Spaces beyond the horizon? Alternative imaginative geographies between Europe and the Orient.*

Roger Bivand†

March 2000

1 Introduction

Observing the changes taking place in the world as we know it, and in the expected reflection of that, or those, worlds in academic discourses, one can hardly help but be struck by the power of agenda-writers and gatekeepers. They are by their own declaration far from wishing to impose any concept or thought on their readers, interlocutors or students, and willingly admit how partial their perceptions are, or at any rate the best of them express these reservations clearly enough.¹ Despite this, it may be argued that their less erudite and empowered

*An earlier version of parts of this paper, entitled ‘Imaginative geographies: spaces beyond the horizon?’, appeared in Kukliński, A. (editor) 1997: European space, Baltic space, Polish space — Part two, European Institute for Regional and Local Development, University of Warsaw, pp. 213–220. A subsequent version was presented at the Second European Urban and Regional Studies Conference, Durham, England, September 1998. I would like to thank anonymous referees for Area and Geografiska Annaler B for their at least partly helpful advice, and for brave attempts to grasp what this essay might be about.

†The author teaches geography at the Norwegian School of Economics and Business Administration in Bergen, Norway, and at the University of Gdańsk, Poland. He is a Council member and was the founding Director of the Business School at Warsaw University of Technology. He taught geography at Adam Mickiewicz University, Poznań, Poland, 1975–1982. He was obliged to leave Poland with his wife, Ewa Siarkiewicz, and daughter in September 1982, finding work in Norway. He was born in Gloucestershire, England, and educated at King’s School, Worcester, St John’s College, Cambridge, and the London School of Economics.

¹Derek Gregory, in his preface to Geographical Imaginations, Oxford: Blackwell, 1994, dwells on the importance of his move to Vancouver in 1989 in throwing his previous “everyday
pupils will be guided in their choice of further reading and study within the conceptual realms in which the discourses are conducted. Geographies are being stretched by the density of reference accorded to concepts, topics, and their contexts, leaving potential “others” beyond the ken of social-theory informed participants, spaced out, one could say.

This contrast made itself evident to me in Edinburgh in January 1983 at the annual conference of British geographers. I had just learned of the capture by the Polish security police of a friend (or possibly friends) from Poznań, and was to give a paper on the geography of the “Solidarity” social movement. I was — and remain — nonplussed by the absence of interest in these matters; I understood that something had affected my perception of events when Gregory, apparently unwilling to hear out my probably tedious account of being part of a vital social movement, impressed on me the significance of the personal tragedies of leading French structuralists being played out then. The chasm was intimately tangible, and most likely infinitely wide. Not just the experience of the sixteen months of “Solidarity”, but also of learning to know oneself and others in the state of war: the counterposition of human dignity, podmiotowość, and servility, fear and selflessness in meeting the eye of the tyrant.

The eye of the tyrant is captured in a most striking way in Igor Newerly’s memoirs of the Bolshevik Revolution, when he finds himself in Kyiv in 1923, a young man drifting towards the Menshevik Social Democratic youth movement after active service on the side of the Reds, all to his family’s alarm and dismay. Their repatriation to Poland is arranged, all that remains is to sit tight and wait.

In this situation mother’s voice — sit still, we’re leaving! — possessed the full weight of sense and obvious rationality, all the activities and perspectives of Kyiv lost their meaning, just carry on cautiously taking care and I was cautious, I did take care, in the club I permitted myself sincerity only among a few trusted colleagues, whom I was leaving behind, but the Never-sleeping Eye lifted its lid, scorching me in a way that shattered my reserve in its blast.2

The reader is free to object that this is also a clip, a subjective sound-bite. I would respond, though, that if you had, as I did, read it in the first edition (1981), having carried it out of a Polish internment camp on the Soviet Border in the snows of practice” into relief (p. ix). I am aware that it is unfair to pick on a particular scholar to represent a disparate field, but since we were contemporaries at Cambridge, this is the choice that I have made. Unlike Gregory, I am but a geographer for the working-day.

late January 1982, the objection might perhaps be moderated. The first person narrator in Neverly’s story found that all but one of his friends had been arrested during the night; the two of them stung into action began to duplicate pamphlets protesting at the betrayal of socialism; he was apprehended without delay:

The sledge was already waiting outside the gate, we drove closely embraced. I could not stand, or call out, long live socialism, the discrete grip restraining my shoulder and a warning mutter — no nonsense or I’ll hurt you — made me realise that I was in the grasp of the GPU. ³

This is an Orient where the choice of Black or White Sea is a whim of the tyrant, the Never-sleeping Eye. It is an Orient expressed in many tonalities by Joseph Brodsky, born in then Leningrad but choosing St Petersburg as his own, sentenced to hard labour north of Vologda, near Archangelsk, and finally exiled to the West. His essay Flight from Byzantium, penned in 1985, by a ‘son of a geographer’ ⁴ - his father was both geographer and journalist - expresses in its often violent forms much of what I wished to illuminate here: there is more to imaginary geographies, or nightmare geographies, than has hitherto been admitted in discourse. Maybe this is special pleading, but Brodsky can better speak for himself:

I’m not a historian, or a journalist, or an ethnographer. At best, I’m a traveller, a victim of geography. Not of history, be it noted, but of geography. That is what still links me with the country where it was my fate to be born, with our famed Third Rome. ⁵

To get a good picture of one’s native realm, one needs either to get outside its walls or to spread out a map. But as has been remarked before, who looks at maps nowadays. If civilizations — of whatever sort they are — do indeed spread like vegetation in the opposite direction to the glacier, from south to north, where could Rus, given her geographical position, possibly tuck herself away from Byzantium? Not just Kievan Rus, but Muscovite Rus as well, and then all the rest of it between the Donets and the Urals. And one should, frankly, thank Tamerlane and Genghis Khan for retarding the

---

³ Ibid., p. 376 (my translation).
⁴ Brodsky, J. 1987: Less than One. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books. The essay is to be found on pp. 393–446, while this quotation is an aside on p. 440, in full: ‘Yet, a son of a geographer, I believe that Urania is older than Clio; among Mnemosyne’s daughters, I think, she is the oldest.’
⁵ Ibid, pp. 443–4.
process somewhat, by somewhat freezing — or, rather, trampling — the flowers of Byzantium. . . . There was nowhere else for Rus to go to get away from Byzantium — any more than for the West to get away from Rome. . . . Rus received, or took, from Byzantium hands everything: not only Christian liturgy but also the Christian-Turkish system of statecraft (gradually more and more Turkish, less vulnerable, more militarily ideological), not to mention a significant part of its vocabulary.\footnote{Ibid, pp. 436–7.}

These Orientes are not those of Gregory, and maybe are not even worth much attention in the academy, but can hardly deserve to be placed out of ken. While Gregory is surely justified in taking up the challenge issued by Edward Said regarding the rethinking of geography, there may be reason to wonder how many interpretative layers may be placed between the subjects implicated in the ensuing discussion. It remains relevant to turn Gregory’s remark about Said back on the author: where does Gregory’s geography come from?\footnote{Gregory, D. 1995: Imaginative geographies. \textit{Progress in Human Geography} 19, 447–485; his questioning of Said’s geography is quoted from p. 448.}

Gregory has the advantage of many human geographers in retaining and developing a sensitive relationship with historical geography, as is evidenced in much of his work, including that on imaginations and imaginaries. His concerns, and, through him and those in his intellectual space, the concerns of influential tendencies in human geography are not only attenuating scholarly communication with other geographers of other traditions, but are also overlooking themes and voices potentially within the purview of imaginary geographies. Of course one cannot demand or expect that scholars encompass more than humanly possible, but the sad feeling of déjà vu that comes upon one after seeing things known represented as things new is always depressing.

This essay is then a modest and unfinished expression of frustration that a main line of human geography is in danger of becoming sufficient unto itself in reference, and is for this reason reducing potentially fruitful avenues for further imagination to dead ends.\footnote{There are other lines, both within human geography, and in other areas of study, that hold more promise, cf. Bassin, M.: Inventing Siberia — visions of the Russian East in the early 19th century, \textit{American History Review}, 1991, 96, pp. 763–794, and Bassin, M.: History and philosophy of geography, \textit{Progress in Human Geography}, 1997, 21, pp. 563–572.}

In his eminent essay addressing Said, Gregory iconizes Joseph Conrad in an aside, invoking an association with Said’s interpretations of the connections between Conrad’s story-telling, colonialism and imperialism.\footnote{Said, E. 1983 \textit{The World, the Text, and the Critic}. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, pp. 4}
mapping others; contemporary human geography is peppered with similar references.\textsuperscript{10}

This, in a way, may foreclose on other readings of Conrad, on the Orient, and on other experiences than those foregrounded in the academy at present.\textsuperscript{11} Among these are configurations of European horizons which, while not specifically excluding other readings, concentrate attention on favoured discourses, leaving the others at best in penumbral disregard. This stage direction — management of illumination — perhaps follows from the undoubted difficulties of communication which arise in the academy when privilege is withdrawn from single voices; the voices that make themselves heard can hardly be blamed for speaking, as Gregory himself points out.\textsuperscript{12} But in speaking, they may disenfranchise the mute, raising questions of ethics and morality in postmodern times.\textsuperscript{13} The mute necessarily include all who do not belong nor aspire to the English-speaking academic intellectuals, bounded further by critical and/or social theory, or who have not been “translated”, raising the poignancy (tęsknota?) of Eva Hoffman’s intervention.\textsuperscript{14} Maybe this also reveals an underlying ambivalence in this essay: a sometime belonger viewing the academy from the position of an exile?

\textsuperscript{90–110, and Said. E, 1992 Culture and Imperialism. London: Chatto & Windus; see especially pp. 20–35, among others.}


\textsuperscript{12}This emerges in a reply to a review of his 1994 Geographical Imaginations: Commitments: the work of theory in human geography — reply, Economic Geography, 1996, 72, pp. 73–80; see also his Power, knowledge and geography, Geographische Zeitschrift, 1998, 86, pp. 70-93.


2 Joseph Conrad

Backtracking from Gregory to Said, we find an acknowledgement that Conrad was not just a regular English colonial writer.

What makes Conrad different from the other colonial writers who were his contemporaries is that, for reasons having partly to do with the colonialism that turned him, a Polish expatriate, into an employee of the imperial system, he was so self-conscious about what he did.\(^{15}\)

In the following, I would like to extend the same warning as Najder in considering the associations that a closer examination of Conrad’s work may arouse, and sidestep any attempt to demonstrate what has or has not influenced Conrad. The same consideration naturally extends to the other positions adopted here, mostly speculative, many downright grounded on little more than scent. Najder comments that:

Influence is always hypothetical: we have to assume that \(X\) has read or heard of something which made him, consciously or not, reshape his own beliefs or style or interests. I want to base my contentions on safer ground and am going to present my case in the terms not of influence, but of affinity, similarity and continuation.\(^{16}\)

Joseph Conrad was born Józef Teodor Konrad Nałęcz Korzeniowski in December 1857 to Apollo Korzeniowski (1820–1869) and Ewelina neé Bobrowska (1833–1865). At his birth his father, a writer, dedicated a poem to him:

> To my Son Born in the 85th Year of Muscovite Oppression:
> 
> Baby son, tell yourself
> You are without land, without love,
> Without country, without people,
> While Poland — your Mother is in her grave.
> For your only Mother is dead — and yet
> She is your faith, your palm of martyrdom.\(^{17}\)

\(^{15}\)Said, *Culture and Imperialism*, p. 25; here I will not attempt to discuss views of Conrad as “an employee of the imperial system”.


\(^{17}\)Ibid, p. 14.
His father was arrested for conspiracy against Russia in October 1861, and the family was exiled to Vologda in Northern Russia. His mother died in exile, and his father two years after his release to Austria’s partition of Poland. Four years later, at the age of 17, Józef translated himself into being a sailor. Which readings might one trace between 19th Century Polish emigrants and colonialism? Might they be associated with partition, with exile from a non-existent Poland? Had Conrad’s self-consciousness anything to do with his experience of a childhood in enforced exile with his parents, who were driven to early death for reasons partly having to do with czarist oppression? Both Najder and Miłosz advise us to pay attention to Conrad’s background. Miłosz writes that:

Apollo Korzeniowski holds an honorable place in Polish letters, and his dual attitude as an ironic realist and an indomitable knight cannot be ignored by any student of the writings of Joseph Conrad.\(^{18}\)

Najder writes that his father left Conrad

\[\ldots\] a formidable psychological legacy: an exceptionally intense emotional life; a rigorous and desperate love of his country, and a spontaneous, instinctive belief in democracy; a hatred of invaders, \(\ldots\)\(^{19}\)

Of course Conrad was not his father, and lived his adult life under different circumstances, but both his reflections on politics in Russia and in particular Under Western Eyes show an abiding concern. The circumstances of the writing of the novel do however suggest that Conrad was possessed by an obsession about ‘senseless tyranny’, as he himself puts it in the author’s note. His life in exile is otherwise typical of many others of his kind throughout the world, wherever they happened to find engagement.\(^{20}\) He remained devoted to his uncle, Tadeusz Bobrowski, who adopted him after his father’s death; it was his uncle’s connections that had saved the family from worse punishment in 1862 than exile to Vologda. Conrad, then a four year old child, nearly died during the


hazardous journey under armed escort, and throughout his life his health was never very strong.\textsuperscript{21}

Although both Vologda, and Perm, where Korzeniowski had requested to be detained but was refused, are in European Russia, west of the Urals, both the manner of administrative banishment, and the image of the escorted closed prison carriage, \textit{kibitka}, communicate the dread of Siberia. The boundary obelisk shown in Figure 1, dated 1835, between Europe and Asia at the village of Rieshoty in the Urals, can well be associated with the Dantcean ‘\textit{Lasciate ong\'i speranza voi ch’entrate}’ — ‘Abandon all hope ye who enter here’ for those travelling from West to East.\textsuperscript{22}

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{image.png}
\caption{Aleksander Sochaczewski: \textit{Po\'zegnanie Europy} (Farewell to Europe), oils; Muzeum Historycznych Ruchów Niepodlegl\'osciowych i Spo\'olecznych, Warsaw. Photo. Eugeniusz Helbert, frontispiece in Trojanowiczowa, op. cit., p. 1.}
\end{figure}

Banishment and hard labour in these infernal regions was the fate of countless through centuries, not just rebels and political prisoners from subject nations and Russia herself, not just offenders against social discipline and other deviants, but


\textsuperscript{22} Trojanowiczowa, Z. 1993: \textit{Sibir Romantyk\'ow}. Pozna\’ń: W drodze, pp. 7–9. Comparisons between czarist-soviet oppression, especially forced labour in Siberia, and Dante’s \textit{Inferno} are commonplace, and also occur, for example, in the work of Alexander Solzhenitsin and Vladimir Vysotsky.
anyone who caught the eye of the tyrant. Space as prison, geography as punishment, a legacy of dread, a tradition of resistance. Joseph Conrad was well versed in all this; ought not this also speak to us before he is ‘sampled’ into our frames of reference?

### 3 Adam Mickiewicz and Conrad

Why Conrad? It turns out that, as a boy, he was called Konrad by his family, from among his many names. Conrad is a far from typical Polish first name, but had achieved a very specific resonance from the 1830’s by its use in several works by Adam Mickiewicz. While Conrad is himself not very forthcoming concerning influences on his life and writing, he does admit to drawing inspiration from Mickiewicz and Słowacki. Mickiewicz himself caught the eye of the tyrant as a young man, born in 1798 in or near Nowogródek, between Vilnius and Mińsk.

He and many of his friends were seized, detained for a year, and forbidden from living in western provinces of the Empire. One of the key themes of their ‘conspiracy’ was meeting to recite the works of Laurence Sterne. He himself was never banished to Siberia, nor did he suffer forced labour. After five years spent in the company of his Russian contemporaries, one of whom, Decembrist Kondratii Ryleev, paid the highest price for his convictions, and another, Alexander Bestuzhev, was sentenced to hard labour, he managed to sail from Kronstadt, escaping the imminent cancelation of his passport, and travelled through Germany to Rome. Schama discusses at some length the position of Mickiewicz’s epic verse in his *Landscape & Memory*, especially *Konrad Wallenrod* and Mickiewicz’s “masterpiece of woodland nativism: *Pan Tadeusz*”. In *Konrad Wallenrod*, set in

---

25 Ibid., p. XVIII; see also Najder, op. cit. 1997, pp. 201-2, and especially p. 212.
26 Ryleev was the first translator of Mickiewicz’s poetry into Russian, and was executed in 1826. There is reason to believe that Mickiewicz used the name ‘Konrad’ in his 1828 epic poem *Konrad Wallenrod*, and subsequently in the 1832 Part III of *Dziady — Forefathers’ Eve*, in homage to his dead friend.
28 Schama, S., op. cit., pp. 53–60; Schama also touches on the friendship between Mickiewicz and Fennimore Cooper, whom he met in Rome, and who subsequently worked in a solidarity committee for Poland in Paris.
the borderland between the Teutonic Knights and Lithuania, the hero Konrad is seized as a child from his Lithuanian family, and brought up by the Knights. Rising to the very top of the Order, his suppressed identity is awakened by the singing of a bard. The resolution of this crisis is found by his leading the Knights to certain and total defeat against his own people. Konrad sacrifices everything in the name of his regained identity, and in combat with the oppressors of that identity. As Miłosz suggests:

An American reading this tale would inevitably think of romantic stories about Indians brought up in a white settlement but who, responding to the call of the wild, return to their tribes to take vengeance upon the white man.

The name Konrad is also used in Part III of Mickiewicz’s theatrical work *Forefathers’ Eve*. In Parts II and IV, written in 1823, the hero is Gustaw, an introspective spiritual figure making frequent reference to traditional beliefs (Part I was never completed, and is replaced by a preface entitled ‘Spectres’; the work is read: ‘Spectres’, Part II, Part IV, Part III, ‘Digression’). *Forefathers’ Eve* is built up of fragments joined together by ‘a kind of dream logic’, and was first staged in 1901, having been regarded as of such technical difficulty as to preclude performance until then. We return here to Miłosz’s account of the translation between the Gustaw of the 1823 version, and the coming of Konrad in the new sections written in 1832 in Dresden, following the poet’s exile in Russia, and the failure of the 1830–31 uprising against czarist tyranny in Poland:

In the preceding parts we saw Gustaw with his unhappy love; here we find him in a czarist prison, an alter ego of Mickiewicz during his half-year imprisonment in Wilno. There comes a night when the prisoner is transformed from a man preoccupied with his personal problems into a man dedicated to the cause of his nation and of humanity. To mark it, he even changes his name to Konrad . . . .

As well as adding Part III to the pre-existing text of *Forefathers’ Eve* in Dresden, Mickiewicz also added a description of his experiences in Russia, and reports of experiences of others heard there, entitled ‘Digression’, and concluded by a

---

30 Ibid., p. 220; Mickiewicz refers to Cooper in his own note to lines 132–133 of the poem, a reference pre-dating their meeting in Rome in 1829.
31 Ibid., p. 222.
poem dedicated to his ‘Muscovite friends’, especially Ryleyev and others oppressed for their opposition to tyranny.\textsuperscript{32} The link onward to Conrad is, according to Milosz’s, quite clear:

The ‘Digression’ can be called a summation of Polish attitudes to Russia in the nineteenth century, and Joseph Conrad, who of course had read that poem, seems to repeat its contents line for line in some of his writings, especially in \textit{Under Western Eyes}.\textsuperscript{33}

4 \textbf{Which Orient?}

Figure 2 is taken from a cycle expressing the desolation of the former gold mines of Kolyma, north of Magadan. The picture is of course in no direct way connected to \textit{Heart of Darkness}, but it is difficult not to associate the two symbolically:

‘I came upon a boiler wallowing in the grass, then found a path leading up the hill. It turned aside for boulders, and also for an undersized railway-truck lying there on its back with its wheels in the air. . . .’\textsuperscript{34}

Ryszard Kapuściński is able to guide us towards the heart of this darkness:

\textsuperscript{32}Trojanowiczowa suggests either that Astolphe de Custine may have based some parts of his \textit{La Russie en 1839}, first published in 1843, on ‘Digression’, or more probably that both reflect a shared view of tyranny in Russia that had crystallised among the intelligentsia in Russia from the mid 1820’s (op. cit., p. 521). Najder suggests that a possible common source is Pyotr Chaadaev’s 1829 \textit{Philosophical Letters}, for which the author was declared insane by the Tsar (1997, op. cit., p. 120). A further representation is given in Kondratii Rylee’s poem, written in early 1825, to honour Andrei Voinarovskii, dead in exile in eastern Siberia: “. . . This wretched country, This vast prison house for exiles.” (Bassin, \textit{Inventing Siberia} . . . op. cit., p. 774.

\textsuperscript{33}op. cit., p. 225; as Najder points out, this view was not specifically Polish, but was shared by Russian liberal, democratic, and radical thinkers, such as Lermontov, Herzen, and indeed Chernyshevskii, author of a phrase quoted by Lenin himself: “A wretched nation, nation of slaves: from top to bottom — all slaves” (1997, op. cit. pp. 120-1.).

\textsuperscript{34}Joseph Conrad, 1902: \textit{Heart of Darkness}, p. 63 in the 1995 edition, Harmondsworth, Middx: Penguin Books. Despite being aware of many readings of Conrad as a critique of totalitarianism, I was still shocked to find precisely the same association being made by Najder, 1997, op. cit., pp. 179–180, after having completed an earlier draft of this essay. Najder quotes the lines immediately following those I had chosen, comparing the chain gang with Soviet and Nazi labour camps, and the grove of death with Kolyma or Auschwitz.
One walks about the streets of Magadan through deep corridors dug out of the snow. They are narrow, and one has to pause to permit others to pass. Sometimes it happens that I meet some older man eye to eye. The same question always comes into my mind: Who were you? Torturer or tortured? Why does this intrigue and fascinate me?
Why can I not look at that person normally, without this unbearable and troublesome curiosity? Were I though to steel myself and ask, and were he to be honest, I might well hear this answer: You see before you both the torturer and the tortured.\textsuperscript{35}

The construction of Magadan, at the northern end of the Sea of Okhotsk, was begun in 1929 in order to supply and support the gold mines in the Kolyma-Magadan Mining District.\textsuperscript{36} Kapuściński reports:

We reached Nagayeva Bay and halted by the water, by the abandoned, rusty ships. It is a symbolic place, a place which documents, of the weight of the Camp Gate at Auschwitz or the Railway Ramp at Treblinka. The bay, the gate, the ramp are three different settings of the same scene: the descent to hell. Of the millions of people who were thrown onto the stony shore on which we are now standing, three million never returned.\textsuperscript{37}

5 Conclusion

These are at least a few of the spaces beyond the horizons of our discourses; there are surely many more. But all hope is not out while life still courses; Brodsky puts it succinctly:

I remember, for instance, that when I was about ten or eleven it occurred to me that Marx’s dictum that “existence conditions consciousness” was only true for as long as it takes consciousness to acquire the art of estrangement; thereafter, consciousness is on its own and can both condition and ignore existence.\textsuperscript{38}

\textsuperscript{35} Kapuściński, R. 1993: \textit{Imperium}. Warszawa: Czytelnik, pp. 218–9, my translation.  
\textsuperscript{36} Kolyma, called the “extreme of cold and cruelty” is a symbol of the Gulag. Lying at the northeastern tip of the Soviet Union, this massive spread of camps and mines in which gold, tin, tungsten, coal and uranium were extracted was one of the harshest places of deportation. It owed its notoriety to the Arctic climate and the ruthless exploitation of prisoners (the Soviet state needed endless supplies of gold and strategic minerals for industrial development, arms production, and to buy grain from Canada). Adding to the severity of the conditions were the isolation — the boundless expanse of Kolyma is cut off from the outside world for six months a year — and the desolation of the Siberian wastelands.’ Kizny, T. 1997: \textit{Czas Imperium — exhibition catalogue}. Warsaw: KARTA Centre, p. 28.  
\textsuperscript{37} Kapuściński, op. cit., pp. 210–11, my translation.  
\textsuperscript{38} Brodsky, op. cit., p. 3.
Thus there are other stories, other geographies; the infernal Orient of serfdom, forced labour and fear may be reclaimed as the individual people involved make their dreams real — consciousness conditioning existence. However as both Marlow and not least Kurtz, even imagined if not real, also suggest, there is no easy way to handle the freedom of ideology as conscience in shaping existence, a terrible freedom manifest in the symbols Kapuściński alludes to.

I would not like to suggest that post-structuralist and postcolonial discourses in human geography, as in other areas of the academy, are invalidated by their selectiveness in reading. I do however regret that they have neglected opportunities for enrichment by a broader understanding and knowledge of such alternative ‘Orients’, which in my opinion would contribute to deeper reflection and perhaps greater responsibility in our “everyday practices”. Part of my regret is undoubtedly fuelled by my own ‘rootlessness’, part by dismay at the play of words dominating discourses, seemingly overshadowing engagement with issues of weight and merit, through which academics might seek to be of service to their peers, students, and the wider community. I still harbour a slight hope that this essay is not overly self-indulgent, and may at least provoke some thoughts, awaken some understanding, provide some ideas for study for those better suited to the task.