

*Paper prepared for the
Second Euroacademia Global Forum of Critical Studies
Asking Big Questions Again*

Prague, 21 – 22 February 2014

This paper is a draft

Please do not cite

Re-imagining Identity: Revisiting Hanif Kureishi's *My Beautiful Laundrette*

Dr Andreas Athanasiades
University of Cyprus

Keywords:

Identity
Hanif Kureishi
Desire
Sexuality
Diaspora

Abstract

Hanif Kureishi's work focuses on the shifting and polyvalent manifestations of desire and sexuality within the social and cultural realms in Britain, opening up spaces in the cultural landscape to include – intentionally – the marginalised and politically disenfranchised, while interrogating at the same time hegemonic discourses pertaining to the formation of identities. Such an approach gestures towards a re-evaluation of desire which, in turn, can lead us to re-think identity as a constantly evolving, uncategorised and therefore politically powerful apparatus. After the publication of his memoir, *My Ear at His Heart* (2004) in which the reader is given insights as to how and why characters in the author's work were created, it seems that affective terms such as desire and sexuality can indeed be used to re-imagine the ways in which identity is experienced. Such an approach alludes to the complex constitutions of identity/ies apropos aesthetic or political concerns, and to how they can engage in a difficult and complex, yet fruitful relationship, avoiding what can be considered by the mainstream as "socio-political abnormalities". In that, I put forward that a retrospective re-examination of Hanif Kureishi's *My Beautiful Laundrette* (1985) is imperative, as it can help us understand how an evolutionary model of writing nods towards a sense of identity whose articulation has become distinctly "polycultural, even post-racial"ⁱ. Such a re-visiting of known texts can offer new insights on debates about identity and nation that transcend "solipsistic and exclusivist diasporic matters about 'myself'"ⁱⁱ as they gesture towards the aesthetic. Indeed, my article invites the reader to conceive contemporary identity in affective terms and consequently as a space that surpasses the solipsism of cultural diversity, racial difference or narrow national exclusivityⁱⁱⁱ, which invites us to experience identity as a cultural instigator carrying socio-political possibilities.

Identity must be seen as contingent and forever incomplete, continually changing as it generates and regenerates itself. Thus, to write an autobiography means, in essence, to write one's own identity^{iv}.

The unravelling of the implications behind the interaction between the aesthetical and the political qualities of a text, as well as the extent to which this contact pertains to society at large, given the revelation of the particulars of the author's quest for identity as it is presented to the reader in the memoir *My Ear at His Heart* (2004), must be the scope of revisiting Hanif Kureishi's work. This work not only embodies a "post-ethnic"^v approach to identity, as Sara Upstone puts it but provides the reader with insights as to how and why masculine sexuality was presented the way it was in *My Beautiful Laundrette* as well as its connotations vis-à-vis the formation of postcolonial identity for diasporic subjects in 80s Britain. The scope of this paper, therefore, besides drawing attention to the potential of desire and masculine sexuality to intervene in relevant literary discussions, is to point to a "new" postcolonial theory embodying a post-ethnic reality that no longer -solely- pertains to race in addressing questions of belonging, but which gestures towards the aesthetic to do so. Such a revisiting of the aesthetic and socio-political characteristics of literature, based on a retrospective examination of Kureishi's work, then, can provide useful insights into the new nature of the relationship between the two, effectively increasing the importance of desire, which not only rises as a viable alternative to a hitherto largely racially defined political context, but eventually manages to point to the potential of a supra-racial and intra-aesthetic stand towards the concept of identity. Thus, the revisiting of Kureishi's

work can lead to the realisation that it is actually a part of what McLeod has termed as “contemporary black writing”^{vi}, as the articulation of the nation through the realisation of a “new” postcolonial identity moves beyond a direct focus on racial concerns and towards an aesthetically engaged discourse.

British-born, Pakistani author Hanif Kureishi published his memoir as he tried to “bring everything together”^{vii}. Indeed, one could read Kureishi’s memoir as an attempt on behalf of the author not only to come to terms with his own past but also to satisfy a need to reconcile both his own ambivalent identity and position as a writer and as an individual, as he looks back at the course of his oeuvre, trying to construct a sense of self through the process of reading and writing his father’s memories. To the extent that texts that represent the self can be read as a search for “truth” as well as a means of understanding the complexities of identity, and, insofar as any autobiographical venture involves a self-conscious approach as well as a deliberate textualisation of the author’s self, one could argue that the sense of selfhood put forward in *My Ear at His Heart* involves specific traits pertaining to the aesthetic which is embedded in the process of constructing an identity. With *My Ear at His Heart*, Kureishi tries to come to terms with his inheritance as it constitutes, in the author’s words, “a quest, for my place in father’s history and fantasy, and for the reasons my father lived the semi-broken life he did”^{viii}. The memoir is based on Kureishi’s discovering and subsequently reading two of his father’s unpublished novels, *An Indian Adolescence* and *The Redundant Man*, which are read as “a legacy of words, a protracted will”^{ix}. Thus *My Ear at His Heart* is about “...the 1960s and the 1970s, set alongside the present [which gives an] objective access to the past. I [...] seem to be opening a door on the past”^x. The discovery of the manuscripts pushes Kureishi to re-examine his past through the process of reading and writing his father, visiting at the same time the pre-1947 Indian space through familial memories. It seems then that the author attributes the various transformations of himself –and his characters– to his being able to “read” and “write” his own past through the reading and writing of his father and his fatherland. Kureishi’s quest suggests that the residues and legacies that affect the author’s thinking processes determine certain boundaries that are themselves elusive. In writing his memoir, Kureishi seems to be successful in writing a self; a self that is useful in creating an image of a postcolonial, racialised, sexual subject with agency to carry on becoming. What is more, to the extent that *My Ear at His Heart* is about the birth of a writer, one could also argue that this apparent success to write a self triggers a retrospective re-examination of his characters and their connection to their past and their legacy.

The close relationship between the artistic and personal selves is made clear from the very beginning of *My Ear at His Heart*, where Kureishi quotes Henry James’ *Portrait of a Lady*: “There’s no such thing as an isolated man or woman; we’re each of us made up of some cluster of appurtenances. What shall we call our ‘self’? Where does it begin? Where does it end? It overflows into everything that belongs to us – and then it flows back again”^{xi}. Kureishi seems to understand that he is made up of others and as he exposes these others, he exposes himself. This quote about identity and its borders gestures towards the permeability of the artist’s boundaries and the circular current (in and out) that characterises the artist’s relationship with his work. Such an issue includes his relationship with his father and the manifestation of his artistic gifts, as it is made clear that Kureishi’s focus on the exploration of masculine sexuality and the discontents of heterosexual relationships in his later work, which were influenced by his own personal circumstances, informed the processes which culminated in the publication of his memoir. In exploring the limits of such relationships between artist and individual, past and present selves and the pain that desire involves, then, the author’s quest for selfhood becomes a complex process, to say the very least, as he tries to come to terms with his imagined India, just like he tried to come to terms with his lived England.

His father’s work, and at the same time his memories and imaginations, are published as part of his son’s memoir which makes them a part of his son’s life at the same time. In a way then, Kureishi’s autobiography of the self is, at the same time, the biography of (an)other. In his own words: “Among other things, this has been a story of generations, told through the males, from my grandfather Colonel Murad Kureishi, via my own father, his brothers, myself and my own sons, three British boys called Kureishi. Out of my reading and others’ writing I have made a story of the past, imagining around their imaginations”^{xii}. One could not help but notice the predominantly male element that seems to govern such realisations. The person who first and foremost embodies desire and is admired by Kureishi for it, is not his father, but Omar Kureishi, his successful uncle, who is described in the book as a boaster and show-off^{xiii}, ruthless, pleasure-seeking and successful, the antithesis of his steady, responsible, suburban father^{xiv}. The two different father-figures and the oscillation of the son between them, will find its way into Kureishi’s first film *My Beautiful Laundrette* (1985). Omar, the son in the film, becomes successful when he leaves his father’s sickbed and comes under the patronage of his morally ambiguous uncle, which is a move that the father comes to resent as rebellion and betrayal. What is more, such a portrayal of the weak and effeminate father figure, is juxtaposed with Kureishi’s

obsession with strong father figures (and consequently, masculine sexuality) and his conscious unwillingness, or inability, to deal with mother figures. The portrayal, then, of the father in *My Beautiful Laundrette* –not only because of its physical weakness but due to its broken down nature (attributed to the loss of his wife) – gestures not only towards a political trajectory which essentially is a critique of the failed Left which did not provide a viable alternative to Thatcherite politics in 80s Britain, but also, and more importantly, towards a sense of melancholia for the loss of the maternal figure. Kureishi felt that loss and tried to overcome this melancholia by focusing on powerful father figures and on powerful male protagonists. Such a sense of loss found its way into his memoir, as the process of re-inscribing oneself as an artist and as a writer, becomes fundamental in overcoming melancholia. Such a fascination with father figures and the reading of his fatherland also gives the readers an insight, within the “birth of a writer” context, as to why he was more interested in exploring masculine sexuality in his works. This kind of realisation gestures towards certain ways in which the spaces of home, which include both the private and the public or national sphere, offer a troubling source of remembered or recreated identities, as these spheres are reflected in the portrayal of female and masculine sexualities, respectively.

The authoritative figure of the father and Kureishi’s admission that he admired his grandfather, underlines the fact that power seems to be linked to the male symbolic order. Thus Kureishi not only admires the father figures in his life but he also fears them. Even after his death, his father’s presence continues to influence and haunt him, as he admits that he thinks about him every day: “The whole time...I still want to be like him, and I still hope one day to coincide with him [...] ...sometimes, I think I go to my desk only to obey my father”^{xv}. Kureishi’s depiction and different manifestations of masculine sexuality were more important to him, as we must assume his relationship with his father was more ostensibly significant to him than the one with his mother; to date, he has deliberately chosen not to disclose details of his relationship with his mother in his work. In fact, Kureishi has said it clearly: “My mother was important in my life too. But she is important to me privately. I don’t feel that I particularly want to write about her, for others to read about her”^{xvi}. Thus, the father figure, being more catalytic than female figures in Kureishi’s work, seems to have been much more present. This goes on to testify to his preoccupation with masculine sexuality, the manifestations of which make him a radical writer who is trying to deconstruct the past/present hierarchy. But is he successful? There are some telling moments in *My Ear at His Heart*, such as the way the male members of the Kureishi family interacted with each other where the rigidity of masculine embodiment and its symbolic values are challenged and male desire and sexuality are discoursed in complex terms. However, it should be noted that, no matter how much he tried to suppress the mother figure, she is translated and proliferated through the author himself. Through the recognition of her absence, the mother is actually present, as she is made visible through Kureishi’s narration of his father’s voice: the author becomes the mother, stealing the *logos* from his effeminate father who is, in effect, the castrated figure and an imagined entity. Such a complex relationship between mothers, fathers, homes and identities in *My Ear at His Heart* points to the interim nature of the constructed self Kureishi was trying to achieve, underlines the impossibility of a coherent sense of identity and gestures towards the painful and complex nature of masculine sexuality. It follows, then, that Kureishi’s self is located within his examination of masculine sexuality, as his failed sense of intimacy in his personal life (to which he refers to in numerous occasions in the memoir) might be attributed, to a certain extent, to his relationship with his father as well as to the fact that he tried to deny aspects of his self and his past from the very beginning of his career. In “The Rainbow Sign” he says: “From the start I tried to deny my Pakistani self. I was ashamed. It was a curse and I wanted to be rid of it. I wanted to be like everyone else”^{xvii}.

My Ear at His Heart is a deeply touching story, by the end of which Kureishi manages to “construct” a self, exactly because he realises that he cannot understand it. Indeed, he realises that he can never actually know his father -or himself-, reflecting as he does on the unknowability of the parents. A sense of unknowability that is, indeed, tied up with desire and sexuality in affective ways as its unformed and unstructured potential has the power to move subjectivity beyond social, personal and political exigencies:

However well you know your parents, children will feel the lives of their parents are a mystery, not only because the desire and sexuality of the parents is beyond them, but because the lesson here is about unknowability ... I have about father, after all this, the feeling you can only have after knowing someone for a long time: that you don’t know them at all, really. If only you could consign your history to the past and keep it there. But history is a blink away, the present in another aspect^{xviii}.

Such unknowability underlines the complexity and the elusive, polyvalent and chaotic nature of identity, thought of in affective terms; however, through chaos, possibilities arise precisely because of the inability to categorise -and therefore limit- it. The aestheticism of masculine sexuality is built on a sense of fantasy that is used as a retrospective substitute for actual experience. With that in mind, revisiting *My Beautiful Laundrette* and the way in which masculine sexuality is manifested, becomes imperative, as new insights pertaining to its understanding are revealed.

It is true that Kureishi's work was heavily criticised, most notably by Ruvani Ranasinha, as approaching all issues from a male point of view, while he has been accused of mistreating his female characters^{xix}. What is true is that none of Kureishi's stories is written from a woman's point of view, for which one could argue that he was influenced by a culture which does not leave space for the independence of women. However, revisiting *My Beautiful Laundrette* can actually show that he is, in fact, radical not despite but because he deals with masculine sexuality the way he does. Indeed, Kureishi is able to offer a subversive and radical perception on sexuality, as he brings masculinity under scrutiny in a manner that subverts heteronormativity, phallocentrism and masculine ego. This very focus subverts norms and unsettles expectations about masculine desire and its social performance in its sexual embodiment, while the rigidity of masculine embodiment and its symbolic values are challenged in 80s Britain. The story in *My Beautiful Laundrette* features Omar, a second-generation Pakistani immigrant, who hires Johnny, a white Cockney and former National Front member, to help him revive an old laundrette that Omar's uncle, Nasser, has entrusted him with, after the latter promised Omar's father to help him out. As they work side by side, and despite the fact that both of their communities oppose it, their relationship flourishes against all odds. A notable quality worthy of focus in *My Beautiful Laundrette* is found in the treatment of the sexual relationship central to the story. The relationship is not dressed in any "identity" discourse; there are no "gays" as such. When he wrote the screenplay, Kureishi said he wanted to write about race, class and sexuality: "A love story between a gay Pakistani and a skinhead? In those days, you didn't see men kissing on screen. Now you can't get away from it"^{xxx}. Omar and Johnny's relationship is not a sexual one between two white male bourgeois characters, but an interracial, interethnic, interclass entanglement that cuts across boundaries pertaining to class and race. As Johnny and Omar challenge white, racial and heterosexual norms, they also challenge the foundations on which British national identity at the time (i.e., white, Anglo-Saxon, heterosexual) was trying to re-invent itself, as legacies from the imperial past were passed down onto postcolonial culture through Thatcherite policies and, in culture, through the revival of Raj films, showing the splendour and glory of the British Empire.

My Beautiful Laundrette engaged directly with Raj Revival films, offering a completely different aesthetic version of 80s Britain. The film ends with a sexual scene at the back of the renovated laundrette on opening day, which brings to mind Gayatri Gopinath's comment on how queer desire becomes central to colonialism, racism and, therefore, to the construction of a migrant, postcolonial identity:

Queer desire does not transcend or remain peripheral to [...] colonialism and racism, but instead it becomes central to their telling and remembering: there is no queer desire without these histories, nor can these histories be told or remembered without simultaneously revealing an erotics of power^{xxi}.

For writers such as Hanif Kureishi, pleasure derived from the fulfilment of desire was a fundamental right of the individual: "I imagine the desire for more freedom, more pleasure...to be fundamental to life"^{xxii}. By definition, any political establishment within which the individual is denied pleasure is an oppressive one, as the pursuit of pleasure is carefully monitored and even legislated. Indeed, insofar as the political context of a given culture affects the lives of individuals, it is imperative to examine a new "intercourse" between the aesthetic and the political, especially pertaining to the way postcolonial nationhood has been imagined, which touches upon the coexistence of desire and violence we see at the end of *My Beautiful Laundrette*. Since the aesthetic pertains more to a sense of feeling, rather than a rational thought, it is uncertain and not governed by rules and limits given that it is experienced differently in each individual. Such a construction of the subject through desire, gestures towards the aesthetic as being a non-conscious experience of intensity that cannot be fully realised in language^{xxiii}. Driven by the multiplicity of meanings such a reading may carry, therefore, I argue that the usefulness of the theories of desire and the aesthetic lies in their ability to open up a space of indeterminacy -and, consequently, of possibilities- which allows us to introduce aesthetic qualities in the processes of constructing subjects and subjectivities.

Such a moment can be found in this last scene, as the characters' actions and choices lead to a final performance on the "stage" that is the renovated laundrette. Their played out desires result in both violence and healing, appealing to the body as a desiring machine itself (to gesture towards Deleuze and Guattari), which is the site of vital performances, bringing together as it does the characters' pasts

and presents, sexual intimacies and imperial legacies, desires and violence. Indeed, the body in this scene becomes a desiring machine that enables the flow and interaction of these elements which, in turn, leads to the construction of a subject that incites hope. Indeed, and through that, it seems that diasporic subjects are able to dictate their own terms for belonging in the transitional 1980s Britain, through non-heteronormative articulations of diasporic, forbidden and intimate desires that challenges traditional definitions of the space of home, and, consequently, the idea of the nation itself. Climaxing towards the most interesting scene in the movie, the connotations of *My Ear at His Heart* go a long way to explain the sexual behaviour we see in the film. The two lovers indulge in intimate pleasure being in a transitory location such as the back room. So they occupy an in-between space, seemingly in the heart of society, as they are within a successful business while everyone is waiting for them outside, but also hidden from plain sight, while they enjoy their pleasure. Graham Huggan has argued that the laundrette scene might be read on one level as an,

...allegorical variant on Bakhtinian carnivalisation - as an extravagantly comic overturning of the anti-immigrant 'whitification' policies of the Thatcher decade...in such a reading, the renovated laundrette becomes a classless space of intercultural celebration, in defiance of the racial battles fought almost daily outside its windows^{xxiv}.

The fact that people who would be shocked to find out what was going on were waiting outside, only serves to heighten the pleasure. The laundrette harbours the forbidden pleasure derived from the interracial, prohibited expression of desire, which is exactly what enables Kureishi to intervene in discussions about what it means to be a citizen of Britain in the 1980s.

It is the infusion of racial violence with desire, however, that shows how such coexistence is necessary for the remembering of regretted histories of the colonial past and its imperial legacy which more often than not pertained to racial violence, which are also present in Kureishi's remembering of India through his father. Sara Suleri argues that the inevitably retroactive narrative of the postcolonial condition, "...allows for the inclusion both of its colonial past and of the function of criticism at the present time as necessary corollaries to the telling of its stories^{xxv}". Indeed, as past and present culminate in the queer, racialised body of Johnny in the final scene of *My Beautiful Laundrette*, one is led to think that the kind of unity we see in Johnny's body does not gesture towards a perfect completion but, rather, it constitutes a testimony to the complexity of such an uneasy union, still offering hope for the future. Hence, Johnny's body, containing both desire and violence, both the aesthetic and the political, becomes a site for the realisation of what seems to be an instinctive and intense feeling that allows subjectivity to escape political limits and gesture towards aestheticism. Rather than being singular then, desire in this scene becomes a network of flows and energies that opens up to transformation and is, as such, impossible to limit. This transformation enables the body to frustrate the predictable results of sexual performativity, pertaining to binarisms such as male/female. Such multiple possibilities of connection enabled by the flow of desire transform Johnny's body, then, which should not be viewed as a source of anxiety but, rather, as a promise for productive becomings, precisely because of its fragmented nature. Johnny's body is, then, a body "populated by multiplicities"^{xxvi} and, as Massumi says, we need to "...rethink body, subjectivity, and social change in terms of movement, affect, force, and violence – before code, text, and signification"^{xxvii}.

One should not read Johnny's body then as a return to the pre-subject state of infancy (as it has been explained due to the water/rebirth scene) but as a deconstruction and queering of it, which entails "taking apart egos and their presuppositions" and "liberating the pre-personal singularities they enclose and repress"^{xxviii}. Johnny's body is exactly that in this last scene of *My Beautiful Laundrette*: a process, a historical archive, which changes and which includes the violent marks of Britain's imperial legacy and racist present. In rethinking the body then, one is invited to rethink the relationship between the colonial and the postcolonial, violence and desire, Britain and India and the postcolonial subjectivity: the aftermath of these interactions are evident in the expression of masculine sexuality manifested on Johnny's queer, racialised body. Such a deconstructive reading of the body as a process which includes all these elements, suggests the hope for the birth of a new Britain which carries the marks of its imperial legacy, but which is also able to heal itself from the shame of its racist past –and present– through the power of the aesthetic which is what enables these fluid processes pertaining to the self and the body. It can be argued, then, that the aesthetic force of unconscious desire breaks through the political, inciting hope in audiences that the relationship will continue and enabling the creation of a new fantasy for a "healed" England. Indeed, the healing of wounds, within this context of the relationship between racialised desire and history, alludes to a re-negotiation of the colonial past, thus allowing the affective to intervene in political discussions pertaining to England's future. Thus, queer desire in Kureishi's film changes the focus of a diaspora looking backwards, as it undercuts the logic of ethnic/racial purity and authenticity^{xxix}. Identity, just like we saw in *My Ear at His Heart*, is not

merely about “looking back”; it is something much more complex than that. Kureishi’s characters do not go back to the past, as conventional diasporic discourse evident in Raj Revival films dictates, but they move forward, trying to dictate their own belonging; this process is evident in their transformation, which once again gestures towards the process we witness in *My Ear at His Heart*.

As such manifestations of racialised desire manifest themselves on Johnny’s body, which is the focus of tensions we see throughout the film, it becomes what Radhika Mohanram has termed “a threat to the myth of ontological purity of the nation”^{xxx}. Desire, therefore, is central to the telling and remembering of these histories, just like it was in remembering the stories of Hanif Kureishi’s father in his memoir, while at the same time, I argue, it can point to ways of coming to terms with the past and offer a relatively better image of the socio-political future of Britain through the construction of a new, postcolonial subjectivity that does not solely pertain to race, tradition and the political but takes aestheticism into account. Gayatri Gopinath has argued that it is precisely through Johnny’s body that histories of the past are brought into the present, and that their legacies are imaginatively contested and transformed^{xxxi}. For Omar, she continues, desiring Johnny is irrevocably intertwined with the legacies of British colonialism in South Asia and the more immediate history of Powellian racism in 1960s Britain^{xxxii}. Indeed, it could be argued that part of the film’s significant impact was precisely this manifestation of the sexualised (male) body because such a sexualised body was not something removed from ordinary life anymore. Indeed, there cannot be a queer desire without these histories, nor can these histories be remembered without simultaneously revealing an “erotics of power”^{xxxiii}, as it has been made evident in *My Ear at His Heart* and the erotics of the colonial father figures’ influence on the son’s postcolonial subjectivity.

In looking for his own identity through the readings of his father, then, Hanif Kureishi created his characters’ identities as processes which challenge and transgress hegemonic notions of heteronormativity, gender and race as the sole signifiers defining identity and belonging, introducing the aesthetic into the mix. Indeed, as Huggan has argued, the gendered performances of Kureishi’s homosexual, bisexual or sexually ambiguous characters...emphasise that identities are fashioned, rather than merely expressed, by corporeal activities, signs and functions^{xxxiv}. Such a revisiting of *My Beautiful Laundrette* then, shows that when the essential dichotomy of either/or is challenged, then the construction of social identities opens up new possibilities for hitherto fragmented identities caught in marginalised spaces of in-betweenness and it is precisely the breadth of these new possibilities that becomes the new angle from which one re-visits Hanif Kureishi’s work.

Author’s bio-note

Andreas Athanasiades is an early career scholar, having earned his PhD in English Literature and Comparative Cultural Studies from the University of Cyprus on a scholarship from the Government of Cyprus. Andreas received his BA in English Language and Literature from the University of Cyprus, graduating with excellence in 2003 and his MA from the University of Leeds in the UK, graduating with Merit a year later. His thesis deals with the social possibilities of the aesthetic in postcolonial culture and specifically in the works of Hanif Kureishi. His academic interests include postcolonialism, non-normative sexualities, psychoanalysis in literature, identity, autobiographical writings and cinematic studies.

Works Cited

- Deleuze, Gilles and Guattari, Felix. *Anti-Oedipus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia*. London: Penguin, 1972.
- Deleuze, Gilles and Guattari, Felix. *A Thousand Plateaus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia* (1980). Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1987.
- Gopinath, Gayatri. *Impossible Desires: Queer Diasporas and South Asian Public Cultures*. Durham: Duke University Press, 2005.
- Huggan, Graham. *The Post-Colonial Exotic: Marketing the Margins*. London: Routledge, 2001.
- Kureishi, Hanif. *The Late Show*. BBC2, April 1990. Radio.
- Kureishi, Hanif. *My Beautiful Laundrette and Other Writings* (1985). London: Faber and Faber, 1996.
- Kureishi, Hanif. “With Your Tongue Down My Throat.” *Granta* 22 (1997). Accessed November 23, 2013.
- Kureishi, Hanif. *My Ear at His Heart*. London: Faber and Faber, 2004.
- Massumi, Brian. *Parables for the Virtual: Movement, Affect, Sensation*. Durham: Duke University Press, 2002.

- McLeod, John. "Extra Dimensions, New Routines: Contemporary Black Writing of Britain." *Wasafiri* 25.4, (2010): 45-52.
- Mohanram, Radhika. "Postcolonial Spaces and Deterritorialised (Homo)Sexuality: The Films of Hanif Kureishi." *Postcolonial Discourse and Changing Cultural Contexts: Theory and Criticism*. Eds. Gita Rajan and Radhika Mohanram. London: Greenwood Press, 1995.
- Ranasinha, Ruvani. *Hanif Kureishi*. Tavistock: Northcote House Publishers, 2001.
- Steiner, Barbara and Yang, Jiun. *Writing Identity: on Autobiography in Art*. Thames and Hudson, London 2004.
- Suleri, Sara. *The Rhetoric of English India*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992.
- Upstone, Sara. "A Question of Black or White: Returning to Hanif Kureishi's *The Black Album*." *Postcolonial Text* 4.1 (2008). Accessed November 29, 2011.

Filmography

My Beautiful Laundrette. Dir. Stephen Frears. Channel Four Films, UK, 1985.

-
- ⁱ John McLeod, "Extra Dimensions, New Routines".
- ⁱⁱ Ibid, p.51.
- ⁱⁱⁱ Ibid, p.48.
- ^{iv} Steiner and Yang, *Writing Identity* 16.
- ^v "A Question of Black or White".
- ^{vi} Extra Dimensions, New Routines.
- ^{vii} *My Ear at His Heart* 218.
- ^{viii} Ibid 29.
- ^{ix} Ibid 1.
- ^x Ibid 12, 16.
- ^{xi} Ibid 18.
- ^{xii} Ibid 238.
- ^{xiii} Ibid 43.
- ^{xiv} Ibid 127-128.
- ^{xv} Ibid 10.
- ^{xvi} "With Your Tongue Down My Throat".
- ^{xvii} "Rainbow Sign", 1.
- ^{xviii} *My Ear at His Heart* 240.
- ^{xix} *Hanif Kureishi*, 45.
- ^{xx} *The Late Show*.
- ^{xxi} Gopinath, *Impossible Desires*, 1.
- ^{xxii} "Some Time with Stephen".
- ^{xxiii} Massumi, Brian. *Parables of the Virtual*, 30.
- ^{xxiv} *The Postcolonial Exotic*, 100.
- ^{xxv} *The Rhetoric of English India*, 21-22.
- ^{xxvi} Deleuze and Guattari, *A Thousand Plateaus*, 30.
- ^{xxvii} Massumi, *Parables for the Virtual* 66.
- ^{xxviii} Deleuze and Guattari, *A Thousand Plateaus*, 362.
- ^{xxix} Gopinath, *Impossible Desires* 2.
- ^{xxx} Mohanram, *Postcolonial Spaces* 121.
- ^{xxxi} Gopinath, *Impossible Desires* 4.
- ^{xxxii} Gopinath, *Impossible Desires* 1-2.
- ^{xxxiii} Ibid.
- ^{xxxiv} *The Postcolonial Exotic*, 112.