
H-France Review Vol. XX (July 2020), No. 125

Sam Coombes, *Édouard Glissant: A Poetics of Resistance*. London: Bloomsbury, 2018. xiii + 199 pp. Bibliography and index. £63.00 U.K. (hb). ISBN: 978-1-350-036833.

Review by Adlai Murdoch, Tufts University.

In this book, Sam Coombes seeks to provide an in-depth critical overview of the theoretical work of the late Édouard Glissant, the Martinican essayist, poet, novelist, and philosopher. It is beyond question that Glissant has long been a pre-eminent, even iconic literary figure in the Francophone world, one whose major contributions to the specificity of the Caribbean experience, to the articulation of community resistance, and to the world of postcolonial theory through his concepts of creolization, *antillanité*, *opacité*, and Relation remain unquestioned. Coombes's well-researched and thoroughly-articulated analysis of the principal tenets of Glissant's thought covers both the 'early' and the 'late' Glissant, tracing his efforts to locate "the situation of post-colonial communities...in relation to larger and indeed hegemonic cultures" (p. xi).

Something of a glissantian overview is probably in order here. Glissant's crosscultural poetics, initially articulated in *Le discours antillais* (1981), but greatly expanded in his *Poétique de la relation* (1990), writes identity out of a historically- and culturally-grounded core Antillean experience. His concept of *antillanité* (Caribbeanness) can be defined as a cultural praxis that draws on the sum total of the historical, racial, cultural and political experience(s) of the Caribbean people. His corollary of insistence on recognizing the latent value of historical patterns of discontinuity and pluralism across the Caribbean--and of their appropriation for cultural self-assertion--is in direct response both to the Western valorization of linear models and accounts of history and to the primary defining regional experiences of colonization, slavery, racism, and insularity. In this way, Glissant sought to specify the principles of a creole culture that would include the wider English, Spanish, and Dutch Caribbean, as well as the French overseas departments of Guadeloupe and Martinique, reflecting and representing the region's constant creative flux and its insistent patterns of transformation and exchange. The larger theoretical concept of Relation (*la Relation*) inscribes a non-hierarchical principle of equality, a relation of mutuality with and respect for the Other as different from oneself. On a larger scale, the concept presupposes a natural openness to other cultures. Glissant also inscribed the figure of the archipelago as both symbol and catalyst of diversity. It immediately separates itself in an important way from continental systems and their corollaries of universalism and totality. He subsequently linked this archipelagic thought to patterns of resistance. He also developed and explored the concept of opacity, positing the lack of transparency, the untranslatability, and the unknowability of the subject as core components of a strategy of resistance. Lastly, he importantly also accorded pride of place to creolization,

which he had long seen as a process of cultural exchange that was interactive, transformational, and unpredictable. [1] It is through his insistence on this unpredictability of creolization that the patterns of boundaries of Glissant's vision of subject and community begin to come into focus.

Coombes begins his account of Glissant's thought with *Poétique de la relation*, its 1990 publication arguably marking an oft-cited shift in his perspective and argumentation, particularly as regards its precedent, the monumental *Le discours antillais*. Coombes lays out the ways in which this text's "distinctive theoretical vision" makes up a "new paradigm"; however, the claim that this "was to remain *the* operative paradigm in Glissant's work until the end of his life" does seem to overstate the case somewhat (p. 4; emphasis in the original), as I hope to show. Coombes argues that, as early as Glissant's *Soleil de la conscience* (1956), his "thought involves a fundamental critique of intellectual, as indeed socio-historical hierarchies," categories which are arguably imbricated in Western social and political practices (p. 5). In predicating his vision of the diversity undergirding Caribbean ethnocultural identity on Deleuze and Guattari's concept of the rhizome, he sought to negate the singular notions of filiation and authority that undergirded these Western hierarchies. But much of the basis of the theoretical approaches articulated in *Caribbean Discourse*, and which were rearticulated and refined nine years later in the *Poétique*, are not addressed here. Glissant's survey of the specificity of the Caribbean experience, emphasizing the ambiguities and disjunctures which, arising out of a series of brutal historical and ethnocultural encounters, he inscribes as the principal signs of Caribbean identity, remains excluded from Coombes's analysis. For Glissant, the historical fragmentation grounding regional affiliations, and whose contestatory elements therefore seek to subvert the inherited dualities that lurk within the postcolonial condition, engender the diversity and pluralism framing the functioning of a regional identity structure and become inscribed in and through the principle of creolization. These intrinsic pluralities lead to his positing of the principle of Relation as "an ideal world in which all languages and cultures...would be accorded equal respect" (p. 11). The generation of a fundamental positioning in anti-colonialist principles can be seen in a related set of key concepts: difference is "an act of resistance in the face of all forms of assimilationist thinking," while errantry is unalterably opposed to the universal, and opacity "safeguards cultural specificity from assimilation to the imperialist designs of majoritarian cultures and communities" (p. 16). The foundational anticolonialism linking poetics to politics in Glissant's world is briefly outlined before turning to Relation and its aftermath.

Coombes correctly points out at the opening of chapter two that "Glissant's works of the last twenty or so years revisit and explore in new ways the concepts laid out in *Poétique de la relation*" but that "they also build on and...extend those concepts" (p. 21). Here, Coombes also points to a complex continuity that has long characterized Glissant's thought. He points correctly to the centrality of the concept of Relation emerging from and through *Caribbean Discourse*, and to Glissant's specific references to the importance of migration and transformation--what he calls *le Détour*--at the outset of this text, although the specificity of its Caribbean context remains somewhat overlooked. He goes on to characterize Glissant's concept of the *Tout-monde* (or the Whole World), as "a manner of apprehending the world in all its diversity as a totality." At the same time, this core diversity of "the 'Whole-World' is irreconcilable with contemporary globalization understood in terms of its negative, culturally homogenizing effects" (p. 28). This is a key distinction that allows us to interpret Glissant's fundamental positions as a strategy of resistance; the *tout-monde* has "a utopian dimension" that fundamentally makes it "of a piece with the concept of creolization" (p. 29). But when Coombes goes on to establish parallels between Glissant's approach and argumentation and that of Paul Gilroy, things become a little more

problematic. While he accurately cites certain parallel approaches to historical patterns and ethnocultural strategies that tend to conjoin these thinkers, the assertion that “Glissant’s interest in the Caribbean experience has always been centred on the communities of the Caribbean islands themselves, whereas Gilroy initially interested himself in the Caribbean population living in the UK and subsequently the African diaspora conceived more broadly” (p. 30), risks inscribing both authors into a rather reductive parallel framework if not, indeed, something of a false equivalence as regards the differing geopolitical contexts of these communities and these authors’ contrasting strategies aimed at recognizing and securing the interests of their respective cohorts. He then turns to one of Glissant’s central concerns, a critical attachment to Eurocentrism that produces what he calls “universalist systems of thought” that “deny minoritarian cultures the right to difference” (p. 34). In a crucial gesture, by elaborating the archipelagic framework of the Caribbean experience so that its non-linearities undergird unexpected and transformative patterns of thought and encounter, Glissant contrasts it with the hierarchies and prejudices that have plagued those nations and nationalisms historically grounded in, or stubbornly in pursuit of, continental systems of thought and social organization and their corollaries of domination, appropriation, and exploitation. In a critical act of conceptual conflation, Glissant joins the principle of creolization to the emerging phenomenon of archipelagic, rather than continental thought. His in-depth analysis of the character and scope of the former concept “confirms that it derives from an understanding of the cultural history and make-up of the Caribbean,” and further that “the open-ended nature of creolization is also what makes it so well suited to the diverse contexts and situations to which Glissant applies it” (p. 48). But it is in attempting to differentiate creolization from *créolité* that Coombes’s analysis begins to fall a bit short.

Coombes’s reading of Glissant’s concept of creolization confirms that it is “the result of two or more linguistic and cultural spheres coming into contact with each other and giving rise to an unpredictable outcome” (p. 48). At the same time, *antillanité* progressively cedes importance in Glissant’s discourse to concepts of creolization, particularly those “highlighting ongoing processes of change,” as Coombes correctly points out (p. 50). Importantly, however, in broadening the conceptualization and applicability of creolization in this way, the slavery-driven circumstances undergirding the originary inscription of creolization in *Caribbean Discourse*—wherein, as Coombes indicates, Glissant argues that “through forced migration and resettlement slave populations had no choice but to change; they had to transform into something they had never been before,” thereby acknowledging the brutalist tensions of slavery as “one of the best kept secrets of creolization” (p. 25)—is increasingly abandoned in favor of an approach whose more fluid geopolitical basis does not take slavery and its racisms into account. This dissonance comes into clearer view when Coombes sets out to tackle the basic tenets of the *créolité* movement. Patrick Chamoiseau, Raphaël Confiant, and the late Jean Bernabé, two novelists and a linguist, respectively, co-authored the *Eloge de la créolité* as self-professed acolytes of Glissant in 1989. [2] But from the outset, his claim that “the vision of ‘Créolité’ which they present is not founded on an accurate reading of the ideas of their ‘maître à penser’” is itself riddled with inaccuracies (p. 53). For while, indeed, it can be argued that “the creolists [sing] the praises of oral expression in unequivocally eulogious terms,” the concomitant claim that this leads to “the promotion of oral culture...as absolutely indispensable to literary production” arguably overstates the case somewhat (p. 53). In fact, what is missing from this analysis—and, indeed, from many similar in theme—is the notion that *créolité* was predicated on carving out a separate, but specific artistic and cultural framework for expression from these patterns of orality. This cultural turn arguably lay at the core of the form and function of the discursive inscription of *créolité*, and indeed, from its opening lines, what it sought most to contest was a longstanding binary perspective that saw

the Caribbean as part of an either/or, Africa/Europe continuum whose singularity still lay in the concept of ethnoracial separation. The aim of this coalescent vision was to use *créolité's* primary instantiation in French creole as an enabling metaphor to help develop modalities for creative expression in the arts that would emphasize the region's creative intersectionality and prioritize local pluralities over metropolitan singularities, all while performing through new perspectives and practices the multiplicity and complexity of the creole mosaic.

And so while "oralité' [orality] is viewed by the creolists as a central pillar of creole identity" (p. 54), its artistic strategy arguably sought to broaden Caribbean identity by allowing multiple influences to coexist by (re)valorizing neglected or forgotten aspects of these transformational encounters drawn from the colonial experience. Their praxis thus reflected neither an "essentialist insistence on a unitary root," nor did it identify with "a putatively lost collective past" (p. 54); rather, what might appear to be the "willfully traditionalist, not to say parochial, focus which Chamoiseau and Confiant appeared to favour in their own literary publications" (p. 55) sought to undo the instantiation in the periphery of the binary hierarchies of *francité*, or Frenchness, such that departmentalization's neocolonial marginalization of the local would be halted, with a vibrant valorization of indigenous cultural affirmation taking its place. Indeed, what is being reflected and embodied in their discourse is the multiplicity and complexity of the creole mosaic. "Our history is a braid of histories....We are at once Europe, Africa, and enriched by Asian contributions, we are also Levantine, Indians, as well as pre-Columbian Americans in some respects." Creoleness is "*the world diffracted but recomposed...a Totality*" (p. 88; emphasis in the original). At the same time, the *Éloge* emphasized the key role of the arts broadly conceived in the articulation of these ideas, "full knowledge of Creoleness will be reserved for Art, for Art absolutely", suggesting that *créolité* be read as a discursive undertaking aimed primarily at enhancing multivalent modes of cultural expression.[3] As a result, their literary representations of Martinique and Guadeloupe as they were before the advent of departmentalization is meant to serve as a bulwark against the increasing literal and figurative *bétonisation* of the post-departmental period, with its corollary of erasure of long-standing traditions ironically embedded only in the islands' oral culture.

Similarly, one might say that Coombes's characterization of the "largely autobiographical memoir *Ecrire en pays dominé*" (p. 52) appears to overlook the crucial point that it is here that Chamoiseau interrogates longstanding categories of Frenchness and Caribbeanness and inscribes a set of writing practices aimed at illuminating the persistent ambivalences emerging from over three hundred years of a dominant French presence and almost fifty years of French Caribbean overseas departmentalization. This double process of economic and cultural domination appropriates identitarian issues of ambiguity, belonging and authenticity predicated on the departmental experience in general and its educational practices in particular. Finally, here, the claim of irony undergirding the fact that "almost all the literature that has been published by the creolists themselves since the *Eloge* appeared has been principally in French" (p. 55) conveniently overlooks the salient fact that what matters here is that the form of such material contributes to, and often supersedes, its content. Indeed, many critics have noted, and discussed both at length and in depth, what they term the *chamoisification* of the French language; this strategy undergirds Chamoiseau's narrative style to the extent that he deliberately blends together standard French, Martinican regional French, creole nouns and verbs, and the transliteration of these creole influences into new French-like vocabulary mixed with onomatopoeia, to generate a unique representation of French Caribbean materiality. This ongoing strategic subversion of standard French is a deliberately differential discourse that seeks to contest the ongoing domination of

local French Caribbean culture by metropolitan France. This discursive re-presentation of French Caribbean identity can by no means be characterized as simply French. Rather, it inscribes a recognition and an affirmation of regional and cultural difference grounded in specificities of historicity, language and ethnicity.

Coombes calls on Guadeloupean author Maryse Condé, and more specifically her well-known opposition to the principles and practices of *créolité*, to buttress his argument concerning broad artistic opposition to this praxis. But while it is true that Condé has indeed criticized the creolists for what she sees as their limited range of style and theme, it is by no means the case, as he goes on to claim, that Condé's *Traversée de la mangrove* constitutes "a very deliberate rewrite" of Chamoiseau's *Solibo magnifique*, thereby "invert[ing] all the principal underlying intellectual positions articulated in Chamoiseau's work of the preceding year" (p. 63).^[4] Now on the one hand, it can be claimed that both novels share "a similarity of narrative construction which is too readily apparent" (p. 63), addressing certain parallels long familiar to specialists in French Caribbean literature, from the death of the protagonist at the opening of both texts to the unspooling of plots seeking to clarify and solve the mystery undergirding the true identity and circumstances of the demise of them both. But Chamoiseau ultimately essays a parody of the detective novel aimed ultimately at overturning the Western valorization of the written over the oral, while Condé inscribes a series of first-person testimonies of encounters with the protagonist that take place at a wake attended by a cross-section of the village, meant to highlight its diverse ethnocultural construction. Further, there are additional problems that arise with the assertions that propel this analysis. While it is certainly fair to say that, rather than "Chamoiseau present[ing] his own association with Solibo as a coming to awareness involving a profound questioning of his own intellectual background and training" (p. 63), what this association in fact illuminates is an oppositional and revelatory tension between the scriptive, the oral, and the temporalities that they re-present as they impact the most effective means of conveying the immediacy of French Caribbean materiality. In addition, despite their superficial similarities, these novels articulate substantial differences in characterization, theme, and narrative practice, so that the claim that Condé deliberately rewrote Chamoiseau's novel would have required—temporally at least—the nearly superhuman feat of conceiving and writing her novel in less than a year. It thus amounts, at a minimum, to a gross overstatement of the facts, and a claim unknown to any specialist of Condé's or Chamoiseau's work, including, or especially, those who know them personally. In sum, then, if "Glissant's ideas were misread by his creolist followers," as Coombes claims (p. 66), perhaps we can also posit a certain misreading of creolist theory and practice as it obtains in this section of his text.

From here, Coombes goes on to consider in greater depth Glissant's inscription in universalist thought and, even more importantly, the putative link between his rejection of this approach and the specificity of Martinique and Guadeloupe's geopolitical relationship to mainland France. Here, Coombes's rightly acknowledges that this relationship is marked by "neocolonial implications" and "accusations of paternalism and intrusiveness in internal affairs" (p. 70). Indeed, it is no exaggeration to claim that the overseas departmental relationship is one that is incontestably unique in the postcolonial world, marking as it does the only occasion on which a former colony was completely integrated into the formal legal and political structure of the colonizing power. Now the neocolonial ambiguities and possibilities for continued domination and exploitation of the periphery are legion, but above all they lead us to assert that the implications and contestation of neocolonial French governmental praxis towards the Antilles reject much more than an "abstract type of universalism" (p. 70).^[5] Indeed, if over time the

hegemonic attitudes wrought by French universalist thinking have mediated and, indeed, enabled colonialism, slavery, racism, economic and ethnocultural marginalization, and an overweening nationalism, then the false inclusivity claimed by such universalism and the neoliberalism that the overseas departmental relation implicitly enables in the present not only effectively removes it from the realm of abstraction, but also problematizes the notion that “certain dimensions of universalist thinking...are...worth salvaging” (pp. 70-71). Put another way, these ongoing departmental ambiguities inform both “the coherence of Glissant’s opposition to universalism” (p. 73), and the “chronic lack of autonomy” (p. 76), a conjunction predicated on the contradiction that “the islands remain colonies of sorts despite being French ‘départements’” (p. 77). This resistance to assimilation, the conundrum of Martinique’s “position of subservience in relation to a larger nation like France” (p. 77), is inalterably bound up with Glissant’s attachment to archipelagic, rather than continental or universalist thinking.

In this regard, Coombes’s extended discussion of universalism in a glissantian context takes something of an unexpected tack when he sets out to examine the parameters of “Glissant’s blanket rejection of universalism.” Starting from the premise that “most if not all colonial projects, not just that of the French, propounded would-be universalist doctrines to greater or lesser degrees,” Coombes wonders if Glissant does not “throw out the baby of an aspiration to universally applicable values with the French Republican universalist and homogenizing globalist bathwater” (p. 79). To this end, he succinctly, but effectively brings together for comparison three recent critiques of universalism written from divergent points of view. The first of these, Caroline Fourest’s *La dernière utopie. Menaces sur l’universalisme*, sets out to defend “the brand of universalism commonly associated with the French Republican mindset” (p. 79), to use Coombes’s words.[6] Coombes correctly perceives key limitations in Fourest’s approach, especially “her skepticism of what she sees to be an increasingly invasive multiculturalist policy,” which leads to a tendency to “overlook the problems which the French social model engenders” (p. 80). But even so, his analysis here does not take into account the fundamental hypocrisy undergirding French universalism’s “origins in Enlightenment thinking and the Revolution of 1789” (p. 80), when such renowned *philosophes* as Rousseau, Voltaire and Diderot somehow managed to ignore the enslavement of millions of black human beings on France’s periphery while glorifying the rights of man and the citizen in the metropole. Their indignation regarding slavery in theory was arguably balanced by them ignoring it in practice, so that slavery ultimately was little but a metaphor meant to service the advancement of the European subject. Serial objections by “members of minority immigrant and postcolonial communities” (p. 81) to French universalism, then, tend to encompass these critical intersections of universal humanism with the selective denial of such humanism. By contrast, Coombes points out that Amin Maalouf insists in *Le Dérèglement du monde* that “the equal dignity of human beings cannot be sacrificed or compromised in the name of a declared respect for the particularities of cultures other than one’s own” (p. 82).[7] Maalouf’s approach to “cultural difference in different parts of the world...encourage[s] the identification of commonalities between different cultures,” arguably paralleling Glissant’s insistence on “understand[ing] all cultural others” but without his caveat of opacity (p. 82). Finally, Coombes cites the French philosopher François Jullien’s “critique of the abstract, disembodied, asocial character of European, and subsequently Western, Universalism” (p. 84) in his *De l’universel, de l’uniforme, du commun et du dialogue entre les cultures*. [8] In a world caught between “the ills of universalism on the one hand, and the uniformizing tendencies of globalization on the other” (pp. 77-78), Coombes argues that Jullien considers the challenges the concept increasingly faces as new centers of power and thinking emerge in various locations, and Jullien’s own survey of universal values obtaining in other

countries confirms his conviction that they “must be viewed as a historically and culturally conditioned phenomenon,” despite their “manifold disparities” (p. 84). Achieving the “genuine dialogue between different cultures” that Jullien envisions while simultaneously avoiding the “ascendancy” of any is a challenge to “preserving cultural specificity and diversity in our globalized world” (p. 85), but presumes, like these other approaches, an absence or an abandonment of what Jullien calls a totalizing universal or an imperialist subtext to universalism, a presumption that Glissant is unwilling to grant.

The critical question of Glissant’s “post-political turn,” as Coombes puts it, comes in for fairly lengthy treatment in chapter five, wherein he critiques the tendency to separate Glissant’s conception of “poetics” from “politics and ethics, suggesting a way of apprehending the world as a totality not just as it presently is but as it could be” (p. 91). While interrogating the more or less arbitrary assignation of the year 1990 as initiating this conceptual turning, Coombes cites the publication of “a number of unambiguously political texts by Glissant” (p. 90), including *Quand les murs tombent. Identité nationale hors la loi?* (2007) and *L’Intraitable beauté du monde. Adresse à Barack Obama* (2009), both authored with Patrick Chamoiseau, as examples of discourses with specifically political contexts and themes. Coombes also cites here *Mémoires des Esclavages* (2007), a text written in the wake of Glissant being commissioned by President Jacques Chirac to oversee the establishment of a National Centre for the Commemoration of Slavery and its Abolition, whose role the former envisioned as “involving transforming the nature of critical thinking and the corpus of materials for study with respect to transatlantic slavery” (p. 111). He follows this with informed readings of Glissantian critics like Chris Bongie and his assessment of the author’s poetics, and Peter Hallward’s take on the influence of Deleuze, particularly as regards “the claim that Deleuze’s thought implies apoliticism and an alignment with postmodernism” (p. 92). This investigation leads him to conclude that “Glissant’s Relation . . . constitutes a counter-narrative of globalization” pp. (96-97). Importantly, he points to Glissant’s opposition to “the chauvinist nationalism of colonialism and neocolonialism” (p. 97), evoking in these terms the author’s principle of opacity as “neither obscurity nor sectarianism,” but rather a drive to protect one’s culture “from subsumption in the invasive neo-imperialist influences from outside which would seek to co-opt it” (p. 99). In both principle and practice, then, opacity thus articulates its own vision of postcolonial resistance as “a demand that one’s own culture, however minoritarian it may be, should be accorded full respect” (p. 99), a position aimed at ensuring cultural specificity, as well as exposing globalization’s transnationalist guise as a variant of colonialist praxis.

Coombes rounds out this chapter with assessments of several of Glissant’s shorter texts published during the 2010s. Here, he importantly posits “the very nature of cultural identity of which relationality is such an important dimension” in *Quand les murs tombent* (pp. 113-114), but his reading of the *Manifeste pour les produits de haute nécessité*, while correctly noting “the directly political content of quite a number of passages” (p. 115), somehow manages to give short shrift to its direct context; the transformational 44-day-long mass general strike protesting the elevated and inequitable cost of living in the French Caribbean DOM in February and March of 2009. Demonstrations by as many as 100,000 people against prices that were often 250 percent or more above their metropolitan counterparts brought Guadeloupe and Martinique to a standstill, and an agreement with the French government was eventually reached that included an increase in the monthly minimum wage and reduced prices on public transportation, gasoline, food, housing, and water. Seen in these terms, the phrase “a social protest movement in the French Caribbean against government policy accused of not doing enough to ensure equal treatment for the overseas ‘départements’” appears to understate the intensity of the events to

some degree (pp. 115-116). His final chapter, entitled "A poetics of resistance and change," accurately sums up the key tenets of what he calls "the fundamentally anti-establishmentarian orientation of Glissant's political thinking" (p. 164), highlighting his vision of "an ever-more creolized and creolizing world" (p. 165) whose fundamental practices embodied the author's "counternarrative of globalization" (p. 166). And so, while "Glissant extends the creolizing processes formerly associated with the Caribbean context to the international context" (168), Coombes simultaneously presents here in some detail the fundamental principles undergirding the thought of the philosopher Hamed Hosseini, highlighting his argument for a "new historical subjectivity" that "offer[s] a much-needed basis and blueprint for collective political action in today's struggle to transform contemporary globalization" (p. 171). For Coombes, then, Hosseini "provides a valuable complement to the vision of the later Glissant, offering a dimension that is very largely absent in Glissant's writing" (p. 174). In a similar vein, he also outlines Paul Gilroy's vision of a "post-humanist humanism" (p. 176), albeit with the caveat that neither Gilroy's nor Glissant's approach can be "plausibly considered to be a valid substitute for organized politics" (p. 177). Concluding with a broadbased critique of globalization and activist politics, he reiterates the importance of "the idea of relationality which lies at the heart of Glissant's thought. It involves an implicit acceptance of the multiplicity and diversity of cultures around the globe and leads us to perceive the value of that multiplicity and diversity in its undermining of normative assumptions," an effective summation of Glissant's overall position (p. 186).

In sum, then, while *Edouard Glissant: A Poetics of Resistance* concentrates on the "later" Glissant, the book can be considered a constructive addition to the critical canon on Glissant's work. Overall, its argumentation clarifies certain aspects of the author's thought while leaving other time frames and their themes and content relatively unaddressed. Like almost any academic text, while there might be failings in certain areas, these are arguably balanced--or even outweighed--by the argumentation in other areas, here the broad globalization framework that enables and illuminates the extended treatment of Relation. It will make a valuable addition to any college or critical library.

NOTES

[1] The primary textual analyses of Glissant's thought include J. Michael Dash, *Edouard Glissant* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009) and Celia Britton, *Edouard Glissant and Postcolonial Theory* (Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 1999).

[2] Jean Bernabé, Patrick Chamoiseau and Raphaël Confiant, *Éloge de la créolité* (Paris: Gallimard, 1989).

[3] Bernabé, Chamoiseau and Confiant, *Éloge de la créolité / In Praise of Creoleness* (Paris: Gallimard, 1993), p. 90.

[4] Maryse Condé, *Traversée de la mangrove* (Paris: Mercure de France, 1989) and Patrick Chamoiseau, *Solibo magnifique* (Paris: Gallimard, 1988).

[4] For an excellent recent assessment of the policies and contradictions surrounding the instantiation of departmentalization and its aftermath, See Kristen Stromberg Childers, *Seeking Imperialism's Embrace: National Identity, Decolonization, and Assimilation in the French Caribbean* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2016).

[5] Caroline Fourest, *La dernière utopie. Menaces sur l'universalisme* (Éditions Grasset & Fasquelle, 2009).

[6] Amin Maalouf, *Le Dérèglement du monde* (Éditions Grasset & Fasquelle, 2009).

[7] François Jullien, *De l'universel, de l'uniforme, du commun et du dialogue entre les cultures* (Paris: Fayard, 2008).

Adlai Murdoch
Tufts University
H.Murdoch.tufts.edu

Copyright © 2020 by the Society for French Historical Studies, all rights reserved. The Society for French Historical Studies permits the electronic distribution of individual reviews for nonprofit educational purposes, provided that full and accurate credit is given to the author, the date of publication, and the location of the review on the H-France website. The Society for French Historical Studies reserves the right to withdraw the license for edistribution/republication of individual reviews at any time and for any specific case. Neither bulk redistribution/republication in electronic form of more than five percent of the contents of *H-France Review* nor republication of any amount in print form will be permitted without permission. For any other proposed uses, contact the Editor-in-Chief of H-France. The views posted on *H-France Review* are not necessarily the views of the Society for French Historical Studies.

ISSN 1553-9172