

Published in Rodica Mihăilă and Irina Grigorescu Pana, eds., *Transatlantic Connections: Essays in Cultural Relocation* (Bucharest: Editura Integral, 2000), 13–25.

Cultural Translation and the Discourse of Transnationalism in American Studies

RODICA MIHĂILĂ

On the threshold of a new millennium, the redefinition of America in the post–Cold War, globalized and computerized world of this last decade has increasingly been done at the level of a transnational system grounded in the new permeability of borders and in the seemingly declining power of the nation-state.

Reflecting the growing consciousness of globalization especially after the collapse of communism, transnationalism marks a new orientation in American Studies scholarship, which places cultural analysis and identity making in a global context. Yet, given its mobility and apparent resistance to theory, American Studies hasn't fully and systematically explored this new orientation. Many eyes are already scrutinizing the horizon of the post-national, post-ethnic and cosmopolitan world of the future, but, as the revival of nationalism in ex-communist countries has recently demonstrated, nation-state is not likely to demise soon. This makes transnationalism an extremely challenging area of investigation.

My inquiry into the discourse of transnationalism in American Studies attempts to identify a transnational paradigm in the evolution of the field over the past decade and to posit transnationalism as a model of cultural analysis to be successfully applied to the investigation of “transatlantic connections.” The transnational paradigm may prove particularly relevant when transatlantic connections involve the post-communist Other, generally neglected by the US American Studies theorists.

The discourse of transnationalism, which has marked the new orientation of American Studies scholarship in the 1990s, emerged in American intellectual history in relation with issues of national identity raised by World War I and the outburst of nativism and European nationalism associated with it. Among them, definitions of the

nation state as a heterogeneous nationally “imagined community” vs. growing ethnic nationalism, and the idea of nationalism as opposed to that of internationalism.¹ The growing pressure to “Americanize” the immigrants from East and Southern Europe resuscitated the melting-pot metaphor of a homogeneous culture just as it drew renewed attention to the idea of diversity contained in the national motto “E Pluribus Unum.” As early as 1915, acknowledging the right of the immigrants to resist forced assimilation and to preserve the autonomy of their ethno-racial communities, the philosopher Horace Kallen formulated the liberal doctrine of cultural pluralism. According to this doctrine, the United States is a “federation” of ethno-racial groups, distinguished mainly through their different cultures.²

In a path-breaking essay suggestively entitled “Trans-national America,” echoing Kallen’s revolutionary appreciation of the positive effect of the ethno-racial cultures of the immigrants on the continuing modeling of national identity, Randolph Bourne acclaims the “cosmopolitan character” of the country, and sees it as the supreme expression of diversity in a democratic society.³ He argues that in the wake of World War I, the new ethnic nationalisms of the European immigrants who resisted acculturation demonstrated the failure of the “melting pot” cultural theory while highlighting the new transnational focus on the concept of nationalism in its relation to internationalism. His use of the term “trans-national,” limited as it was only to European immigration, provided nevertheless an efficient category of social and cultural analysis. It was capable to reveal the impact of European immigration on American society, to explain the new ethnic nationalisms as the combined effect of transnationalism and internationalism, and to reaffirm the solidity of the democratic principles allowing for the gradual transformation of America into the first cosmopolitan, international nation.

Bourne saw America as “the intellectual background” of a worldwide struggle over the hegemonic nature and prerogatives of the modern European State.⁴ Transnationalism for him then describes the process by which an imagined America would ideally provide a national political framework for a culture of international identities. But since, in his opinion, only (European) immigrants who come from unitary nation-states have the capacity to imagine a new transnational community, colonial immigrants are implicitly excluded from the process.

The term “transnational” has returned into the limelight in the 1990s under the impact of the communication revolution and in close relation with the immense interest in globalization as a new kind of phenomenon that has already started to radically change our world. Widely used by various disciplines, it has acquired various new meanings.

Reflecting the major transformations in the new global system, political science for instance, defines the “transnational” in contradistinction to the “international.” While the term “international” applies to relations among states, governmental agents and intergovernmental organizations, “transnational” relations

designate a “layering of inter-state relations with networks or systems relationships between individuals and collectivities that transcend or subvert state boundaries.”⁵ Political science is concerned mainly with the effects of the transnational on international relations and the nation-state while the chief focus of sociology is on the making of “transnational identities” across international borders and the way in which they act upon the mechanisms of social relations. The humanities, in their turn, stress the idea of “border” and use the term “transnational” in a much broader sense “to signal the fluidity with which ideas, objects, capital, and people now move across borders and boundaries.”⁶

In American Studies the emergence of transnationalism as a category of cultural analysis became evident in the mid-1990s, in contexts that brought together social sciences and literary and cultural studies. One of the landmarks was the 1996 ASA Conference entitled “Global Migration, American Cultures and the State,” which called for papers to address the “historical and contemporary significance of transnational and intranational migrations for American society [and its] forms of expressive, material, and popular culture.”⁷

With an intense consciousness of the need to redefine changing American identities, American Studies has drawn on both social sciences and the humanities to develop an approach aimed to destabilize the essentialist relation between identity, culture, geography and nation-state. Such an approach highlights the transnational character of identity-formation across international boundaries and the hybridity of cultural value as a result of permeability of borders and cultural translation through spatial displacement. Growing in opposition to the Cold War holistic discourse of American universalism, the discourse of transnationalism has developed in contexts dealing with the postmodern fluidity of borders and boundaries and revolves around such notions as “hybridity, hyperspace, displacement, disjuncture, decentering, and diaspora” (Basch, Schiller, Bland 27).

The rapid ascendancy of transnationalism as an American Studies paradigm has been mainly the work of cultural studies focused on globalization, border matters and cultures of imperialism. Partly under the influence of British cultural studies and their postcolonial concern with issues of identity, nation-state and common culture, the paradigm has been developed within a theoretical and methodological framework that puts in conjunction globalization and postcolonial theories.

My attempt to trace the contours of this framework starts from globalization, for it represents the main conceptual grounding of transnationalism. From a socio-cultural perspective, globalization is “the process whereby individual lives and local communities are affected by economic and cultural forces that operate world-wide.”⁸ Moreover, it is *the* concept of the 1990s—a “key idea by which we understand the transition of human society into the third millennium,” as Waters describes its significance (1).

From the numerous definitions of globalization I have chosen one given by Frederick Buell, which foregrounds the sociocultural dimension of the process. For Buell “globalization focuses on the ways in which nonlocal factors interact with local ones in producing sociocultural identities and forms.”⁹ Globalization is then a process that establishes a new relation between the local and the global (nonlocal) represented by the economic and cultural forces operating on a global scale. In Roland Robertson’s classical definition, it is the “two-fold process of the particularization of the universal and the universalization of the particular.”¹⁰

The discourse of globalization takes, in Buell’s opinion, two extreme forms depending on the emphasis in the definition of globalization on either economic or social processes (“Nationalist” 549). One version focuses on transnational capitalism and global economy and views globalization as a “new stage in the narrative of capital” (549), an expression of what Fredric Jameson called “late capitalism.”¹¹ The other focuses on “peoplehood and imagined communities, from diasporas to civilizations” and views globalization as an “interactive,” “sociologically-based,” “communicative” process that calls for a continuous redrawing of borders, and the “creation of a heterogeneous transnational public sphere globally” (550).

In the first case, globalization acts negatively, as a “single, though heterogenizing power system tightening its grip on the world’s remotest localities and enclaves” (550). It encourages transnationalization in the sense that it is “accompanied by postmodern hyperdevelopment . . . which means commodification of all areas of experience, and the development of a new kind of global postmodern consumer culture of flexibly produced, heterogeneous, customized simulations” (549). In the second case, globalization “extends the discourses of nationalism, postcolonialism, and internationalism into a different kind of transnationalism, one that privileges new transnational communications networks as key mechanisms” (550). It, therefore, acts as a “complex system becoming still more decentered and interactive” (550).

Extrapolated from Buell’s scheme, the discourse of transnationalism appears to reproduce the two extreme views on the relation between the local and the global that inform the two main streams of globalization theory.

My discussion of the first type of transnational discourse will be based on Fredric Jameson’s influential book *Postmodernism, or, the Cultural Logic of Late Capitalism* (1990) and on *The Cultures of Globalization* (1998), a book he edited with Masao Miyoshi. As for the second type of discourse, my inquiry will focus on the reconsideration of globalization and transnationalism from a postcolonial perspective—particularly, with reference to the theoretical contribution of Homi Bhabha’s *Location of Culture* and the redefinition of America in *Cultures of United States Imperialism* (1994) edited by Amy Kaplan and Donald E. Pease. As I hope to demonstrate, the two approaches to the idea of transnationalism have more than one point in common.

The first type of discourse grows around the idea of a transnational system built on the structure of transnational corporatism (TNC), which, as Miyoshi argues, represents capitalism going transnational, the “continuation of exploitation and colonialism domestic and overseas” and a “process of decomposing the state; and along with it, of economicization of culture.”¹² Jameson relates it to what he calls “late,” multinational or consumer capitalism, which produces transnationalization and, as he explains in *Postmodernism*, the “penetration and colonization” of “hitherto uncommodified areas” such as Nature and the Unconscious (36). The commodification of Nature is marked by “the destruction of precapitalist Third World agriculture by the Green Revolution,” and that of the Unconscious, by the “rise of the media and the advertising industry,” which transforms the real world into mere simulacra (36). Jameson associates the “cultural dominant” (6) of multinational or late capitalism with Postmodernism. As a new culture of “depthlessness,” of “the image” and “the simulacrum” (6), Postmodernism represents, in his definition, the final penetration of the commodity form into culture at the local as well as the transnational, global level. Addressing the relationship between global postmodern culture and the transnational system that supports it, Jameson argues that the United States dominates both: “. . . this whole global, yet American postmodern culture is the internal and superstructural expression of a whole new wave of American military and economic domination throughout the world” (5).

The critique of globalization as a new power system identified “philosophically” as Eurocentric and “economically” as an “essentially American worldwide capitalism” (xv) is further articulated in *Cultures of Globalization*. Investigating the worldwide cultural changes under the impact of globalization, Jameson introduces here a third perspective, that of the nation-state, to emphasize the negative effects that the transnational system has on the local and the regional. As globalization liberates local culture from the constraints of the nation-state, the latter falls under the threat of transnational domination and standardization. Jameson concludes:

[I]t is no longer the bureaucratic state apparatus that restricts the burgeoning of local cultures and local political freedoms, but rather the transnational system itself that menaces national autonomy, and that on all levels: socially, by way of . . . “culture-ideology of consumerism”; culturally, by way of American mass culture; politically, by the emergence of a world policing system; and economically, through the demands of IMF and the structural requirements of the “free market.” (xiv–xv)

Paradoxically, under such circumstances, transnational domination may also produce positive effects on the revival of an “oppositional” national cultural project

and the redefinition of national identity, especially in the case of postcolonial, Third World countries. The postcommunist countries find themselves in a more or less similar situation, which makes them interesting case studies. Nevertheless, their experience has been totally ignored by the contributors to this challenging study of the cultural effects of globalization. Acknowledging the complexity of the phenomenon, Jameson describes globalization as a “space of tension” in need of being explored and theorized. As he puts it: “its theorization necessarily uniting the social and the cultural sciences, as well as theory and practice, the local and the global, the West and its Others, but also postmodernity and its predecessors and alternatives, will constitute the horizon of all theory in the years ahead” (xvi). In this respect, a discussion of the transatlantic connections from the perspective of transnationalism will necessarily reveal the significance of the missing postcommunist Other.¹³

An important transformation occurred in the discourse of transnationalism under the impact of postcolonial theory, when the transnational started to be viewed from the position of the postcolonial. In other words, when in the definition of globalization, a fourth, postcolonial, perspective was added to the other three already mentioned—the transnational system, the local and the regional and the nation-state.

In his contribution to *Redrawing the Boundaries: The Transformation of English and American Literary Studies* (1992) edited by Stephen Greenblatt and Giles Gunn, which he included two years later in his book *The Location of Culture*, Homi Bhabha explains the advantages of such a perspective grounded in the colonial experience of the Third World and in minority discourses of cultural difference and marginality. The postcolonial perspective deconstructs the nationalist discourse that places the Third and the First Worlds in a relation of binary opposition, destabilizes, negotiates and redraws boundaries and borders, revises the concept of culture and replaces the idea of the purity of First World cultures with that of the hybridity of all cultural value.

From the positions of the postcolonial hybrid “culture of survival,” Bhabha interrogates the “ordered *musee imaginaire*” of national cultures as pretended custodians of the purity and continuity of traditions and values (*Redrawing* 438) in order to demonstrate the “hybrid location” of all cultures in the globalization age.¹⁴ In doing so, he identifies this location at the intersection of the transnational and the translational.

The transnational manifests itself in “specific histories of cultural displacement, whether they are the ‘middle passage’ of slavery and indenture, the ‘voyage out’ of the civilizing mission, the fraught accommodation of Third World migration to the West after the Second World War, or the traffic of economic and political refugees within and outside the Third World” (438). *The translational* describes the complex process of cultural signification produced under the impact of such displacements, migrations, relocations and diasporas and the unprecedented

development of transnational communications and media systems—from mechanical to electronic ones.

Bhabha's postcolonial model of cultural signification can be easily applied to First World cultures, particularly to American culture, which has steadily been losing its purity and acculturational (melting pot) powers in the interaction between center and periphery, the local and the global, the transnational and the translational. The advantage of the postcolonial model over the multicultural one resides precisely in the transnational-translational dimension of the former. Multiculturalism tends either to reinforce ethnic separatism or to exacerbate indiscriminate pluralism, isolating America within the confines of a center-margin power system. The postcolonial, transnational model fluidizes borders, places America in a global context and views it as a "node in transnational circuits."¹⁵

As Bhabha was among the first to recognize, and American radical multiculturalists have long advocated, "The time for 'assimilating' minorities and organic notions of cultural value has dramatically passed. The very language of cultural community needs to be rethought from a postcolonial perspective. . . ." (*Redrawing* 441). Such a perspective, which involves the transnational and the translational, revises the relation of binary opposition not only between the First and the Third Worlds, but also between center and periphery. It, therefore, systematically subverts holistic definitions and nationalistic syntheses as it problematizes boundaries (439). In doing so, "it makes you aware of the construction of culture and the invention of tradition," which, as Bhabha argues, is "the great advantage of this position" (438).

One year later, Paul Gilroy's influential book, *The Black Atlantic: Modernity and Double Consciousness* (1993), demonstrates again how effective such an approach may be, particularly when applied to the transatlantic connection. The book explores the construction of a "black Atlantic tradition" within a transatlantic cultural circuit including the Caribbean, the United States and the United Kingdom and demonstrates that the so-called "purity" of any race or/and culture is always an illusion. Taking America as an example of alterity, he argues in favor of the heterogeneity of culture and relates the process of culture-formation to "the persistent crisscrossing of national boundaries" and the modern communication and transportation technologies.¹⁶

In a study of the "cultural dimension of Globalization," which examines "how locality emerges in a globalized world" and "how global facts take local form," Arjun Appadurai is of a similar opinion. He views locality "as primarily relational and contextual rather than as scalar or spatial," the factors that affect its production at present being the nation-state, the diasporic flows and the electronic and virtual communities.¹⁷

Applying the transnational grid to cultural practices and their relation to power, cultural studies have paid increased attention not only to cultural homogeneity (the "standardizing" effect of transnationalism described by Jameson)

but also, and even more so, to the dialectic between the local and the global which produces cultural heterogeneity.

Stuart Hall finds in American culture and in America's "capacity to live with difference"¹⁸ the best illustration of "a continuous dialectic between the local and the global," between the insular and the transnational. In America's case, transnationalism provides a particularly relevant instrument of cultural analysis for, as Hall observes, the new kind of globalization through transnational communications networks, including the Internet, is US-dominated, American hardware and programming have already colonized the cyberspace and American English has become the *lingua franca* of globalization.¹⁹

The reconceptualization of America in the past decade has been done from such a perspective chiefly within the framework of the postcolonial discourse. The turning point was notably marked by the publication of *Cultures of United States Imperialism*, a major attempt to relate the study of American cultures to that of Western imperialism, the history of empire and the postcolonial critique of imperialism. Addressing these absences in the study of American cultures, the authors focus on "the multiple histories of continental and overseas expansion, conquest, conflict, and resistance, which have shaped the cultures of the United States and the cultures of those it has dominated within and beyond its geopolitical boundaries."²⁰ In her seminal essay "Left Alone with America': The Absence of Empire in the Study of American Culture," Amy Kaplan argues that the postcolonial/imperial perspective casts an altogether new light on US culture, revealing as the most significant moments in its formation the "European colonization, slavery, westward expansion, overseas intervention, and cold war nuclear power" (4). The great advantage of this perspective is that it rearticulates the multicultural critique of American Eurocentrism by relating hierarchical power relations at home with imperialism and exceptionalism abroad or, in her own words, "by relating those internal categories of gender, race, and ethnicity to the global dynamics of empire-building." Describing the major objective of the project Kaplan writes:

Cultures of United States Imperialism explores how such diverse identities cohere, fragment, and change in relation to one another and to ideologies of nationhood through the crucible of international power relations, and how, conversely, imperialism as a political or economic process abroad is inseparable from the social relations and cultural discourses of race, gender, ethnicity, and class at home. . . . Foregrounding imperialism in the study of American cultures shows how putatively domestic conflicts are not simply contained at home but how they both emerge in response to international struggles and spill over national boundaries to be reenacted, challenged, or transformed. (16)

For all its revisionism, *Cultures of United States Imperialism* remains enmeshed in the Cold-War ideology of a world controlled by two opposed power systems and of an America containing its differences within the myth of its exceptionalism. The postcolonial/imperial perspective provides an inner-directed oppositional critique of a society divided, above all, by differences of race and gender and, to a lesser extent, of sexual orientation. Such concepts as “globalization” and “transnationalism” are not even mentioned, though the concern with borders and the assertion of the hybridity and heterogeneity of US cultures and identity-formation point to that direction. The global-and the local are reduced to the foreign and the domestic, where the foreign is in its turn limited to the Third, ex-colonial World, for the obvious reason that the latter can make a better case for the multicultural critique of Eurocentrism. This also explains, in my opinion, the absence of the Post-communist space from the discussion.

The rise of the transnational paradigm in the new American Studies of the mid- 1990s has been predicated on the counter-distinction between the idea of “the Frontier,” and that of “the border.” The “frontier,” a central concept in the holistic, exceptionalist Old American Studies, designated a limit, an imaginary line located in the New World, which marked the expansion of the Old World’s civilizing mission. A one-way, onward movement—the pushing of the frontier, defined its dynamics. The new American Studies gradually replaced the concept of the frontier with that of the border as a place of in-betweenness, hybridity, negotiation, crisscrossing and transgression. Where the idea of the frontier was essential for the Cold War period of American Studies, the border marks its multicultural stage setting the grounds for the new paradigms of the globalization age, of which transnationalism is an early one.

The emergence of the postcolonial/imperial perspective in American Studies in the early nineties, took place within the frame of a multicultural model that emphasized racial, ethnic and gender difference and division along center-margin power lines, located ethno-racial identities on the margins, ignored globalization and conceptualized borders as bounding, separating lines. In recent years, the critique of this model has been marked by the rise of border studies on the one hand and of cosmopolitan and postethnic theories on the other. In order to abolish the divisions that such a model overemphasized, David Hollinger, for instance, developed a “postethnic” theory of voluntary ethno-racial affiliation, which aims to “promote solidarities of wide scope that incorporate people with different ethnic and racial backgrounds.”²¹ Fixed identities assigned to people within the confines of the ethno-racial enclaves will be eventually replaced by flexible identities, acquired through “affiliation” with an ethno-racial community of one’s own choice. Nevertheless, lacking the transnational dimension, his theory falls short of incorporating a cosmopolitan perspective.

In its need to decentralize the multicultural model and retheorize the field for the globalization age, the American Studies avant-garde mainstreamed the border

discourse and operated a shift in the idea of border from a site of confrontation, conflict and separation to one of negotiation, transgression, hybridity, shifting subjectivities and multiple identities, as in the borderland studies of Gloria Anzaldúa and José Saldívar.

Shaped by the culture battles over the re-negotiation of American identity, the border discourse has manifested a marked trans-national tendency. As American Studies tended to expand its scope from a parochial multicultural model emphasizing the color divide to a much more comprehensive view of society and culture seen in a wide international context, it developed a transnational paradigm that could include the postcolonial, the cosmopolitan and the global as well as the postnational and the post-ethnic of the next millennium.²² The location of the new American Studies in the past decade has been on the Janus-faced border of multiplicity, which implies being simultaneously in the local and the global while critical of both.

In Janice Radway's opinion, this re-positioning has been done at "the intersection between American Studies' alternative traditions produced by earlier critiques of external and internal forms of U.S. imperialism and certain strains in critical race theory, Black Atlantic studies, women's studies, postcolonial theory, subaltern studies, and trans-national feminist and queer studies."²³ Radway considers that the main "potentially transformative" force in the field has been the new American Studies' "turn to the question of American imperialism" at home and abroad (7). On the one hand, the "imperial turn" (11) foregrounds a relational view of American national identity as constructed "in and through" imperial relations of subordination and oppression; on the other, it destabilizes and reconsiders the relationship among "geography, culture and identity" (8). In the new critique of America, locality, as Appadurai described it, is no longer "scalar and spatial" but "relational and contextual" and identity, as Radway contends, is no longer dependent on "essentialized notions of culture and geography" (16).

In his attempt to use the postcolonial "for retheorizing American Studies in an age of globalization," George Lipsitz also believes that "one of the most important aspects of the current moment for American Studies [is] a radical disturbance in the links between culture and place."²⁴ Informed by the postmodern consciousness of globality, otherness and fluidity of borders, this dislocation of the link between identity, culture and geography reflected in the trans-national paradigm has generated a new orientation in American Studies, which, in Gayatri Spivak's opinion, will free the field from "parochial multicultural debates," and place it within an international context.²⁵

The new orientation in American Studies has been confirmed by the recent founding of the International American Studies Association (IASA), which brought together scholars from eleven national associations around the world. In their inaugural statement, the founding members declared themselves "committed to the study of America—regionally, hemispherically, nationally, and transnationally." One of them, Werner Sollors, describes the association as an international forum for

“Americanists sans frontieres” and explains its founding as a need “to create a new post-Cold War atmosphere of international cooperation on a global scale.”²⁶

Depending on the position of the viewer, the transnational perspective discloses two extreme aspects of American culture and society. At one end, America is viewed as being shaped by the global system—by displacements, migrations, dislocations, diasporas and borderlands. At the other, it exists only in the collective imaginary—it is invented, constructed, turned into virtual reality.

Paul Giles rightly observes that “America is valuable not for what it might be in itself, but for the interference it creates in others” (“Virtual Americas” 544–545). Accordingly, he points out that American Studies must increasingly “involve analysis of how the US interfaces with other world cultures” (545). Acknowledging the difficulty of defining American Studies as area studies without falling into the traps of nationalism or essentialism, he posits American Studies in a transnational, global perspective, viewing it as “a virtual discipline, a means of disrupting the self-enclosing boundaries of other areas, whether academic disciplines or geographic territories, by its projections of dislocation and difference” (545).

It is as such that America may still serve as a model space of stimulating alterity for countries like the post-communist ones that are searching for ways to build new democratic societies. And it is in this spirit that the transnational paradigm can be best applied to the investigation of transatlantic connections.

Notes

¹ See the use of the term “imagined community” in Benedict Anderson, *Imagined Communities*, rev. edition. (London: Verso, 1996).

² Kallen published his first articles on cultural pluralism in *Nation*, in 1915, but he developed his thesis only a decade later, in *Culture and Democracy in the United States* (1924).

³ Randolph Bourne, “Trans-national America,” in *Randolph Bourne: The Radical Will: Selected Writings 1911-1918* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1992), 248–65.

⁴ *Ibid*, 258.

⁵ Malcom Waters, *Globalization* (London and New York: Routledge, 1995), 27.

⁶ Linda Basch, Nina Glick Schiller, and Cristina Szanton Bland, *Nations Unbound: Transnational Projects, Postcolonial Predicaments and Deterritorialized Nation-States* (Amsterdam, 1994), 27.

- ⁷ Michelle A. Stephens, "Black Transnationalism and the Politics of National Identity: West Indian Intellectuals in Harlem in the Age of War and Revolution," *American Quarterly*, 50, 3 (September 1998), 592.
- ⁸ Bill Ashcroft, Gareth Griffiths and Helen Tiffin, *Key Concepts in Post-Colonial Studies* (London and New York: Routledge, 1998), 110.
- ⁹ Frederick Buell, "Nationalist Postnationalism: Globalist Discourse in Contemporary American Culture," *American Quarterly*, 50, 3 (September 1998): 548–549.
- ¹⁰ Roland Robertson, *Globalization. Social Theory and Global Culture* (London, New Delhi: Sage Publications, 1992), 177–178.
- ¹¹ See Fredric Jameson, *Postmodernism: Or, the Cultural Logic of Late Capitalism* (Durham: Duke UP, 1991).
- ¹² Masao Miyoshi, "'Globalization,' Culture and the University" in *Cultures of Globalization*, ed. Fredric Jameson and Masao Miyoshi (London and Durham: Duke University Press, 1998), 258, 259.
- ¹³ See Rodica Mihaila, "Crossing Borders/Exploring Boundaries: American Studies and the Postcommunist Other" Paper read at the ASA Conference, Montreal 1999.
- ¹⁴ Homi Bhabha, "Postcolonial Criticism," in *Redrawing the Boundaries. The Transformation of English and American Literary Studies*. Ed. by Stephen Greenblatt and Giles Gunn (New York: MLA, 1992), 438.
- ¹⁵ Frederick Buell, "National Postnationalism": 562. Buell uses this description of the position that the United States holds in today's world, with reference to Arjun Appadurai's essay "Patriotism and Its Futures," *Public Culture* 2 (1993): 411–430.
- ¹⁶ Paul Gilroy, *The Black Atlantic: Modernity and Double Consciousness* (London: Verso, 1993), 34–35.
- ¹⁷ Arjun Appadurai, *Modernity at Large. Cultural Dimension of Globalization* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1996), 18, 178.
- ¹⁸ Stuart Hall, "Culture, Community, Nation," *Cultural Studies* 7 (Oct.1993): 360.
- ¹⁹ See Stuart Hall, "Old and New Identities, Old and New Ethnicities" and "The Local and the Global: Globalization and Ethnicity," in *Culture, Globalization and the World-System: Contemporary Conditions for the Representation of Identity*, ed. Anthony D. King (London: McMillan, 1991).
- ²⁰ Amy Kaplan, "Left Alone With America," in *Cultures of United States Imperialism*. Ed. by Amy Kaplan and Donald E. Pease (Durham and London: Duke University Press, 1993), 4.
- ²¹ David A. Hollinger, *Postethnic America. Beyond Multiculturalism* (New York: Basic Books, 1995), p.3.

²² For a discussion on the trans-national dimension in American Studies see, for instance, Paul Giles, "Reconstructing American Studies. Transnational Paradoxes, Comparative Perspectives," *Journal of American Studies*, 28, 3 (1994), and "Virtual Americas: The Internationalization of American Studies and the Ideology of Exchange," *American Quarterly*, 50, 3 (September 1998); Buell, *National Culture and the New Global System* (Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1994) and "National Postnationalism"; David Hollinger, *Postethnic America*; Doris Friedensohn, "Towards a Post-Imperial, Transnational American Studies: Notes of a Frequent Flier," *American Studies*, 38, 2 (Summer, 1997) and *American Studies International*, XXXVI, 1 (February 1998); Michelle A. Stephens, "Black Transnationalism"; Daniel Mato, "On the Making of Transnational Identities in the Age of Globalization: The US Latina/o - 'Latin' American Case," *Cultural Studies*, 12, 4 (October 1998).

²³ Janice Radway, "'What's in a Name?' Presidential Address to the American Studies Association, November 20, 1998," *American Quarterly* 51, 1 (March 1999): 7.

²⁴ George Lipsitz, "'Sent For You Yesterday, Here You Come Today': American Studies Scholarship and the New Social Movements," *Cultural Critique* 40 (1998): 217, 205.

²⁵ Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak, *Outside the Teaching Machine* (London, New York: Routledge, 1993), 262.

²⁶ Werner Sollors, "The Internationalization of American Studies" (<http://www.fas.harvard.edu/~amciv>)