

Note from the Editors

This issue of *ARIEL* contains a cluster of articles commemorating the fortieth anniversary of Edward Said's groundbreaking book *Orientalism*. Most of the articles in this cluster make an eloquent case for Said's continuing relevance for scholars who grapple with critical approaches that might seem to have moved beyond his work.

In "Globalorientalization: Globalization through the Lens of Edward Said's *Orientalism*," Victor Li suggests that Said offers both an illuminating theory of globalization *avant la lettre* and a prescient critique of models of globalization that rely on essentializing identity claims or binaries between the global and local. Instrumental to this critique is Said's commitment to contrapuntal reading and, in Li's words, Said's "contrapuntal cosmopolitanism," which "accepts neither the global nor the local because rather than a position or place there is only movement, circulation, counterpoint, and constant departure from a place to which one is attached . . . so that one may better judge it." Continuing Li's exploration of Said's technique of contrapuntal reading, Christopher Langlois reads Salman Rushdie's *The Satanic Verses* contrapuntally, showing how this practice can apply "to literary textual locations outside of the over-trodden British tradition." By doing so, Langlois illustrates how contrapuntal reading can answer the call of contemporary theorists of world literature to acknowledge what Langlois calls "the untranslatability of a planetary imagination."

Robert Warrior's article, "'The Finest Men We Have Ever Seen': Reading Jefferson's Osage Encounters through *Orientalism*," takes inspiration from Said's book in order to understand the colonial encounter between the United States and the Osages in the early nineteenth century. In addition to emphasizing the enduring relevance of Said's work, Warrior suggests in particular that Said's methodology continues to have value for contemporary Indigenous studies. This is a provocative proposal given that Indigenous studies has arguably sidelined Said's

work and postcolonial theory out of a sense that they ignore the ongoing need for *anti*-colonial scholarship and activism. (For further discussion of the relationship between postcolonial and Indigenous studies, see Byrd and Rothberg, “Between Subalternity and Indigeneity.” *ARIEL* will offer more on the important relationship between Indigenous studies and postcolonial theory in its upcoming fiftieth anniversary special issue, *Indigenous and Postcolonial Studies in Conversation*.) In the process of making their arguments, Li, Langlois, and Warrior illuminate different strands of Said’s thought, but the fourth article in the cluster makes this kind of illumination its focus. “Said, Marxism, and Spatiality: Wars of Position in Oppositional Criticism” examines Said’s disavowed but in fact intimate relationship to Marxism. Robert Tally explores affinities between Said’s thinking and that of critics like Georg Lukács, Antonio Gramsci, and Fredric Jameson, finding a distinct point of convergence in their spatially oriented interventions. These retrospective considerations of a foundational text in postcolonial studies seem especially timely not only because of the recent fortieth anniversary of Said’s book but also because 2020 is *ARIEL*’s fiftieth anniversary.

We will continue this series of exciting commemorative articles on Said’s *Orientalism* in later issues of this volume, but at this point we want to extend a special thanks to Christopher Langlois, who first proposed the idea of this cluster on Said’s *Orientalism* and solicited the articles that appear here and will appear in future issues.

Works Cited

- Byrd, Jodi and Michael Rothberg. “Between Subalternity and Indigeneity: Critical Categories for Postcolonial Studies.” *Interventions*, vol. 13, no. 1, 2011, pp. 1–12.