncertainty about the welcome he would receive on his return: 'I also had some inkling that neither India nor Calcutta, my birthplace, was the sort of nation and city to receive their returning sons emotionally with opened arms'.[39] As it turned out, Chaudhuri's suspicions were

---

35. *Ibid.*
36. Sonali Jain, 'The Rights of "Return": Ethnic Identities in the Workplace among Second-Generation Indian-American Professionals in the Parental Homeland', in *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, Vol. 37, no. 9 (2011), pp. 1313–30; and Ramji, 'British Indians "Returning Home"', pp. 645–62.
37. Amit Chaudhuri, *Calcutta: Two Years in the City* (London: Union Books, 2013), p. 99.
38. *Ibid.*, p. 147.
39. *Ibid.*

justified—he was welcomed back to India with a negative review of his novel, *Freedom Song*, which he claimed was not a surprise to him,[40] but which nevertheless irritated him because 'some wishful part of [him] had longed for a warmer greeting'.[41]

While the city might function as a locus of attachment for the re-territorialising (arguably formerly de-territorialised) diasporic subject, Chaudhuri writes candidly of his fraught identification of Calcutta (now Kolkata) as home:

> When visiting Calcutta from Bombay (now Mumbai), I would actually think to myself, 'How glad I am not to be at home', while, back from England, I overhear myself exclaiming in the first few days: 'How glad I am to be back!'—literally, at intervals, congratulating myself. In other words, the association of 'home', 'away', 'return' are quite hopelessly mixed up in my mind.[42]

This tangle in terms of identity and belonging and confused sitings of home may be part of the common condition of the sojourner migrant, pushed back and forth, always only being someone or somewhere relative to some other place. Chaudhuri expresses this displacement with his usual verve: 'Decades of dispiriting travel between the two countries (India and the UK) have made my experience of place not just comparative, but occasionally vituperative'.[43] That last word, 'vituperative', sums up the exasperation, frustration and anger of the migrant at constantly being forced to navigate two or more sets of intractable systems in countries which have little understanding of or sympathy for those who occupy the interstices.

Chaudhuri describes how, in the last few decades, Calcutta has itself been characterised by two types of migration: outward and inward. The former occurs when the younger generation from the middle and upper-middle classes have left for 'New Delhi, or even New Jersey. The aging parents (or parent) live in the house, which they may or may not have built, but where the children were born. Upkeep is difficult'.[44] The inward migration is fuelled by two groups: the immigration of Marwaris from western India moving east; and NRIs (non-resident Indians) buying apartments in new buildings. It is worth quoting Chaudhuri at length here:

> … the dreaded NRIs, who are of the city and yet not of it, who are Bengali despite being something else. These are people who left thirty years ago for Michigan, New Jersey, or Atlanta—the ugly acronym stands for Non-Resident Indian, and encompasses movement, desire, pride, memory, and, plausibly, disappointment. The NRIs are not necessarily coming back; against their better judgement though, they do want to keep one foot planted in the city in which they grew up.[45]

---

40. Chaudhuri wrote: 'Reviewing is often a form of thuggery in Anglophone India, threatening, a way of roughing somebody up; and the books pages are a bit like [the] lawless part of town, from which you have to be thankful to slip away with your writerly life—not to mention your dignity—intact …. My poor novel … had been called an "entomologist's notebook", and its characters compared to stick insects. To add to these insults was the insult of the review being quite poorly written by the Plato-reading reviewer, bristling with bad syntax and self-importance, and unaware of its missing articles'. *Ibid.*, p. 148.
41. *Ibid.*, p. 248.
42. *Ibid.*
43. *Ibid.*
44. *Ibid.*, p. 15.
45. *Ibid.*, p. 16.

Chaudhuri's disenchantment with this group is unmistakeable. He apparently reproaches them for a lack of faith in India and a corresponding lack of commitment to and investment in the country, which is paralleled by an attitude of not-wanting-to-miss-out; hence, they keep one (investment) foot planted in the past. In his disdainful depiction, it does not appear that Chaudhuri is advocating that India should welcome back such returnees with warmth. He is also contemptuous of those Indians in the West who claim they desire to return, but do not do so:

> I had seen it happen to others—couples who'd lived much of their adult life in Bicester, or Rochdale, or in Newbury Park; always deferring the day of departure, always behaving as if they were temporary residents who'd been in England only for the last few months; then, when the time of departure came at last, it was a further deferral of their plans—it was a departure to the afterlife, no doubt another limited stint before they made their way back to Bengal.[46]

Perhaps it is Chaudhuri's view that in order to merit a warm welcome back to India, the returnee must be prepared to invest in and *be* invested back into India, rather than attempt to straddle two worlds, only eventually throwing their lot in with whichever yields the greatest personal gain. Thus, according to Chaudhuri's stance, hospitality contains within it the hidden premise and expectation of the guest–stranger somehow committing to—almost as an act of faith—some degree of investment in the host nation by believing in the positives to be reaped alongside the welcoming host. This is a premise which the reluctant NRI, or the NRI with divided loyalties, somehow seems to be reneging on unfairly, hence India's lukewarm reception. This adds an interesting layer to the notion of hospitality (particularly coming from a somewhat disillusioned returnee)—that the stranger has to somehow *deserve* the welcome of the host, instead of being owed hospitality just by *being* the guest–stranger.

Chaudhuri himself had two reasons for returning. One was for the sake of his aging parents, which he believes is the main reason people return to Calcutta, particularly those feeling their filial duty most keenly: 'Naturally, the pressure of obligation or duty is felt most strongly by the only child, perhaps the Bengali only child…. Bombay is about money; Delhi about power; Calcutta is about parents'.[47] However, he had a personal reason too:

> Because I'd been rehearsing that journey for years: as a child, in trips from Bombay in the summer and the winter; and later—in my continual search for a certain kind of city, in my reading. And Calcutta would make its way back to me, unexpectedly…that city would be given back to me by my readers.[48]

Note to typesetter: please do not indent this sentencePerhaps, given these reasons, Chaudhuri sees his own investment—or re-investment—in India as being proven by family allegiance and duty, and the reclaiming of the city as his own, albeit in a literary and spiritual way.

---

46. *Ibid.*, p. 247.
47. *Ibid.*, p. 249.
48. *Ibid.*, p. 74.

That said, Chaudhuri is candid about not being particularly fond or proud of India or Calcutta: 'I don't actually like the Calcutta of today',[49] he admits; 'I can't say I like the India of today'.[50] As a guest—if indeed he is a guest—this would be less than tactful, but Chaudhuri often writes as a local–insider, not a stranger–guest. The returnee, outsider or trespasser is usually at one remove from both his host nation and his homeland, but in his sardonic observations, informed by a double agency related to a potential conflict of allegiance, Chaudhuri displays an insider's intimacy with India. For example, commenting on a street boy he encountered who 'wasn't sure if I was a scam-artist who was going to exploit him, or whether I was an imbecile up for exploitation—the perpetual and urgent Indian dilemma',[51] Chaudhuri's attitude is one of wariness born of an expectation of family foibles rather than the indignant surprise of a visitor.

In a similar vein of disgruntled intimacy, Chaudhuri is unsympathetic to Indian insularity: 'All foreign food is doomed to be consumed in India not so much by Indians as by a voracious Indian sensibility, which demands infinite versions of Indian food, and is unmoved by difference'.[52] He does not apologise for applying cosmopolitan or universal standards when drawing comparisons with India; in a 2004 piece published in the *London Review of Books*, he wrote: 'for almost two hundred years, in countries like India, there has been a self-consciousness (and it still exists today) which asks to be judged and understood by "universal" standards'.[53] However, as an author and academic, Chaudhuri is keenly aware of orientalism's privileging of Europe as an epistemological centre, and of Dipesh Chakrabarty's notion that, in Chaudhuri's formulation, 'no Modernism outside Europe can be absolutely genuine'; hence, he deplores the 'uncritical investment in the idea of Europe as the source, paradigm and catalyst of progress and history'.[54]

Chaudhuri's writing departs from the conventions of diasporic Indian writing in English in the expert and careful way he picks out regional distinctiveness, making his work refreshingly *non*-pan-Indian. The narratives of earlier Indian writing in English primarily focused on migrants' struggles to assimilate in the new host nation and the weakening of their links with the Indian homeland, and set up that binary time and again.[55] Instead, Chaudhuri's attention is directed towards how the West is re-orientalistically utilised as a reference point, in the sense that Indian norms and

49. *Ibid.*, p. 43.
50. *Ibid.*, p. 86.
51. *Ibid.*, p. 53.
52. *Ibid.*, p. 186.
53. Amit Chaudhuri, 'In the Waiting Room of History', in *London Review of Books*, Vol. 26, no. 12 (2004), pp. 3–8.
54. *Ibid.*
55. Rushdie offers an evocative description of this struggle as represented by the diasporic writer: 'Our identity is at once plural and partial. Sometimes we feel that we straddle two cultures; at other times, that we fall between two stools. But however ambiguous and shifting this ground may be, it is not an infertile territory for a writer to occupy. If literature is in part the business of finding new angles at which to enter reality, then once again our distance, our long geographical perspective, may provide us with such angles. Or it may be that that is simply what we must think in order to do our work'. Salman Rushdie, 'Imaginary Homelands', in *Imaginary Homelands: Essays and Criticism 1981–1991* (London: Granta, 1991), pp. 9–21.

behaviours are often judged against Western practices and consistently found wanting and un-modern.[56]

A significant portion of *Calcutta* is dedicated to Chaudhuri's working out of a new and changing personal relationship with Bombay/Calcutta/India. Although the narrative does not actually extol the UK at India's expense, it does re-orientalise India to some extent by repeatedly holding it up to scrutiny based on Western standards. An example of this is when Chaudhuri praises a chef for preparing a dish that demonstrates the man's familiarity with Western cooking. He writes about tasting a wild mushroom and cherry tomato bisque cappuccino a few years after moving back to Calcutta: 'I asked to see the chef to check out his features and demeanour personally, and to compliment him … . He must have been Calcutta's first skilled import in decades—at least from Europe'.[57] Although—or because—he may have been made to feel provincial or not quite good enough in his encounters with Calcutta, paradoxically, Chaudhuri himself can also be condescending, even imperialistic and high-handed. The whole story seems to speak of upper-class privileges and fancies: the demand to inspect the chef and pass judgement, and the critical reflection on Calcutta even when he is paying the chef this backhanded compliment.

As such, issues of authority and the legitimacy of the returnee writer are at stake in this portrait of urban India. That said, Chaudhuri flexes his insider status by daring to represent India with intimate criticality rather than in polite or congratulatory ways. He depicts the India he has returned to as still shackled by its colonial heritage, unable to live up to cosmopolitan standards. Testing the boundaries of belonging, he (very likely deliberately) performs a distinctively upper-caste and upper-class consciousness, with all its entitlements. He is prickly and resentful of any lack of respect shown to him: 'At the Calcutta Club, I was treated as millions are daily in India: as one intrinsically below par'.[58] And Bombay's hospitality is no warmer, leaving Chaudhuri feeling 'humbled, provincial … . There's something about the unprecedented, blasé mix of globalised India that's nervous-making, and threatens to make you forget your education, and feel diminished and small'.[59] He does not quite explain why or how this intriguing inferiority is imposed, but it seems clear that India has many degrees of 'unwelcome' which the returnee may find uncomfortable encountering. At these points, it would seem Chaudhuri feels it is a failing on India's part when he is not extended an appropriate welcome.

---

56. Post-independence novels and non-fiction works of Indian writing in English have consistently unsettled notions of 'modernity'. These narratives have demonstrated that, regarding the subcontinent, the discourse of modernity, in its singular tense, fails to cover the fractured and multi-temporal present of our multipolar world. Hence the concepts of 'multiple modernities', 'alternative modernities', modernity 'at large', 'multiple globalisations', and the interrelated notions of fluidity, localisation and hybridisation that they entail. For analyses of these concepts, see Zygmunt Bauman, *Liquid Modernity* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 2000); Dipesh Chakrabarty, *Provincializing Europe* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2000); Dilip Parameshwar Gaonkar (ed.), *Alternative Modernities* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2001); Peter L. Berger and Samuel P. Huntington (eds), *Many Globalizations: Cultural Diversity in the Contemporary World* (Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press, 2002); S.N. Eisenstadt, 'Multiple Modernities', in *Daedalus*, Vol. 129, no. 1 (2000), pp. 1–29; Bill Ashcroft, 'Alternative Modernities: Globalization and the Post-colonial', in *ARIEL*, Vol. 40, no. 1 (2009), pp. 81–105; Bill Ashcroft, 'Postcolonial Modernities', in *Kyiv-Mohyla Humanities Journal*, Vol. 1, no. 1 (2014), pp. 3–26; and Amy Allen, *The End of Progress: Decolonizing the Normative Foundations of Critical Theory* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2016).
57. Chaudhuri, *Calcutta*, p. 186.
58. *Ibid.*, p. 169.
59. *Ibid.*, p. 218.

Chaudhuri performs his insider status through his open intolerance for the Indian people. By *not* taking care to tread carefully and be politically correct as a visitor to India might, Chaudhuri instead demonstrates a certain—and typically local Indian—classist dismissal of and contempt for the masses, coated in barbed humour:

> The zoo, today, hardly has a middle-class visitor; what you see, instead, is an array of humanity, tourists from small towns, villages, and suburbs, casually strewing plastic bags in their wake, lower-middle class, working class, or plain poor, come to admire and wonder at and heckle the animals, whose responses range from indifferent to bewildered to contemptuous. These visitors are themselves hardly better looked after by the nation than the inarticulate inmates of the zoo, but are full of energy and noise, exotic in their colours and behaviours … .[60]

However, while performing an insider status, Chaudhuri simultaneously exploits his *outsider* status, for example, by accurately observing the fraught relationship and unwarranted class distinctions between the '*bhadralok*' (middle class) and the '*kaajer lok*' (working class), wherein the former wants greater commitment from the latter, but is not prepared to remunerate them adequately or provide sufficient security to secure their commitment: 'It's a patchwork democracy, heavily weighted against the poor', says Chaudhuri.[61] In fact, he indicts the whole system, the way of life of both communities. From an outsider standpoint, he is able to see how the '*bhadralok*' and '*kaajer lok*' are locked together in an uneasy, unsatisfactory, but reciprocal relationship, precisely because he is not (yet) implicated or complicit in it. While criticism of a host by a guest may not be explicitly prohibited, it may well undermine the unwritten contract of hospitality, contravening the laws of restraint and courtesy which supposedly characterise the roles of host and guest. In his critiques of Calcutta and India, Chaudhuri may therefore be testing the boundaries of acceptability where the guest–host code is concerned.

Orientalism, the academic understanding of the 'Orient', scientific and instrumental in purpose, can be discussed and analysed as a corporate institution for dealing with the 'Orient' by making statements about it, authorising views of it, describing it, teaching it, settling it, and ruling over it; in short, orientalism can be seen as a Western construct for dominating, restructuring and having authority over the 'Orient'.[62] Said takes the late eighteenth century as a very roughly-defined starting point for orientalism. Chaudhuri, as a returnee, is a twenty-first-century *post*-post-colonial writer who is re-orientalising India. He is no longer writing back to Empire, but back to 'home'. In essence, Chaudhuri is 'othering' India. Though this 'othering' of India is by no means the prerogative of the cosmopolitan returnee migrant, Chaudhuri's stance is revealing when he normalises not only his Westernised, but also his upper-caste and upper-class, standards as universal. In an inversion of the norms of hospitality, Chaudhuri's re-orientalism appears to expect India to extend a welcome on his terms, to extend the type and degree of hospitality he would prefer. This is not dissimilar to the attitude of a coloniser to the colony, with a similar sense of ownership, proprietorial stance, superiority and othering of the host.

---

60. *Ibid.*, p. 205.
61. *Ibid.*, p. 254.
62. Said, *Orientalism*, p. 3.

Chaudhuri's expectations of India's hospitality are complex: on the one hand, he resents the lack of warmth in the Indian welcome, but on the other, he might bristle if India extended a hospitality that underlined the (Derridean) territorial possession of the host–master by casting its returnees as mere guests. As Langmann points out, it is difficult to perform a hospitality free of hostility.[63]

Conclusion

Sojourner writers are perhaps what Pico Iyer has described as seasoned translators and global souls (using Kazuo Ishiguro and Salman Rushdie as exemplars); they are hybrid souls, 'citizens of the West who have easy access to the East, are able to make sense of either part of the cultural equation in terms of the Other', giving voice to hyphenated identities who commute between cultures and write from a space of 'in-betweenness'.[64] Sojourner writings are noticeable for their fragmented and multiple senses of home and belonging. This is in line with Massey's work on how place identities are not bounded or stable, but increasingly fluid, open and provisional: 'the identities of places are inevitably unfixed. They are unfixed in part precisely because the social relations out of which they are constructed are themselves by their very nature dynamic and changing'.[65] The unfixedness of identities impacts very directly upon hospitality theory because hospitality traditionally depends on clearly delineated positions and platforms of host–master and guest–stranger. When boundaries are blurred, or identities are multiple or overlapping, hospitality needs to be renegotiated to remain hospitable. But adding complexity to the condition of sojourner writers, recent narratives of Indian writing in English have underscored their authors' located-ness, not their dislocation; the authors offer an avowal of attachment to India as opposed to exilic detachment. In these narratives, conventions of hospitality are nego-tiated to effect diasporic re-territorialisation. If, particularly for the diasporic subject, being unmoored seemed to be a *sine qua non* of living in a globalised world, what the diasporic subject now seems to yearn for, in fiction and non-fiction, is to be re-territorialised in the glocal city. Extending this further, rather than being either totally unmoored or permanently berthed, there seems to be a desire to be anchored while still retaining the privilege of being able to weigh anchor and set sail to new shores at any time. In occupying (or claiming) such a positionality, sojourner writers push at the boundaries of the conventions of hospitality, testing its elasticity and tolerance.

It is pertinent to recall Said's observations on narrating the 'Orient' to further sus-tain the connections between (re-)orientalism and hospitality theory:

> Everyone who writes about the Orient must locate himself vis-à-vis the Orient; translated into his text, this location includes the kind of narrative voice he adopts, the type of structure he builds, the kinds of images, themes, motifs that circulate in his text—all of which add up to deliberate ways of addressing the reader, containing the Orient and finally representing it or speaking on its behalf.[66]

63. Langmann, 'Representational and Territorial Economies in Global Citizenship Education', pp. 399–409.
64. Amitava Kumar, *Bombay, London, New York* (Routledge: London, 2002), p. 178.
65. Massey, *Space, Place and Gender*, p. 168.
66. Said, *Orientalism*, p. 20.

Within orientalism as a discourse, the 'Oriental' as a colonised subject was denied a position, a voice and a space for expression; with re-orientalism, 'Orientals' themselves define, or redefine, 'the Orient'. However, even if re-orientalism opens up a space for self-representation, more than an overthrowing or reversal of power, re-orientalism brings about a rearrangement of the perspectives and thought systems at work in orientalism. Refracted through the idea of re-orientalism as a discourse, hospitality theory brings both enabling tropes and possible fractures when applied as an interpretive framework for analysing narratives of return. The India represented in Chaudhuri's *Calcutta* is a narrative construction clearly marked by the perceptions of an author who as an individual measures India by Western standards and so exposes the fragile and fragmented nature of the nation, but one who is nonetheless moved by an imaginary revisiting of the homeland as much as by the effect of yearning for a hospitable embrace.

Drawing on the Derridean conceptual framework of hospitality as an ambivalent discourse of inclusion and exclusion, of belonging and alienation, of welcoming and rejection, and using Chaudhuri's *Calcutta* as a case study, this article has analysed how those with the most privileged of personal resources still struggle with accessing hospitality, and the (inevitable) mismatch between expectations of hospitality on the part of both host and recipient. Chaudhuri's portrait of an individual who voluntarily chooses to migrate delineates how he negotiated the hospitality offered as well as the hospitality withheld—in this case, by an India that is granted the status of a host (whose withholding of hospitality Chaudhuri resents), and the India that is not granted the status of a host (and whose shortcomings are openly lamented). As such, this narrative illuminates some of the often unarticulated difficulties underlying the transition and adjustment processes migrants undergo when they seek the hospitality of host countries which are simultaneously their original homelands.

Having considered Chaudhuri's dilemma as the cosmopolitan guest and his expectations, further research could consider what India 'owes' Chaudhuri and its other returnees, and what would constitute an ethical response on India's part to the demands of the heterogeneous community that constitutes the Indian diaspora. Tolerance may not be the answer, or may not be an adequate answer, as Derrida reminds us:

> Tolerance is actually the opposite of hospitality. Or at least its limit. If I think I am being hospitable because I am tolerant, it is because I wish to limit my welcome, to retain power and maintain control over the limits of my 'home', my sovereignty, my I 'can' (my territory, my house, my language, my culture, my religion, and so on).[67]

Dasli, in fact, goes even further when she notes that 'tolerance runs counter to the imperatives of hospitality'.[68] Thus, if mere tolerance would be an inadequate response, India would have to formulate a clearer platform of hospitality towards its returnees when considering the need for 'an ethical response to the demand of the

67. Jürgen Habermas, Jacques Derrida and Giovanna Borradori, *Philosophy in a Time of Terror: Dialogues with Jürgen Habermas and Jacques Derrida* (Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 2003), pp. 127–8.
68. Maria Dasli, 'Intercultural Education of Tolerance and Hospitality', in *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education*, Vol. 38, no. 5 (2017), p. 8.

heterogeneous'.[69] In fact, the nation is already moving towards gestures of hospitality in terms of granting greater rights to NRIs with regard to inheritance and citizenship status.

That noted, the tension between Derridean unconditional and conditional hospitality remains inevitable considering 'the exigencies of the real world and the everyday laws that protect the threshold and the host from potentially abusive guests';[70] hence the process of negotiation between India and her returnees needs to continue. New guest–host contractual understandings and unwritten rules may need to be revised, rethought and rewritten. This much is visible in the ongoing re-conceptualisation of identity affiliation in cultural productions such as novels, art, music, etc., which continuously reflect and impact upon the fluid nature of societies today. Returnees of the future may find India's hospitality extending much further than previous returnees have experienced thus far, which may in turn inspire greater numbers of potential returnees.

Disclosure statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the author.

69. Langmann, 'Representational and Territorial Economies in Global Citizenship Education', p. 402.
70. Jelnikar, 'Hospitality and Worldliness', p. 354.