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Identity is changed by the journey.

—Madan Sarup, “Home and Identity”

Living on borders and in margins, keeping intact one’s shifting and multiple identity and integrity, is like trying to swim in a new element, an “alien” element.

—Gloria Anzaldúa, Borderlands / La Frontera

Out of Africa the human species came, dispersing across the globe over the eons. The transnational Genome Project, involving scientists from all over the world, is the mark of the times, the science of human beings constantly on the move, creating contact zones of genes and more than genes—cultures; ways of being in the world; ways of creating; ways of hating; ways of conquering and being conquered; ways of surviving, enduring, and resisting. The anthropologist James Clifford calls it “traveling cultures” and invites us to look not only to the cultures of dwellings and fixed places but also to the cultures of mobility, of those who travel, migrate, and bring differences into contact with one another to make new cultural formations based on exchange and intermingling—an intermingling that is sometimes creatively reciprocal, sometimes oppressively brutal, and often a complex mixture of the two (Routes 17–46). Nomads, once thought to exist at the irrelevant fringe of “civilization,” are being newly understood as the impresarios of cultural traffic in goods, ideas, peoples, and practices (Khazanov; Weatherford). Great transcontinental patterns of travel and intercultural contact have shaped every period in history and every part of the globe. Movement, whether forced or sought out, is the foundation of human evolution and the history of change on a global landscape.

Migrations, diasporas, and borders are nothing new: they have shaped human cultures from time immemorial. But as areas of inquiry in literary studies, they are relatively new, developing out of the past two and a half decades of innovation in the humanities. Rooted in the departures from New Criticism and from traditional forms of literary history in the 1970s, the study of migration, diasporas, and borders gathered momentum in the late 1980s and 1990s, emerging preeminently from postcolonial studies, the rising interest in travel writing, and the interdisciplinarity fields centered on questions of identity—race and ethnic studies, gender studies, sexuality studies. This study has been also influenced by the analysis of textual language, discursive regimes, and systems of representation developed during the heyday of poststructural theory in the 1980s. But its widespread impact on mainstream literary scholarship starts with the return to history and the rise of interdisciplinarity cultural studies beginning in the early 1990s.

Literary scholarship on migration, diaspora, and borders has not evolved as a single field; each subject has its own complex history of formation and institutional expression in the academy. Moreover, each is particularized in reference to the languages, national literatures, and particular geographies under study. But the cultural theory of these distinct fields has become increasingly interwoven and mutually constitutive in literary studies. They cohere, without having the coherence of a single school, whether in theoretical, methodological, or institutional terms. Fast in scope and disparate in design, they pose an enormous challenge for anyone attempting an overview, a challenge compounded by the new mandate in literary studies for planetary thinking and the decline of the nation-state model. This essay represents a preliminary mapping, and although I strive to be inclusive, it is no more than a starting point.

Why now—the naming of migrations, diasporas, and borders as a field? In a word, globalization, a term with shifting meanings that spawned debate about its politics, its utopian possibilities, and its dystopic realities.¹ For some, like Fredric Jameson and Masao Miyoshi, globalization refers solely to the contemporary period, often associated with late capitalism. For others, including me, globalization is not a new phenomenon, although the naming of it is new, indicating heightened awareness of what has been there all along. The routes of ceaseless intercultural exchange among different societies—what Philip Curtin and others have called the global ecumene—developed as a constitutive element of human civilization, involving the dispersion of peoples, the formation of vast trade routes and interconnecting metropoles, and the conquest and inequities that accompanied the rise and fall of numerous empires worldwide. What is different is the particular form that globalization began to take by the end of the twentieth century: a highly accelerated form of the global ecumene in which technologies of travel, information, media, exchange, and violence have intensified the patterns, mechanisms, and degrees of interconnectedness. This contemporary phase of globalization is distinctive at least in part because the new technologies of the so-called information revolution are primarily representational in nature, enabling (in a way the steam engine did not) radically new forms of knowledge production, dissemination, surveillance, and communication in the virtual realities of cyberspace.

The anthropologist Arjun Appadurai, a founder of the influential journal Public Culture, has theorized that the intensified global flow of money, goods, people, and media in this period of late modernity (or postmodernity, as some term it) has led to a worldwide network of cultural traffic and a global ecumene that has broken down seemingly fixed differences among national cultures, ethnicities, and races (Modernity 48; see esp. 48–60). Massive movements of peoples as refugees and migrants in a world filled with ethnic and religious violence, national conflicts, and widening divisions among rich and poor countries have swelled the cities of the world with peoples from many locales, setting in motion radical juxtapositions of different languages and cultural practices. Cosmopolitanism, once thought to be the privilege of metropolitan elites, travelers, and expatriate artists, is newly understood to include those who move in search of a more secure or better life at the most basic level of survival, even those whose migration is only ambiguously voluntary or decidedly involuntary.²

Blurring the boundaries between home and elsewhere, migration increasingly involves multiple moves from place to place and continual travel back and forth instead of journeys from one location to another. The Internet has transformed the diasporic experience of many through the formation of virtual communities
connecting the far-flung with those still back home. Many migrants and diasporics associate home not with a particular geographic location but with an "imaginary homeland" (Rushdie, Imaginary Homelands 9–21), with the experience of being perpetually in between cultures, or with an affiliation based on a communal identification that crosses national boundaries (e.g., religion, gender, queerness, indigeneity). The writing of home has become in a variety of ways, from the literal to the metaphorical, increasingly deterritorialized. Globalization has not eliminated the power of nationalism as a global force. But transnational mass media, economies, cultural practices, and peoples have reshaped national institutions and identities and made for new forms of interplay (both creative and destructive) between the global and the local.

One effect of this newest phase in globalization has been increased attention to transnationalism in literature and language, a change marked by a special issue of PMLA, Globalizing Literary Studies, edited by Giles Gunn in 2001. The articles in that issue contrast sharply with the 1992 edition of the MLA’s Introduction to Scholarship, which included an overview essay on border studies, as well as essays on feminist and gender studies, ethnic and minority studies, and cultural studies (Gibaldi). Implicitly framing all these earlier essays was the overarching significance of the nation-state as the entity within which these issues played out in literary studies. Greater attention to nationalism, national identity, and geopolitics in literary studies in the past decade or so has paradoxically led to the opposite: greater understanding of the porousness of the cultural borders of the nation-state; how the history of empire and (post)colonialism binds the literatures of different parts of the world together; how national literatures are formed in conjunction with the literatures of other nations; and how interconnected and mutually constitutive the cultures of the world have always been—and will continue to be in ever-intensified ways, because of the new technologies of knowledge and communication.

Instead of focusing exclusively on a national literature within the boundaries of a single nation-state, literary scholarship has shifted dramatically toward a transnational perspective: literatures written in a common language in different parts of the globe. Postcolonial studies dominated by the literature and culture of the British Empire and the new nations that emerged from its demise has transformed British and Commonwealth literary studies by providing a new theoretical framework for analysis; expanding the canon to include literatures in English throughout the anglophone world; and highlighting the significance of the colonies for the formation of literature in Britain, including British literature not written in English. Latin American and United States Latino/a literary and cultural studies has rapidly expanded in Spanish departments, often quite separate from the study of Iberian Spanish literature and reflecting long-overdue attention to the Spanish literatures of the Americas since the early days of contact through the present (Alley; Anderson and Kuhnheim; R. Johnson; McClennen; Mignolo, Darker Side and Local Histories; Pratt). The study of Portuguese literature, typically located in departments that originally focused on the Iberian Peninsula, has now broadened to become Lusophone studies, encompassing literatures produced in Portugal’s former colonies in South America, Africa, and Asia in the world’s sixth most common language (see, e.g., Lusophone Studies). The francophone world, especially in the Caribbean and Africa, has blended with postcolonial studies to become a significant new area in French literary studies, even as the status of French as the world’s lingua franca has yielded to English (Forsdick and Murphy; Jack). The breakup of the Soviet Union into many nations has necessitated the development of transnational analysis in Slavic and central Asian studies (Moore). Where American studies used to focus on the formation of the United States and its cultures as distinct from Europe and other lands of immigrant origins, the field is now decidedly transnational in emphasis, reconstituting itself along north-south and east-west axes to incorporate examination of indigenous and migratory cultures from every continent as these have shaped the literatures of the United States.

The new globalization has also reshaped comparative literature, undermining the discipline’s early emphasis on European culture capitals, extending the bases of comparison to non-Western literatures, and fostering the development of translation studies (Apter; Bassnett; Lionnet and Shih; Saussey, Comparative Literature; Spivak, Death). Race and ethnicity studies have moved toward the examination of transnational and intranational diasporas: tracking the forced or voluntary migration of peoples across continents and within national boundaries, tracing the meanings of shifting borders for indigenous peoples, and identifying the formation of new ethnicities over time and space.

The rapid emergence of transnationalism and globalization as pervasive categories in literary studies helps explain the new significance of migration, diaspora, and borders as a crossdepartmental and cross-specialty field of inquiry in the study of modern languages. What brings together the three areas of interest in this field is the underlying question about identity in motion on a transnational landscape—not only identity as it is changed by the journey, to echo the epigraph from Madan Sarup, but also identity as it is in a continual process of (re)formation in relation to changing spaces and times. The feminist critic Carole Boyce Davies terms these phenomena “migrations of the subject.” As the geographers Michael Keith and Steve Pile argue, “identity and location are inseparable: knowing oneself is an exercise in mapping where one stands” (26). Or, in the widely cited words of the feminist poet and social critic Adrienne Rich, we need “to understand how a place on the map is also a place in history” (212). The geographies of identity articulated in the field reflect new attention to space (and embodiment in given locations) as a constitutive component of human experience and culture. In a prescient lecture given in 1967, appearing in English in 1985 and now widely cited, Michel Foucault predicted, “The present epoch will perhaps be above all the epoch of space. We are in the epoch of simultaneity: we are in the epoch of juxtaposition, the epoch of the near and far, of the side-by-side, of the dispersed” (22). Migrations, diasporas, and borders heighten the meanings for literature of juxtaposition, near and far, side by side, and dispersion not only in themes explored but also in the forms of literary embodiment.

Geography has been rapidly acquiring a new significance for literary studies and remains an essential interdisciplinary for migration, diaspora, and border studies. History has long been important for literary studies and will surely remain so, at the very least for the historical contextualization of writers and literary texts, for historical narratives of literary movements and genres, and for identification of change and continuity over time. But geography is gaining a compensatory presence, providing concepts for thinking about the literary meanings of location, movement, simultaneity, juxtaposition, and interactions of sameness and difference.

The work of such geographers as Henri Lefebvre, Edward Soja, Linda McDowell, and Do neon Massey variously establishes ways in which space is conceived not as empty or neutral—the backdrop of history—but rather as full: generative of situation, relation, and social being; marked by formations of power and resistance. Not a static essence, space in these terms is a location of historical overdetermination, a site for the production of communal and individual identities. In short, geography is providing literary studies with a new form of contextualization—a specifically spatial one that complements the long-standing methodologies of historicization. For migration, diaspora, and border studies in particular, the new geography often provides conceptual tools for thinking about the multiple spatialities of identities in motion.

Anthropology has been as important for migration, diaspora, and border studies as geography—not the structuralist anthropology that influenced Northrop Frye’s archetypal criticism in
the 1950s-60s, and only partially the theoretical anthropology pervasive in the new historicism in the 1980s (e.g., Claude Lévi-Strauss, Victor Turner, Mary Douglas, etc.). Rather, the anthropologies of cultural identity that developed in conjunction with area studies, postcolonial studies, gender and sexuality studies, race and ethnicity studies, and post/ modernity studies have shaped criticism on the literatures of writers and communities defined by movement and intercultural encounter. Anthropologists such as Clifford, Appadurai, Lila Abu-Lughod, Ruth Behar (Behar and Gordon), Kirin Narayan, Renato Rosaldo, Michael Taussig, Michel-Rolph Trouillot, Kamala Visvesvaran, and Neil Whitehead have served as a rich source of concepts useful for literary studies—culture, hybridity, ethnoscopes, intercultural transaction, transcultural, cultural relativity, cultural traffic, fetish, primitivism, and so forth. In turn, literary studies and the turn to theory (esp. postmodern or poststructuralist theory) have influenced these anthropologies, with increased attention to the effects of the ethnographer’s standpoint, subjectivity, and writing on transcultural acts of representation.

DIFFERENCES:
BACKGROUND AND ISSUES

Migration, diaspora, and borders as distinct interest areas in literary studies initially developed in conjunction with interdisciplinary postcolonial, gender, race, multicultural, and queer studies. Like these fields, it emerged most extensively from scholars working in the modern period, roughly from the late nineteenth century, through the twentieth century, and into the current century. They have gradually come to influence those working in earlier historical periods, a process analogous to the beginnings of new historicism in Renaissance studies and its eventual spread to other periods. A brief overview of each area is instructive for the way they have more recently come to interweave, collaborate, and to some extent cohere.

Migration

The movement of peoples from one place to another around the globe is a history of dislocation and relocation, displacement and entrenchment, losing homes and making new homes, living in a limbo between worlds and adapting over time to new ways, being changed by and also changing the culture of the adopted land. As a term, migration encompasses a plethora of distinct migrants, sometimes subtly and sometimes vastly different from one another in relation to structures of power and privilege and to issues of agency: refugees, cosmopolitans, exiles, diasporics, pilgrims, nomads, settlers, asylum seekers, evacuees, emigrants, displaced persons, strangers, guest workers, migrant workers, travelers, tourists, and so forth. Migration has been a powerful stimulant to literary expressions of identity in motion and the self-fashioning that new homelands require. To my knowledge, few scholars have attempted to theorize the discursive field of migration literature per se or to identify structural patterns of migration literature beyond generalizations about the literature of distinctive cultural groups or comparisons among them. But migration has long been a staple for those who study the national literatures of nation-states or regions built predominantly through massive waves of immigrants from different parts of the world (e.g., the Americas, Australia, New Zealand, South Africa). Narratives of assimilation; cultural clashes; hyphenated identities; generational conflict; intermarriage; and competing national, ethnic, or religious loyalties have been explored for decades, especially in American studies.

In the past decade or so, however, the national and ethnic paradigms for studying migration literature have yielded to transnational models emphasizing the global space of ongoing travel and transcontinental connection. Examples are the literary-cultural scholarship of the Pacific Rim (e.g., Lowe; Bow; Ma), the circumAtlantic (e.g., Gilroy; Appiah, In My Father’s House and Cosmopolitanism), the North-South axis (e.g., Gikandi, Maps; Pratt, Ramos), and cultures of the Indian Ocean (e.g., Ghosh). Another major shift in migration studies has come from what many see as a significant change in global migration patterns in the second half of the twentieth century, leading to what is widely termed the new migration. The rise to economic and military power of the United States after World War II and the 1965 Immigration Act, which effectively opened the door that had been shut in 1924, have made the United States a magnet for those from the Caribbean, Latin America, Africa, and Asia who seek to escape repression or poverty.

Economic and political asymmetries between European nations and their former colonies in the postcolonial period (starting in the late 1940s) have led to the migration of millions from Africa, Asia, the Caribbean, and Latin America into Britain and Europe. Racism, religious differences, class disparities, and fears about changes in national identity produced through immigration have produced intense conflict, even violence, and pressure to enact restrictive citizenship laws. Not all migration has been between the so-called First and Third Worlds, however. Political instability, ethnic cleansing, and economic disparities have led to refugee and labor migrations from India to the Gulf States, for example; from the Philippines to the Middle East, Europe, and the Americas; from one part of Africa to another; from one former Soviet state to another; and from rural to urban areas in China and India.

New technologies of travel and communication also contribute to the new migration. The speed of migration (airplane vs. ship) and transcontinental contact (e-mail and telephone vs. sea mail) have increased for many the frequency of circular migration, ongoing visits back home, and connection with the home culture—all of which has made the radical rupture of migration less fixed for many, especially the more affluent.

The criticism of the new-migration literature has tended to follow the example of prior decades by focusing on the experience and writings of single ethnic, national, or racial groups or by initiating some comparative study across different groups. Criticism on migration narratives in the United States still predominates, with some postcolonial criticism of migration narratives in Britain and Europe now appearing as well. Alpana Sharma Knipping’s New Immigrant Literatures in the United States is an invaluable sourcebook presenting introductions to the history, culture, and literature of post–World War II migrations into the United States from twenty-two countries and regions of the world—French, Korean, Arab, Armenian, Sephardic-Jewish, Greek, Czech, and Mexican, to name a few. Critics like Paul Heike in Mapping Migration, Gilbert Muller in New Strangers in Paradise, Katherine Payant and Toby Rose in The Immigrant Experience in North American Literature, Eleanor Ty and David C. Goellnicht in Asian North American Identities, Louis Mendoza and S. Shankar in Crossing into America, and Carine Mardorossian in “From Literature of Exile to Migrant Literature” stress a major shift in North American migration narratives away from the assimilation model, which centers on the plot of Americanization in earlier narratives like Mary Antin’s The Promised Land or Anzia Yezierska’s Bread Givers. Instead, they see in the post-1965 migration narratives more fluidity of identity, more heterogeneity, more resistance to assimilation, more bilingualism and hybridity, and less willingness on the part of American society in general to integrate these newly racialized immigrants.

As Matthew Frye Jacobson describes in Whiteness of a Different Color, many groups coming into the United States on earlier waves of immigration were not considered white at first—especially the Irish, Jews, Italians, and Slavs. However, they gradually acquired the privileged status of whiteness in opposition to black, Native, and Asian populations, who remained racial others, perpetually marginalized, legally segregated, and not fully American.
Despite tensions between new immigrants to the United States and older racialized communities, the new migrants have more often joined the ranks of people of color than those of white America. Tensions over race, religion, and culture are reflected in such contemporary migration narratives and poetry as Meena Alexander’s *The Shock of Arrival*, Diana Abu-Jaber’s *Arabian Jazz*, Mohja Kahf’s *E-Mails from Scherazad*, Junot Diaz’s *Drown*, Loida Martiña Pérez’s *Geographies of Home*, Gish Jen’s *The Monk in the Promised Land*, Leilah Ahmed’s *Border Passage*, and Pamela Moride’s *Citable*. Cultural critics of the United States like Ali Behdad in *A Forgetful Nation* and Kevin Johnson in *The Huddled Masses Myth* add important historical contexts to this literature of the new migration, arguing that the American national imaginary has celebrated the country as a nation of immigrants at the same time that it has repressed memories of compulsory migrations, conquest, and nativist movements.

Migration within the United States and Canada has also become a focus of study. The Great Migration of African Americans from the South to the North in the twentieth century, the internal migrations of Native peoples forced from their homelands, and the intermingling of Japanese Americans during World War II—to cite a few prominent examples—have inspired both literary and literary studies. The expressive culture of the Great Migration—literature, music, the arts, folk culture, and so on—has been in particular the subject of several sustained studies. Farah Jasmine Griffin’s *Who Set You Flowin’?* Lawrence R. Rodger’s *Canaan Bound*, and David G. Nicholls’s *Conjuring the Folks* variously explore the forms of expression that record the drive to migrate north, the shock of the urban landscape for predominantly rural folk, the formation of northern black urban culture, the experiences of racial invisibility and alienation, and the continued presence of the South in the arts and culture of the transplanted African Americans in the North.

Other nations and continents have experienced massive migration, of course, and their literatures reflect its significance, especially in fiction, autobiography, and other forms of life writing. Some of these migrations have involved searches for a better life, especially in Canada, Australia, France, and Spain. But for others, involuntary migration, political exile, ethnic cleansing, genocide, refugeeism, and perpetual guest worker status meant suffering and homelessness. Past history of colonial migration underlies the new migration of the late twentieth century. Settlers from the British Isles moved in large numbers not only to the United States, Canada, Australia, and New Zealand but also to India and Africa, especially southern and eastern Africa, established as small minorities with economic and political hegemonies based on racist ideology—a history that Doris Lessing explores in settler novels like *The Grass Is Singing*.

In turn, the postcolonial era contains a vast reverse migration into the once imperial metropoles of Britain and Europe. This migration of largely brown or black people into the heart of whiteness has challenged the underlying racial basis of European national imaginaries. As Bruce King points out in *The Internationalization of English Literature*, the new migration from the former colonies has internationalized English literature in Britain, introducing narratives of migratory nostalgia and self-fashioning, back-and-forth movement, mixed-race identities, conflict around gender and sexuality, and tension among the different cultural groups often homogenized under the derogatory label black in their new home.

The identity of English literature and its writers has itself become migratory, a notion that writers like Hanif Kureishi, Buki Emecheta, Ben Okri, and Salman Rushdie (*Satanic Verses*) embody and narrativize. For example, Rushdie writes as a cosmopolitan—born a Muslim in Bombay, separated from his family in Pakistan by the aftermath of partition, now a British citizen and living in the United States. Should he be called an Indian, English, British, or American writer? Is his oeuvre part of English, British, American, Indian, or South Asian literature? Even the term “English literature” in Britain is an ambiguous designation: alternately linguistic, ethnic, or geopolitical at a time when literature in Britain is increasingly micronational (e.g., Scottish, Welsh, English), multicultural, multilingual, and even multilingual. Other European countries face similar ambiguities. Are the Muslim girls in France who insist on wearing a hijab to public school denying their Frenchness? Or can Frenchness be separated from its historical ties to the universalistic discourse of republican France so as to institute a new, multicultural understanding of French? As Azade Seyhan points out, the literature of Turkish guest workers in Germany, of some of it reflecting several generations of life in Germany, exists in a kind of legal and cultural in-between, since even the children of these workers born in Germany do not have access to German citizenship.

Although few studies attempt to theorize migration literature beyond the patterns evident in the literatures of specific groups, migration studies in the social sciences has developed a considerable theoretical body of scholarship that would greatly benefit literary studies. As Caroline Breell and James F. Hollifield note in Migration Theory: *Talking across the Disciplines*, social scientists have developed some key terminology for migration, such as sending and receiving cultures; push and pull factors; out-migration and immigration; host-newcomer relations; networked migration; enclave migration; and various terms with distinctive and nuanced meanings for cultural change—assimilation, acculturation, enculturation, deculturation, transculturation, cultural hybridity, hyphenization, and so forth. They have also developed complex typologies of migration, including such categories as seasonal, temporary, nonseasonal, recurrent, continuous, permanent, yo-yo, commuter, shuttle, return, and bright-light (rural to urban). Breell warns against typology as a homogenizing practice that tends to erase contradictions and tensions within any given migration, especially those produced by gender (Breell and Hollifield 109–13).

Modeling migration in the social sciences has drawn on different kinds of social theory, from modernization theory to historical-structuralist theory and newer transnational paradigms. Modernization theory, Breell suggests, tends to be microlevel, focused on individual reasons for migration, agency and decision making, and the attraction of modernity as an advance over tradition (Breell and Hollifield 102–06). The historical-structuralist models are macrolevel analysis of world systems that emphasize systemic forces and the lack of choice. Transnational models deal with the new globalization, theorizing the effects of deterritorialization, new modes of travel and communication, and the issues of national borders and citizenship.

Some social science theory on migration makes a particular effort to bridge the gap between social theory and literary-language studies of migration and is therefore of particular use to future literary migration studies. In *The Turbulence of Migration*, the sociologist Nikos Papastergiadis links the study of the "new migration" to modernity studies, arguing that "the dynamic of displacement is intrinsic to migration and modernity" (12). He notes that "the metaphor of the journey, the figure of the stranger and the experience of displacement have been at the centre of many of the cultural representations of modernity," as in the work of James Joyce (11). The "restless dynamism in modern society" and the "movement of people and the circulation of symbols" characterize late-twentieth-century modernity, so much so that cultural displacement is experienced even by those who are not migrating (15). Papastergiadis critiques the old sociological models of migration as water-pump models, too mechanistic and static, whether the neoliberal voluntarist model based on push-out or pull-up forces or the Marxist world-systems model. He posits a model of turbulence that takes into account subjectivity and agency and places concepts of cultural translation—including linguistic and aesthetic practices—and the semiotics of hybridity at the center of analysis. Immigration has functioned at the level of lyrical speculation and postmodern philosophy as well, at times removed from the literal meanings of migration in material space and time but nonetheless evocative and influential in literary
studies as a way of unmooring the subject from illogical certainties of language, representation, and being. In Nomadic Subjects, for example, the feminist philosopher Rosi Braidotti deterritorializes nomadism and adapts the term as a metaphor for epistemological migration, which she defines as a critical consciousness that is "transmobilizable," "transnational," and attuned to the axes of differentiation such as class, race, ethnicity, gender, age, and others as they intersect and interact with each other in the constitution of subjectivity. The norm is my own figuration of a situated, postmodern, culturally differentiated understanding of the subject in general and of the feminist subject in particular.

The interdisciplinary cultural critic Lain Chambers in Migrancy, Culture, Identity regards migration, "together with the enunciation of cultural borders and crossings," as the primary concept underlyng the "institutings of much contemporary reasoning." (2) Adapting a rhetoric of mobility, Chambers advocates the journey as "the form of restless interrogation," a sort of perpetual questioning that privileges displacement and the need for a mode of thinking that is neither fixed nor stable. ... For the nomadic experience of language, wandering without a fixed home, dwelling at the crossroads of the world, bearing our sense of being and difference, is no longer the expression of a unique tradition or history. Thought wanders. It migrates, requires translation. ... This inevitably implies another sense of home, of being in the world. It means to conceive of dwelling as a mobile habitat. (4)

Treating migration as a lyrical signifier emptied of reference to the real of mobility in geohistorical space and time carries its own risk, but such slippage between the metaphors of migration and the literary representations of migrating people is common in contemporary criticism and can be richly suggestive. (5)

Diaspora

By definition, diaspora involves migration—but specific kinds of migration that set in motion particular longings for a lost homeland. Diaspora is migration plus loss, desire, and widely scattered communities held together by memory and a sense of history over a long period of time. Frequently, but not always, this history has involved oppression against a whole people and thus an attachment to community based on a sense of shared suffering and the richness of the community's minority traditions. Diaspora, as the sociologist Robin Cohen points out in Global Diasporas, is a Greek word that means the sowing or dispersion of seed (speto, to sow), dia, is "over," and it was used by the ancient Greeks to refer to migrations of colonizing Greeks who formed settlements throughout the Mediterranean world, extending the economic, political, and cultural power of those who remained "at home." (6) But as the term developed in literary and cultural studies of the past decade or so, it was associated with collectivities of the expelled, the exiled, or the forcibly removed rather than with the colonizing settlers of imperial powers. Thus diaspora is bound up with notions of a once-territorial homeland to which dispersed communities remain emotionally attached even as their relation to it is a form of perpetual de-differentialization, a consciousness of collective rather than individual exile.

Diasporas are "imagined communities," to adapt the influential term Benedict Anderson developed to describe the role of collective consciousness in the formation of the nation-state. The continuity of diasporas is related not to the fate of the nation-state but to a diasporic consciousness, an imagined community of the scattered held together by their shared sense of a distinct history and culture as a people and by obstacles to full assimilation in diverse host countries. Some diasporas are long-standing, like the two-thousand-year diaspora of the Jews or the five-hundred-year African diaspora; others are more recent, yet insistently claimed, such as the Armenian (after World War I) or the Palestinian (after World War I or 1947).

In recent years diasporic consciousness has developed around other migrations that are less clearly tied to compulsory loss of homeland. Impoverished laborers from India, for example, fanned out to the Americas, the Caribbean, Africa, and Southeast Asia in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, with many remaining as large and sometimes prosperous communities, as in Trinidad, Fiji, and eastern and southern Africa. A second wave of South Asian migration began after Indian independence and partition, particularly to the former colonial center in Britain, both political and economic reasons fueling that demographic implosion. Yet a third wave of South Asian migration in the past thirty years is considerably layered: Indians expelled from Uganda going to Britain and the United States, laborers going to the Gulf States and Southeast Asia for jobs, intellectuals and highly trained engineers and computer experts going to the West, and so forth. Often differing in religion, language, caste, class, and nation(s) of origin, these South Asians are newly constituting themselves as the South Asian Diaspora, claiming the term, producing literatures, and engaging in other cultural practices that reflect a newly imagined community dispersed around the globe. (9)

Much debate in diaspora studies has been devoted to definitional questions, represented usefully in Jana Evans Bazielle and Anita Mannur's Theorizing Diaspora. What is a diaspora? What groups and kinds of experiences can justifiably be called diasporic? How does diaspora relate to exile? Is it negative or positive? Utopian or dystopian? What is its politics? What is the relation of diaspora to nation, nationalism, the nation-state, de/differentialization, transnationalism? How does gender complicate diasporic consciousness and community? In founding the journal Diaspora: A Journal of Transnational Studies in 1991, Khachig Tololyan calls for an expansive understanding of the term and points to how discourses of diaspora and nation are thoroughly entangled. Diaspora's mission is concerned with the ways in which nations, as real yet imagined communities . . . are fabricated, brought into being, made and unmade, in culture and politics, both on land people call their own and in exile. Above all, this journal will focus on such processes as they shape and are shaped by the infranational and transnational Others of the nation-state.

(3)

The "semantic domain" of diaspora "includes words like immigrant, expatriate, refugee, guestworker, exile community, overseas community, ethnic community. This is the vocabulary of transnationalism." (4–5)

Other definitional approaches have been less inclusive, especially the typological ones. William Safran's "Diasporas in Modern Societies" is a structuralist identification of six characteristics of diasporas based on a center/periphery model that sets in opposition the lost point of origin, the margins of dispersion, and the promise of return. Safran uses the Jewish diaspora as an ideal type and recognizes that many historical diasporas do not share all six defining elements. Arguing against the use of any one diaspora as a prototype, Cohen identifies five different kinds of diaspora: victim, labor and imperial, trade, nationalist, and culturalist. He emphasizes that diasporas change over time, often leading to communities with great stability and creative interactions with host societies.

Clifford advocates a "relational" and "lateral" approach that focuses on tensions or contradictions that an array of different diasporic formations share (Routes 244–78). The main tension is encapsulated in the homonym roots-routes, which he introduced in his 1992 essay "Traveling Cultures" (Routes 17–46). Diasporic cultures are products of the interplay between their "roots" in consciousness of common community, past, and original homeland and their "routes," that is, their migration(s) and relocations into new societies. "Diaspora cultures," he writes, "thus mediate, in a lived tension, the experiences of separation and entanglement, of living here and remembering/desiring another place" (255). Diasporas involve a "loosely coherent, adaptive constellation of responses to dwelling-in-displacement," a liminal and hybrid space in between separatist and assimilationist movements (254). Diasporas induce a form of
cosmopolitanism and "double consciousness" based in both accommodation to the dominant culture and an ongoing tie to a homeland elsewhere. They involve "feeling global" in a locale that is both home and not quite home (257).

Like Clifford, Avtar Brah in Cartographies of Diaspora centers her theory in the fundamental contradictions of diaspora—for example, the concepts of home as "a mythic place of desire" and as "the lived experience of a locality" (182); diasporas as reminders of trauma and as "sites of hope and new beginnings" (193). "Paradoxically," she writes, "diasporic journeys are essentially about settling down, about putting roots elsewhere" (182). Moreover, any given diaspora embodies the contradiction of establishing a "we" out of heterogeneity. "All diasporas are differentiated," not only from other diasporas but also by the impact of dispersion itself. As people from a single diaspora settle in different lands, they indigenize at the same time as they hold on to a sense of common diasporic culture (184). Another dimension of differentiation for Brah is the "intersectionality" of national identity with gender, race, religion, sexuality, class, and so forth (10). Using diaspora as a conceptual tool for analyzing complex identities, she foregrounds the "multi-axial" dimensions of any given diaspora, refusing metanarratives of diasporic home and centers of origin (189).

Despite the widening applications of diaspora, especially in reference to contemporary globalization, two particular affliction diasporas continue to play a normative role in diaspora studies, serving as a kind of theoretical touchstone for the field. These are the Jewish and African diasporas, entangled not only as theoretical models but also as historical phenomena.

The Jewish and African diasporas are entangled not only as theoretical models but also as historical phenomena. On multiple expulsions or re-disporizations from Israel, in the Babylonian captivity starting in 587 BCE, then with the destruction of the second temple in Jerusalem in 70 CE, from Spain, Portugal, and their colonies in the Americas in 1492 as part of the Inquisition, from Eastern Europe with pogroms of the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries; from Europe with the Holocaust; and from Arab lands after World War II. Scattered to every continent of the globe, the Jews retained a sense of themselves as a people with shared cultural practices (if not beliefs), a shared history, global networks of affiliation, and attachment to the imagined homeland of Israel—a place that for some was an actual territory and for others a spiritual site for the union of a people with its god. In this type of diaspora, communal identity is bound up with consciousness of affliction and minority status, both the pain of and pride in difference, both the desire for and the continual threat of assimilation. With the establishment of the state of Israel in 1947, the Jewish diaspora entered a new and more controversial phase as the reterritorialization of the dispersed through the law of return for Jews anywhere involved the creation of a new diaspora of Palestinians expelled not from their own nation-state but from their lands, which had been ruled by the Ottomans and the Europeans for generations.

In Jewish studies, the meanings of diaspora and exile have been the subject of widespread debate, belying the idea of a fixed prototype. There is disagreement about the significance of the nation-state of Israel. Howard Winetstein argues that the term exile is too "hauntingly negative" and that the Jewish diaspora does not exclusively represent anguish and forced homelessness; it also incorporates a "positive" notion of a "people of the Book" whose "homeland resides in the text" (2). This alternative view recognizes that "diasporic communities were often stable" and desired for the benefits of widespread intercultural exchange and trade; they were often chosen destinations (3). Jonathan Boyarin, a critical legal scholar, and Daniel Boyarin, a specialist in Talmudic culture, further argue that the association of identity with the exclusive control of territory is ultimately destructive. They suggest that Jewish identity began with Abraham outside Israel, not in a territorial homeland. They insist that the creative and positive aspects of the Jewish diaspora be acknowledged as well as how the diaspora has empowered some at the expense of others. "Evaluating diaspora," they write, "enables acknowledging the ways that such identity is maintained through exclusion and oppression of internal others (especially women) and external others," including other diasporas (7–8). They favor a comparative approach to diasporas that explores the Jewish diaspora not in isolation, not as an unchanging essence justifying the claim on biblical lands, but as phenomena in a changing landscape of history, filled with problems and possibilities.  

The discourse of the African diaspora, the second main prototype, often self-consciously adapts the Jewish model to the specificities of systemic racism, colonialism, and the affiliation of many scattered peoples of African descent around the concepts of blackness and the lost homeland of Africa, a place without the geographic specificity of biblical Israel but a generalized location of home nonetheless. Although becoming current in scholarly circles in the past fifteen years, the notion of the black diaspora has deep historical roots in the history of slavery, the Marcus Garvey and Rastafarian "back to Africa" movements of the 1920s and 1930s, the negritude movement and pan-African movements from the 1930s through the 1960s, and the civil rights and black nationalist movements of the 1950s through the present in various countries. The Middle Passage—some three hundred and fifty years of the transatlantic slave trade—is the defining moment of this diaspora, the traumatic theft from sub-Saharan Africa and the sale of populations on a massive scale to and in the Americas. With languages and local cultural groupings often lost in the face of deliberate dispersals of the enslaved, such cultural practices as the oral tradition, religious and spiritual communities, political organizations, and expressive forms in the arts provided the basis for the imagined communities of blackness. As a continent rather than a country, Africa functioned as a source of spiritual rootedness and affirmative identity drawn on to counter the sorrows and lamentations of a brutalizing diaspora and ongoing racism.

The initial focus in black studies on race in a single nation (e.g., the United States, Brazil, France) or region (e.g., the Caribbean) has since the 1990s increasingly shifted toward attention to a transnational African diaspora. The Department of Afro-American Studies at Harvard University, for example, became in 2002–03 the Department of African and African American Studies. Underlying this shift is not only the growing transnationalism of literary and cultural studies but also a debate over the meanings of diaspora that parallels the opposing views in Jewish studies. For some, like a leading voice in Afrocentrism, Molefi Asante, the African diaspora coheres around an essential and inherent blackness that goes back to the ancient dynasties of Egypt and descends through the great kingdoms of black Africa (e.g., Asante and Fulani empires in West Africa, Great Zimbabwe of the Shona people, and Zululand). But for others, like Paul Gilroy and Stuart Hall, the African diaspora is a relatively new ethnicity in the making, a formation that underlines how the modernity of Europe, Africa, and the Americas was mutually constitutive, with the enslavement of millions as the initial dislocation in that construction. In his influential book The Black Atlantic: Modernity and Double Consciousness, Gilroy attacks Afrocentric "ethic absolutism" (2) and argues that the "black Atlantic" connecting Europe, Africa, and the Americas has always been a hybrid space of cultural exchange and the interplay of blackness and differentiation.  

New claims to the term diaspora have diffused the exclusive force of the prototypical Jewish and African diasporas and affliction diasporas in general. A sampling of books from the past decade or so demonstrates the global range and variety of migrations laying claim to the word: Nicholas
Van Hear's New Diasporas, on refugiaism; Shahnaz Kahn's Aversion and Desire: Negotiating Muslim Female Identity in the Diaspora; R. Badakhshan's Diasporic Meditations; Anny Kaminisky's After Exile: Writing the Latin American Diaspora; Azade Seyhan's Writing outside the Nation; Martin Manalanjan's Global Divas: Filipina Gay Men in the Diaspora; Kandice Chah and Karen Shimakawa's Orientations: Mapping Studies in the Asian Diaspora; Anuradha Dingwall's Needham's Using the Master's Tools: Resistance and the Literature of the African and South Asian Diasporas; Rebecca Walsh's Special Issue of Interventions, Global Diasporas. In queer and gender studies, the concept of diaspora deals with sexual exile and outcast status as well as the transnational circuits of sexuality and culture (Cruz Malave and Manalanjan; Joseph, Manalanjan; Patton and Sanchez-Eppler). For others, the discourse and experience of exile has blended with the concept of diaspora, as in Edward Said's Out of Place and "Reflections on Exile," Noor Ila's Outlandish: Writing between Exile and Diaspora, Andre Aciman's Letters of Transit: Reflections on Exile, Identity, Language, and Loss, and Michael Hanne's Creativity in Exile.

The conceptual border between diaspora and other forms of migration such as travel, exile, expatriatism, immigration and emigration, nomadism, and refugeism has become ever more porous. In part, this definitional flexibility emerges out of a growing awareness of the complexity of diaspora and the differences among diasporas. But it also reflects that many of the observers of diaspora are intellectuals living and working outside their native lands. Diasporas, everyone seems to agree, involve whole communities, not just individuals. But it remains true that the most eloquent articulations of contemporary diaspora come from diasporic intellectuals and writers, from individuals whose migrancy is often chosen or ambiguously compelled and whose ties to communal diaspora are heavily mediated by class. Amitava Kumar's Passport Photos, to cite one example, is an ambitious critical, theoretical, autobiographical, photographic meditation on the modalities of migration that embodies this new intellectual thread. With its chapters organized around the categories of the passport—from "Language," "Photography," and "Name" to "Nationality," "Sex," and "Identifying Marles"—this hybrid text moves through the geohistorical landscapes of diaspora with its commingling of shame, abjection, hope, despair, and desire as linguistic, aesthetic, and philosophical border crossings.

Universities, especially in the West, have increasingly become transnational crossroads for highly educated cosmopolitans, who often travel back and forth across multiple borders, feeling fully at home nowhere as they move through contact zones where race, religion, gender, class, and national origin constitute their identity differentially. At times attacked for their relative privilege, they also experience alienating forms of othering, particularly racism. In Writing Diaspora, Rey Chow turns a critical eye on "third world intellectuals," including herself, insisting that they be attuned to the conditions of their own articulation. She worries that diasporic intellectuals can too easily hide behind or inside their "victim" status in the West, not taking into account their own positions as elites in both old and new "homes" (99–119). Her critique notwithstanding, many of these migrants from Asia, Latin America, Africa, and the Caribbean embody the paradoxes of diaspora, the simultaneous rooting and routing of situated identities in different cultural terrains. Their diasporic theorizing often effectively incorporates what Brah terms "the technologies of autobiography" or what Meena Alexander calls "alphabets of flesh": a narrativizing and metaphorizing of individual diasporic experience as communal voice. As May Joseph puts it, "Cultural citizenship is a nomadic and performative realm of self-invention" (358), and diasporic intellectuals are an avant-garde of perpetual dislocation and relocation.

**Borders and Borderlands**

Border studies begin with attention to the material borders among nation-states, the technologies of enforcement, the controls and markers of citizenship, and the structures of inclusion and exclusion that are enabled by borders as lines on a map backed by armies and law. But border studies has also developed in the past fifteen years across a spectrum of divergent issues and fields in literary studies, ranging well beyond the geopolitical to exploration of the metaphoric dimensions of borders and borderlands as tropes for regulative and transgressive patterns in the cultural and social order. Underlying these spatialized modes of critical thought is the basic contradiction embedded in both the material and figurative meanings of border.

Borders are fixed and fluid, impermeable and porous. They separate but also connect, demarcate but also blend differences. Absolute at any moment in time, they are always changing over time. They promise safety, security, a sense of being at home; they also enforce exclusions, the state of being alien, foreign, and homeless. They protect but also confine. They materialize the law, policing separations; but as such, they are always being crossed, transgressed, subverted. Borders are used to exercise power over others but also to empower survival against others. They regulate migration, movement, travel—the flow of people, goods, ideas, and cultural formations of all kinds. They undermine regulatory practices by fostering intercultural encounter and the concomitant production of syncretic heterogeneities and hybridities. They insist on purity, distinction, difference but facilitate contamination, mixing, creolization.

Geographic borderlands are related to but distinct from borders. Borders are imaginary lines of separation with real effects, as in a geopolitical boundary between nation-states. From the American Southwest to other parts of the world like Alsace-Lorraine, the Caribbean, South Asia, the Balkans, Iraq-Iran, China-Tibet, and Israel-Palestine, borderlands are ambiguously demarcated areas with complicated histories, where different peoples and cultures have intermingled over time, often in the context of competing state powers and institutional regulation. Borderlands have been the sites of hatred and murderous acts, akin to the grating of continental tectonic plates and their occasional violent eruptions. They can also be locations of utopian desire, reconciliation, and peace. Borderlands are a "contact zone" where fluid differences meet, where power is often structured asymmetrically but nonetheless circulates in complex and multidirectional ways, where agency exists on both sides of the shifting and permeable divide.

While the geographic and geopolitical basis of border studies has remained compelling, borders and borderlands have also taken on broad theoretical dimensions as spatial metaphors for the liminal space in between, the intersitial site of interaction, interconnection, and exchange across all kinds of differences: psychological, spiritual, sexual, linguistic, generic, disciplinary. A frontier between differences also operates figuratively as a conceptual space for performative identities beyond the fixed essentialisms of fundamentalist or absolutist identity politics. It has functioned as a tropic space of play and interplay, of representational transgression and postmodern experimentation, of fluidity and utopian possibility. Such expansive and figurative work in border theory moves far beyond the economic, political, material, and even cultural realities of the peoples who live on both sides of a geopolitical border, which are the focus of scholars working in more empirically based fields in border studies. The metaphorization of borders in cultural and literary theory remains a point of considerable tension in the field.

Gloria Anzaldúa's Borderlands/La Fronter 

The New Mestiza has been a touchstone text for border studies, often cited, taught, and critiqued as both literature and theory across the disciplines. Published in 1987, this collage of prose and poetry, English and Spanish (six kinds of Spanish, according to Anzaldúa), history and theory starts from the bitter history of the geopolitical borderlands of the American Southwest and moves on to psychological, spiritual,
and sexual borders as figural representations of regulation and transgression. As a self-identified Chicana feminist and lesbian, Anzaldúa explores the pain and pleasures of mestizaje in the history of pre-Contact Meso- and Southwest America, the Spanish conquest and Mexican independence, the Mexican-American war and its aftermath, and twentieth-century Chican@ experience. The importance of Anzaldúa’s “Borderlands” (La Frontera) for border studies highlights the centrality of the Mexican–United States border culture (including California), Central America, and Latin America in general for the formation of the field. What Nestor Garcia Canclini calls the “hybrid cultures” of Latin America and its borders in the north have been a primary generator of border theory. Adapting the work of Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari on “minor” literature, deterritorialization, and Kafka (Kafka), Emily Hicks theorizes the significance of biculturalism and bilingualism for the production of multidimensional models of border writing and border crossings between self and other in Latin American literature. “Criticism in the Borderlands,” edited by Héctor Calderón and José David Saldivar, calls for a new Pan-American studies that recognizes how the United States conquest of Mexican lands in 1846 created a borderlands culture mixing Hispanic, Indian, white, and other traditions. Saldivar suggests that this border culture breaks the pattern of linear migration, substituting bi- or multiculturalism for assimilation, and highlights the intercultural and transnational nature of popular and high cultural forms of linguistic and aesthetic expression (Border Matters). Debra Castillo and María Socorro Tabuenca Cordoba challenge the mainstream notions of border culture produced in Chicana/o studies and explore women writers on both sides of the Mexican–United States border in a comparative methodology that resists homogenization.

With the spread of border theory, other border regions of the world have become subjects of literary study. Rachel Brenner examines the literature of Israeli and Arab Jews in Israel to see how writers who dissent from the prevailing exclusionary discourses of both Israel and Palestine create a borderland of dialogue between the victors and the vanquished. An explosion of partition literature in South Asia in recent years, for example, has led to studies on violence, religion, identity, gender, and memory in the context of the cataclysmic sectarian violence that erupted with the splitting of India into Pakistan and India at the end of the British raj in 1947–48. The role of fiction, life writing, testimony, and the oral tradition has been the subject of many interdisciplinary books and conferences in South Asian studies that examine the repressions, hauntings, and attempts to remember that accompany collective trauma and its aftermath in the contemporary period (e.g., Bhalla, Partition Dialogues and Stories; Bhatia; Menon and Bhasin; Kaul; and Saint and Saint). The particular suffering and silences of women who experienced rape, disgrace, and widowhood during the partition, with the massive migrations of millions (esp. Hindus, Muslims, and Sikhs) across the new borders has been a rich area for feminist research. As Mary Layoun points out in reference to other intensely divided border regions in Greece, Cyprus, and Beirut, nationalism offers comfort to highly gendered tropes of nation to expel the other and enforce exclusionary borders. With women as metaphor for nation, actual women often experience the displacements of nationalism with competing loyalties that reflect the intersecting identities of gender, nation, class, religion, and sexuality.

Border as geographic metaphor has been especially prevalent in postcolonial studies for its suggestive overtones of in-betweeness and liminality, which are particularly suited to characterize subjectivities on the move between cultures, palimpsestically layered by formative experiences in different locations, hybridically blended out of different cultural strands, and often caught up in the dynamics of past and present, tradition and modernity, self and other. Homi Bhabha is the preeminent theorist of the interstitial, of the examination of culture in the “moment of transit,” and of the “borders” and “borderposts” that are crossed in the “articulation of cultural differences” (Location 1). For Bhabha, the interstitial is a border space that exists over time but gains its most resonant meaning as metaphor for postmodernity. The concept is basic to his notions of “colonial mimicry” (120), the imitation in the contact zone between colonizer and colonized that denaturalizes the colonizer’s assumed superiority by highlighting the constructedness of cultural practices. But the interstitial also captures for Bhabha the particular conditions of postmodernity, with what he calls the demography of the “new internationalism”: “the history of postcolonial migration, the narratives of cultural and political diaspora, the major social displacements of peasant and aborigine communities, the poetics of exile, the grim prose of political and economic refugees.” The discourse of “boundary” or “border” signifies the continual “displacement and conjunction” that characterizes the physical and psychological existence of people caught up in the new internationalism (5).

Less sanguine about the utopian possibilities of border liminality than Bhabha, the Latin Americanist Walter D. Mignolo has developed an alternative theory of “border thinking,” what he calls “border gnosics,” one that takes as its framework Immanuel Wallerstein’s world-systems theory and his emphasis on post-1500 European imperialism as structural force of inequality that produces border gnosics. Akin to Pratt’s concept of the contact zone as a product of the asymmetrical power relations of colonialism, Mignolo’s border gnosics represents a critical stance toward colonialism, one developed as a form of subaltern resistance. It involves absorbing and displacing hegemonic forms of knowledge into the perspective of the subaltern. This is not a new form of syncretism or hybridity, but an intense battlefield in the long history of colonial subalternization of knowledge and legitimation of the colonial difference.

Border thinking is inherently critical, a form of “colonial semiosis” that expresses the resistance of the colonized (14). Border theory across the spectrum of identity studies draws on the geographic roots of the metaphor but goes well beyond this spatial terrain. As lines that divide and join, borders function figuratively as the point of connection and disconnection between differences. They also trope the borderlands in between various binary oppositions: male/female, white/black, heterosexual/homosexual, self/other, and so forth. For Julia Kristeva, such states of liminality are sites of abjection, thereby exerting a deconstructive force on the symbolic order (Powers, esp. 207–10). The rhetoric of borders often accompanies the adaptations of deconstruction to social and cultural analysis of identity in fields such as women’s studies, race and ethnicity studies, postcolonial studies, and queer studies. Consequently, the language of borders pervades works that examine the regulative and resistant discourses that insist on identity differences as well as discourses that suggest imitation, sameness, and hybridity. As Rosaldo writes:

Our everyday lives are crisscrossed by border zones, poaches, and eruptions of all kinds. Social borders become salient around such lines as sexual orientation, gender, class, race, ethnicity, nationality, age, politics, dress, food or taste…. Such borderlands should be regarded not as analytically empty transitional zones but as sites of creative cultural production that require investigation.

COMMONALITIES: SHARED CONCERNS

While migration, diaspora, and border studies have developed along separate tracks, they have also converged around several core issues that underlie the location and movement of people in space over time.

Culture and Identity

How do individuals and collectivities of people change through their intercultural contacts with
others? What are the effects of those changes? How do they reflect structures of power? To think about intercultural exchange, do we need some kind of consensus on what we mean by culture? What is the relation between culture as forms of creative expressivity and the culture of everyday life? Zygmunt Bauman notes, "The idea of culture was itself a historical invention," one that has produced endless philosophical and political debate (Culture xiv). Two opposing notions have been particularly significant for issues of migration, diaspora, and border in literary studies: "culture as the activity of the free roaming spirit, the site of creativity, invention, self-critique and self-transcendence" and "culture as a tool of routinization and continuity—a handmaiden of social order" (xvii). But complicating this binary has been the assertion that the culture of creativity can also be complicit with the social order and that the culture of everyday life can disrupt it—all the more so in communities of people on the move.32

The interaction of cultures on the move or existing in border areas ensures that no one culture will exist in pure form: each is influenced by all the others to which it is exposed. But what is the nature of this influence? Terms like assimilation, acculturation, deculturation, and accommodation suggest what Rosaldo calls a "cultural stripping away," a loss of culture as minority individuals or communities become absorbed into the mainstream (209). The United States image of the melting pot for national identity originated with Israel Zangwill's 1908 play The Melting Pot. The play was opposed to the insistence of Anglo-Americans like the prominent sociologist Henry Pratt Fairchild that immigrants fully assimilate to American culture by the abandonment of their home cultures.33 But over time, the trope of the melting pot morphed into its opposite and has become the center of critique as an ideological rhetoric veiling an imposed assimilation, with Americanization meaning the loss of past language, culture, and identity of origin.

Instead of assuming complete cultural erasure, transculturation posits continual circuits of cultural mixing, often in settings of unequal power relations. Images of diversity—the mosaic, stir-fry, salad, stew, callaloo, rainbow, quilt, and so on—have developed as a rhetoric of resistance to mainstream groups determined to exclude the foreign, racial, or otherwise othered subordinate groups who do not want to lose their distinctive cultures. The "glorious mosaic" in particular suggests that the assimilation model is neither desirable nor accurate as a descriptor for national identity in the face of migration, diaspora, and border cultures. The mosaic rhetoric of pluralism, however, tends toward an understanding of culture as a patchwork of fixed differences, of a proliferation of changing minorities that remain forever marginalized from the center, from the cultures of privilege and power.

Transculturation is a term used for an approach to intercultural interaction that emphasizes the reciprocal influences across borders of all kinds. Immigrant and diasporic cultures not only change in relation to their new locations but the cultures in which they settle also transform as a result of the presence of the outsiders in their midsts. As a concept developed in the new ethnography, transculturation in particular acknowledges the agency of marginalized, subjugated, or foreign peoples. As Pratt puts it in Imperial Eyes, while such people "cannot readily control what emanates from the dominant culture, they do determine to varying extents what they absorb into their own, and what they use it for" (6). She discusses transculturation in the context of imperialism, but the concept has much wider applications in both cultural and literary theory.34 Tausig, for example, theorizes in Mimesis and Alterity that the drive to imitate is as basic to human (and animal) culture as the need to differentiate. As a word associated with both representation and imitation, mimesis foregrounds the way aesthetic and cultural forms develop as a form of border crossing in the praxis of culture. The diasporic Caribbean poet and critic Édouard Glissant theorizes the "flood of convergences" unleashed by intercultural encounters as the dynamic, relational, and chaotic "processes of circular normadism," as "the immeasurable intermingling of cultures," and as "an aesthetic of rupture and connection" (45, 137, 138, 151).

Transculturation assumes the existence of cultural hybridity or syncretism as a defining issue for analysis. Instead of assuming complete cultural erasure, transculturation posits continual circuits of cultural mixing, often in settings of unequal power relations. Also termed creolité (especially in Caribbean studies), métissage (in French and francophone studies), metztzoz (in Spanish and Latino/a studies), and tahljan (in Arabic studies), cultural hybridity is much debated as to its meaning and politics. At times, hybridity means the fusion of cultural differences into the production of an entirely new cultural form; at times, it means the interplay of differences that retain their cultural distinctiveness; and at still other times, it means the mixing of the already syncretic. For some, hybridity is endemic to culture itself, always present in an ordinary, routine fashion as the process of cultural development; for others, hybridity is inherently destabilizing, transgressive, parodic, and creative, a strategy employed to resist tyrannies of social and discursive orders.

The politics of hybridity, fiercely debated, is sometimes condemned as ideological, obscuring power relations and ignoring the need for communal solidarities; sometimes attacked as naively utopian; sometimes valorized as nonsectarian or antifoundationalist, and sometimes recognized for its potentially positive and negative formations depending on location and period of history.35 Moreover, cultural hybridity is not just a product of interculturalism; it is also a process that takes on various forms of cultural translation, transplation, adaptation, and indigenization. Cultural traffic on a global scale, to invoke Appadurai's discussion of the global ethnoscope in Modernity at Large, involves the praxis of cultural formation, deformation, and reformation—transformations in which aesthetic expressions have a particularly important role to play.

Intersectionalism

Identities within a cultural group are not homogeneous, however much they are imagined to be. Generalizations about the African diaspora, Mexican immigrants, overseas Chinese, the Islamic ummah (global community), the NRI (non-resident Indians), and so forth often obscure the divisions within such groups, especially divisions based on gender, sexuality, class, religion, and caste. The imagined community of nation or culture frequently assumes a normative or defining identity that all too easily ignores hierarchical redistributions of power within the group.

Working against these homogenizing tendencies in migration, diaspora, and border studies has been the development of intersectionalism as the analysis of multiple axes of power and difference as they intersect, mediate, and articulate one another. Feminists have pioneered this analysis, particularly in the area of nation and gender studies.36 Women on the move often experience competing patriarchies and internal conflicts between loyalty to their cultural traditions and desire to change the ones that imprison. Advocating change in their cultural group often opens them to charges of betrayal and inauthentic Westernization. As Uma Narayan writes in Dislocating Cultures:

Feminists all over the world need to be suspicious of locally prevalent pictures of "national identity" and "national traditions," both because they are used to privilege the views and values of certain parts of the heterogeneous national population, and because they are almost invariably detrimental to the interests and political standing of those who are relatively powerless within the national community... If nations are "imagined communities," then bigoted and distorted nationalism must be fought with feminist attempts to reinvigorate and reimage the national community as more genuinely inclusive and democratic.35

The need for intersectional analysis of migrant groups is not restricted to gender. As Avtar Brah points out, diasporic communities dispersed throughout the globe are themselves
heterogeneous (esp. 10–16). South Asians in Britain, Fiji, Trinidad, Guyana, South Africa, the Gulf States, and the United States—to name a few prominent migrant locations of the far-flung South Asian diaspora—differ greatly from one another because of their varying degrees of integration into their new homelands. Moreover, the South Asian diaspora reflects the diversity and hybridity of the subcontinent to begin with, including sharp religious, caste, linguistic, class, and regional or national differences. Sexuality can be a flash point for conflict in diasporic border, and migrant communities, often producing individual exile and rebellion against communal mores. Intermarriage, love matches (as opposed to arranged marriages), and queer sexualities often result in generational conflict, alienation, or expulsion from the community, and an uneasy relation with the new homeland. Given the role of the marriage plot, family conflict, and Bildung in the history of the novel, narratives of such intersectional issues have proliferated in diasporic, migrant, and border writing.

Memory and Desire

"Memory is a phenomenon of conceptual border zones," writes Seyhan. "It is an intersection and an interdiction. It dwells at the crossroads of the past and the present" (31). Moreover, "it is embedded in the past and will have to be retrieved in symbolic action. Memory marks a loss. It is always a re-presentation, making present that which once was and no longer is" (16). Memory—and its partner, forgetting—define the consciousness of migration, diaspora, and borders. The act of remembering—past lives, past homelands, past ways of being—is symbolic, that is, a process of meaning making that is dependent on narrative and figuration. Whether memories are silently experienced, told in oral and communal form, or written down, they exist as a form of storytelling resonant with metaphor. What has been forgotten can often return in the form of hauntings, ghostly traces of the past, longings that don't quite dare direct expression, mourning for what once was and is now lost. Memory and forgetting, as Sigmund Freud theorized, are psychodynamic processes that play out desire and the repression of desire in a symbiotic dance of creative forms (Interpretation and Repression). For the migrant, the diasporic, and the border crosser, memory is the point of transit between old and new, past and present, there and here. It is the funnel, the channel, the technology of contact. Communities in transit develop a culture of collective memory, mechanisms for passing on a heritage through the generations. Oral and written traditions—especially storytelling and literature—play a central role in articulating that collective memory and reenacting the continued existence of the community over time.

Attention to memory in migration, diaspora, and border studies foregrounds the function of desire and longing in the production and continuation of distinctive communities of people with crossroads identities and bi- or multilingual imaginations. Desire, especially as theorized in psychoanalysis, represents a state of lack—once sated, it no longer exists. Especially for migrants and diasporics, home is often the perpetual object of desire, a longing that is never fulfilled in the ambiguity of existence caught between a consciousness of roots elsewhere and the realities of routes, of life shaped by movement through different locations that are never quite home. Desire crossed by diaspora often produces nostalgia and its discontents. In her study of nostalgia and immigrant identity, Andrea Deciu Ruiuvi discusses nostalgia as a form of homesickness (nostos means "return"); ajju means "pain") that can both hinder and enable individual adaptation to a new homeland (15). She writes, "nostalgia is a genuine pathos, both medicine and poison: It can express alienation, or it can replenish and rebuff our sense of identity by consolidating the ties with our history" (39). Kumar, in contrast, stresses the illusionary constructions of nostalgic desire:

Why do we so easily replace our material past with a mythical one, pure and glorious—and then shed blood, ours and that of others, to protect that unreal, entirely illusory sense of ourselves?

After all, the India of our pasts has historically been a place of cultural mixing. This process has continued in the diaspora, where our roots have given way to routes. (Biswajay 31)

Desire in the borderlands and diaspora can also fuel hope, serve as the drive for change, opportunity, freedom, the embrace of the new—and, of course, love of all kinds. Desire is double-edged, motivating rigidity on the one hand and adaptability on the other. Like memory, desire finds its most resonant forms in acts of imagining, in the symbolic representations of culture. In "Reflections on Exile," Said points especially to the "lyrics of loss," poems in which "the pathos of exile is in the loss of contact with the solidity and the satisfaction of earth: homecoming is out of the question" (179). Rushdie notes:

Exiles or emigrants or expatriates, are haunted by some sense of loss, some urge to reclaim, to look back... But if we do look back, we must also do so in the knowledge... that we will not be capable of reclaiming precisely the thing that was lost; that we will, in short, create fictions... imaginary homelands, Indies of the mind. (Imaginary Homelands 10)

Desire in the borderlands between self and other oscillates between the dystopic and utopic, with perhaps a benign curiosity existing somewhere in the middle. Such fluctuations have inspired writing in all modes, from the lyric, narrative, and dramatic to the ironic, tragic, and comic. Desire for the other can involve the fascination for the stranger as alien, exotic, fearful, primitive, stigmatized, fetishized, and an assumed absolute difference. Such fascination often combines disgust and attraction, projecting repressed aspects of the self onto the other. As Kristeva writes in Strangers to Ourselves, "The foreigner is the other of the family, the clan, the tribe" (95). And as Sarup points out, this sense of the other's strangeness is inseparable from the idea of "strangeness within the self" (99).

For Trouillot, the other occupies the "savage slot" in a symbolic field that appropriates subjectivity and heterogeneity for the self and its tribe, not for the other. He counters this totalizing narrative of "us and all of them binary" by insisting, "There is No Other, but multitudes of others," that is others who have historically and geographically specific forms of difference, not ontological or ideological ones (39). As the "savage slot," the other can be the racial or ethnic other, but also the other by gender, sexuality, religion, class, and a host of other ways in which human beings separate themselves into distinct communities. Migrants, however, are often culturally marked as the stranger—in legal terms, aliens policed at geopolitical borders and potentially harassed by the laws of citizenship, in cultural terms, aliens whose speech, clothes, food, festivals, religion, and so forth separate them from the mainstream into which they may or may not want to assimilate. As Trinh T. Minh-ha describes in it, Woman, Native, Other, "It is as if everywhere we go, we become someone's private zoo" (82).

But desire in the borderlands can take utopic forms, the longing for mixing with others in creative interplay, stimulating fusions, and the hope for understanding across difference, for reconciliation, coexistence, or peace. The innovative playwright and actor Ani Deveare Smith crosses the borders of cultural difference by traveling to and inhabiting the other's body in performance, inhabiting the actual speech and mannerisms of different sides in the racial-ethnic conflicts of Crown Heights, Brooklyn, in 1992 and Los Angeles after the Rodney King incident. "The spirit of acting," she explains, "is the travel from the self to the other" (xxvi). Contrasting her theory of performance with the Stanislavsky method of expressing the other by thinking about the self, she writes, "To me the search for character is constantly in motion. It is a quest that moves back and forth between the self and the other" (xxvi–xxvii). In her attempt as writer and performer to break cultural divisions, Smith's utopian dramas embody what P. Mohanty advocates in his discussion of the potentially utopic epistemology of the borderlands. To cross the divide between "us" and "them," he writes, we must begin with the assumption of the subjectivity of the other.
Language, Multilingualism, and Cultural Translation

Is there a mother tongue, a single language learned in the intimacy of the family and held dear as the core signature of one's culture? Has the mother tongue been forbidden, forced into extinction or near loss? Or are there multiple mother tongues, different languages learned through exposure in a variety of settings, signaling the multilayered and interwoven complexities of community and communal identities for people in diaspora, the borderlands, or multilingual societies? How do such language options encode the history of migrations, of colonialisms past and present? As a result of the old British Empire and the new American hegemony, English has supplanted French as the global language and is now the most common second language around the world. But for many people, Spanish, French, Portuguese, Mandarin, Hindi, and Arabic are the linguistic entryways into economic and cultural literacy, no matter the attachment to mother tongue(s) or the need for English in an age of intensified globalization. Language issues are at the heart of the larger cultural translation that movement from one culture into another necessarily entails. For migrant or nomadic writers and intellectuals, the question of language is central. In what language should they write? For which audiences? How do the institutions of production, dissemination, and reception in print culture affect their linguistic choices? Whatever choice they make, geopolitical histories and realities overdetermine their decisions, making the linguistic act fraught with past histories and potentially conflicting desires.

Bilingualism and multilingualism are key markers of transit; of the refusal to assimilate completely; and of the insistence on retention of the past, other homes, and other cultural identities. Generational differences intensify the significance of language: first-generation migrants both need and resist the language of the host-

Land, and subsequent generations retain, lose, or hybridically combine the old with the new. For the Chicana writer Ana Castillo (Massacre of the Dreamers), the "poetics of self-definition" begins with language:

As mestizas, we must take a critical look at language, all our languages and patterns combinational, with the understanding that language is not something we adopt and that remains apart from us. Explicitly or implicitly, language is the vehicle by which we perceive ourselves in relation to the world.

(qtd. in Seyhan 106)

The hybridity of Spanglish, Chinglish, and other creole combinations embodies the blending of cultures that accompanies migration and life in the borderlands (on Spanglish, see Stavans).

Itineraries of multiple migrations create a linguistic hybridity of a different kind, a sort of geographic palimpsest with linguistic aftereffects created over time. Meena Alexander, for example, grew up with Hindi, Malayalam, English, French, and Arabic and is now aware in the different Englishes and Spanishes of New York City. Her family home is in Kerala, where Malayalam is the mother tongue, but she first learned Hindi because she was born in Allahabad. Growing up with North African French and then the Arabic of Khartoum, she was later educated in Britain and moved to the States. She never learned to read or write in Malayalam, although the "rhythms of the language first came to me, not just in hollowies or in the chatter of women in the kitchen . . . but in the measured cadences of oratory and poetry, and nightly recitations from the Bible and the epics" ("Alphabets" 145). For Alexander, language is supercharged, a multiplicity of places and identities.

FUTURE DIRECTIONS

Growth areas and issues for migration, diaspora, and border studies are diverse. I outline here a few of the most relevant for literary studies.

Genre and Textuality

Literary scholarship in migration, diaspora, and border studies has focused heavily on the narrative genres of travel writing, autobiography, novel, and testimony. This attention to fiction and life writing may reflect a foregrounding of culture, identity, and politics and an unexamined need for modes of writing that are more easily assimilated, especially across cultural borders, and that are more conventionally tied to the real. Poetry translates less easily than narrative fiction—both linguistically and culturally. Drama, too, relies heavily on culturally specific forms and norms for performance. Jahan Ramazani has called for more attention to postcolonial poetry; Teju Mola Olajumokan writes extensively on drama in the African diaspora; and criticism on experimental diasporic writers such as Theresa Hak Kyung Cha (author of the long poem Dictée) is now developing. This trend needs to expand, in my view, with greater attention in general to issues of textualization and form as well as less-studied genres and modes of writing.

History

The recent compensatory turn to geography and spatialized thinking has been fruitful for literary studies in general and a central feature of migration, diaspora, and border studies. However, the field's predominant focus on the twentieth and twenty-first centuries is too limiting and belies the way that any spatial location contains the palimpsestic layers of history that overdetermine the present and help shape the future. Literary studies of earlier periods is now fruitfully taking up questions of migration, travel, and intercultural contact (e.g., the Arabic, European, and African exchanges in the medieval world; travel writing in the age of European discoveries; colonialism and Romanticism). Basem Ra'id considers questions of the "legacies of Canaan and Etruria" for the history of writing and literature in later periods. Amitav Ghosh's In an Antique Land has been widely read for its combination of medieval scholarship, contemporary ethnography, and life writing in his exploration of cultural, economic, and religious traffic across the Arab Republic of Egypt, North Africa, and into Persia and India. Nabil Matar's Turks, Moors, and Englishmen in the Age of Discovery attests to the largely ignored presence of Muslims in England and its significant impact on Elizabethan literature; his In the Lands of the Christians: Arabic Travel Writing in the Seventeenth Century shows how Arabs in turn represented Europeans. John Archer's Old Worlds: Egypt, Southwest Asia, India, and Russia in Early Modern English Writing brings questions of intercultural contact into Renaissance studies, as does Whitehead's edition of Walter Raleigh's Discoverie of the Large, Rich and Beautiful Empire of Guiana, which blends ethnohistory, analysis of travel writing, and anthropological perspectives on the commons. Sarea Malsudi examines the complicity between the rise of Romanticism and Western imperialism. The expansion of this work will add vital historical depth to the understanding of globalization and to the literatures of migration, diaspora, and borders.

Comparatism, World Literature, and Institutional Issues

Migration, diaspora, and border studies—with their enhanced attention to geopolitics on a global landscape—have led to a new comparatism: one less centered on European literatures and their diffusion or on the literatures of different nation-states; one more global in scope, more interested in creative agencies outside Europe and the United States, more likely to consider transnational literatures in a single language across national boundaries, and more attuned to traveling and transplanted cultures. This new comparatism challenges center-periphery and diffusionist models that privilege the literatures and languages of the West and consign the Rest to marginality and pale imitation. It assumes different nodal centers of aesthetic production and agency around the globe and examines the effects of transnational contact zones, traveling ideas and forms, reciprocally
Some scholars welcome porous boundaries among disciplines; others resist them.
Migrations, Diasporas, and Borders

1. For a sampling of debate about globalization particularly influential in or relevant to literary studies, see Appadurai, Modernity and Globalization; Bauman, Globalization; Breckenridge, Pollock, Bhabha, and Chakrabarty; Bhabha, Frank, Friedman and Randera, Gunning, Hedgcock, Hulme, Jameson, and Miyoshi; Mudimbe-Boyel; Muller, New World Reader, Radhakrishnan, Theory; Sanderson; Wallerstein; Waters.
2. The late twentieth century has even been dubbed "the age of migration" (Carles and Miller).
3. Contemporary debates about the nature and politics of cosmopolitanism are a significant part of migration, diaspora, and border studies. For a sampling, see Appiah, Cosmopolitanism; Archibugi, Bernard; Breckenridge, Pollock, Bhabha, and Chakrabarty; Brennan; Cheah and Robbins, Clifford, Routes 17–47 and Predicament; Dhurandhar; Kaplan, esp. 101–42, Nussbaum; Vertovec and Cohen, Conceiving; Wallerstein.
4. Intellectual diasporas and exiles are particularly likely to articulate such multifaceted belongings. See for example Alexander, "Alphabetas"; Appiah, In My Father's House; Bhabha, Location; Braidotti, Chambers, Border Dialogues and Migrancy; Ghosh, Fuentes, Givens; Issel; Kamrani; Passport Photos; U. Narayan; Radhakrishnan, Diasporic Mediations; Rusthie, Imaginary Homelands; Said, "Reflections"; Sarup.
5. Initiated by Gilles Deleuze and Felix Guattari in the 1970s, "rhizomatic" (Thousand Plateaus), the concept of decentralization and its related notion of nomadism have gained great currency in literary studies, with widely divergent meanings and debates centered particularly on how much to link this concept to geo-political conditions. See for example Braidotti; JanMohamed and Lloyd; Kaplan, esp. 65–100; Lumiére and Schurrman.
6. Paula Gann Allen wrote the volume's essay on border studies and focused particularly on women of color as writers and critics in the United States. The border she explored was more than just geopolitical as she called for more attention to the intersections of gender and color in the writing of women ("Border Studies"). See the recent collection of her own border essays in Off the Reservation.
7. Postcolonial studies on British and anglophone literatures and cultures are too vast to properly reference here, but for some influential texts and useful collections, see Said, Orientalism and Culture; Spivak, In Other Worlds; Ar_crefti, Griffis, and Tifflin; Chambers and Gilroy; Gidney; Gilmore, Maps and Writing; McClintock; Olaniran; Radhakrishnan, Diasporic Mediations and Theory; Ramazani; Williams and Chrisman.
8. There is a fascinating literature on the new transnational emphasis in American literature and cultural studies. See L. Baer, Dimock, "Literature and Shadows"; Edward; Grewal; Jay, "Beyond Discipline?"; Kadir; Kaplan and Pease; Madsen; Pease and Wiegman, Rowe, New American Studies and Postnational American Studies; Saltvold, Dialectics; Spillers, Comparative American Identities; Walters.
9. See Gilroy, Fall, "New Ethniches"; M. Jacobson, Sollors, Invention; Olaniyan; and note 13.
10. The terms identity and subject are not identical, coming as they do out of different philosophical, political, and national traditions. In using identity, I do not align myself with essentialist identity politics; presume a self that exists outside language; or assume an unchanging collective identity of groups by race, gender, nation, and so on. Nor do I accept a view often associated with postcolonialism that the subject is fully determined by preexisting discursive regimes. I use identity in the context of a cultural constructivism that assumes a dialectical relationship between determinism and agency as part of a historical process existing in specific locations. See Friedman, Mapping, esp. 1–104; Alcoff, Hames-Garcia, Molyan, and Moya.
11. A few exceptions include Rosemary Marangoly George's "Traveling Light," which identifies immigrant literature as a genre characterized by narrative repetition and tells of one woman's life (a fascinating and unusual failure of a narrative novel), and a link with colonialism. William Q. Boelhower's "The Immigrant Novel as Genre" is a structuralist analysis of immigrant narrative patterns with examples drawn from United States literature. His surprising failure to include anything of interest from the Spanish-speaking colonies similarly draws only on the United States example, but Ferraro presents a useful genealogy of literary criticism on migration narratives and argues against the common marginalization of migration literature from the Americas, such as Appadurai, Modernity, Brah; Grewal; Kaplan, Rowan, Pollock, U. Narayan, Needham; Radhakrishnan, Diasporic Mediations and Theory; Shulski; Tambiah. The term diaspora is also increasingly being used in relation to Chinese outside of the mainland of China, people who have been known as overseas Chinese for centuries. See Anderson and Lee; Chow, Chuk and Shimakawa; Lowy; Ty and Goellnicht; and Cohen's discussion of the overseas Chinese as a "trade diaspora" (83–104). Breeze and Masoun's collection includes many of the most significant contemporary theoretical essays on diaspora. Their introduction and that of the anthropologist Livio and Swenson in their Displacement, Diaspora, and Geographies of Identity are particularly interesting. See for recent discussions of Jewish and Israeli diasporic literature see Brenner; Shriver; Weber.
12. For recent discussions of black diasporan literature, film, and culture in the Americas, see Edwards; Foster; Gilroy; Spillers, "Introduction"; Walters.

See Friedman, "Bodies." For other blends of autobiography and diasporic theory, see Bhabha, "Frontlines" and Location; Chow; Davies; Chen; Frankenberg and Muri, Kannan, Away, Passport Photos, and Feuer, U. Narayan; Radhakrishnan, Diasporic Mediations and Theory; Sarup; Said, "Reflections"; Seyhan; and Spivak, Post-colonial Criticism. Said's "Reflections on Exile" and Rusthie's "Imaginary Homelands" predote the use of the term diaspora in cultural theory, but have been influential autobiographical theory in diaspora studies.
14. Prant introduced the term "contact zone," which she defines in Imperial Eyes as "spaces where disparate cultures meet, clash, and grapple with each other, often in highly asymmetrical relations of domination and subordination—like colonial slavery, or their afterlives as they are lived out across the globe today." (4).
15. See Sullybrass and White on transgression of high and low borders; JanMohamed on the particular "homelessness-as-home" of border intellectuals; Welchman's Rehearsing Borders, which extends border theory in multimedia, interdisciplinary, and theoretical ways; Thrift's "An Acoustic Journey," for the move from relative to absolute locations of diaspora; for a critique of the ease of empirical scholariship in border theory and literature, see the sociologist Pablo Villa's Ethnography at the Border, esp. 306–41; see also "Theories and Methodologies—Anzaldua," devoted to Anzaldua's work and legacy; Friedman, Mappes, 93–101. The poems, critical writings, and carnivalesque performance of Guillermo Gomez-Peau have also been influential in both Mexico and the United States (e.g., The New Border). See Fregosi for discussions of Chicanas and "mexicanas" in the production of American and Mexican border culture in film, literature, and popular culture.
16. See also Polkinhorn, Di-Bella, and Reyes, Jay's overview of border studies, "Myp," For an acknowledgment of the formative influence of the American Southwest on border theory and an insistence that border theory move beyond its regional origins, see Michaelsen and Johnson; Welchman.
17. Geographic borders under examination in border studies are not always contiguous. The supposed "civilizational divide" between East and West has led to work particularly in comparative literature examining the cultural exchanges and fruitful juxtapositions of European literary and aesthetic cultures; for example for Hayoni, Savoy, Great Walls and Problems; L. Zhang, Y. Zhang.
18. See also Chambers, Border Dialogues; Thrift, "Acoustic Journey." For discussions of border issues, cultural politics, and narrative, see Egan; Fregosi; Friedman, Mappes, 132–78; Izzo and Spadori; Sullybrass and White.
30. In "The Many Faces of Cosmo-polis," Mignolo links border thinking to "critical cosmopolitanism" and sees colonial modernities as distinct from Enlightenment modernity. See also his Darker Side of the Renaissance.

31. Bhabha uses the rhetoric of borders to discuss the breakdown of minority identities based on a single identity category and the development of intersectional analysis of the multiple constituents of identity ("Frontlines"). For border rhetoric and feminism, see Spyer.

32. For other influential discussions of culture as concept, see Bourdieu; Certeau; Rosaldo; Hall, "Cultural Identity"; Hannerz, esp. 3–39; Manzoor; Stallybrass and Watt; Spyer.

33. See Abu-Lughod, Nee, and Zangwil's passionate defense of "melting-pot" America as a national identity built on diversity in his Afterword to The 1914 edition of The Melting-Pot; Fairchild's attack of Zangwil and Anglophone racism for assimilation in The Melting-Pot Mustach, the attempt to resurrect the original meaning of the trope in Jacob's Reinventing the Melting Pot; Schreibersdorff; and Wilson on this early-twentieth-century debate.

34. The Cuban sociologist Fernando Orizo coined the term transcendentalism in the 1940s (Oriz 1989). See Rosaldo's broader definition of transculturation as the "creative processes" of "improvisation" in the borderlands (215–16).

35. For overviews of debate about cultural hybridity, see, Fried} and Oms (1999); Oms (2001); Oms (2002); and Oms (2003).

36. For an example, Friedman, "Feminism," "Locational Feminism," and "Mappings"; Grewal and Kaplan; Kaplan, Alarcón, and Moseley; Layton; U Narayan; Yuril Davis.

37. See in particular Said, "Reflections; Rushdie, Imaginary Homelands; Alexander, "Alphabet"; and Seyhan, esp. 33–84.

38. On global English, see Mair: for hybrid Englishes, see Crenshaw. For the relation of current globalization and language, see especially Aruga.

39. See Lowe 128–33; Kim and Alarcón; and Friedman, "Modernism."

40. See also Fuchs; Kadi; Mignolo, Darfur Side and Local Histories; Valses, Prayer and Three Tanka Plays; Singh, and Hulme. Said's Orientalism is an important precursor to this trend; see also his Culture and Imperialism. For historians of early inter-cultural contact, see especially J. Abu-Lughod; Frank, Sassen, and Trinder.

41. For critiques of Eurocentricism in comparative literature, see Lescar; Lionnet and Shih; Spivak; Death; Saxton, Comparative Literature.

42. See esp. Saxton, Comparative Literature for debates about the new comparison and methodological implications. For the impact of current globalization on institutional structures in the academy, see Jay, "Beyond Discipline?"

43. For examples of this new debate on world literature, see Apter; Basnett; Casariva; Daimo; "Dimock, "Literature"; Lissandri and Shih; Moseley, "Theories and Methodologies: Comparative Literature"; Saxton, Comparative Literature; Spivak, Death.

44. L. Zhang, Y. Zhang.
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