As global flows of texts, media, persons, goods, and cultures traverse national borders, what is gained, what is lost? How do we compare these modes of being, knowing, and aesthetic expression as they move from one context to another? And from what critical ground? The contributors to this special issue of *English Language Notes* on “Transnational Exchange” take up these questions in a series of multidisciplinary interrogations of material ranging from comparative literary modernisms, queer Chinese transnationalisms, contemporary photography, collage form, little magazines, jingo poems, and popular theater revues. These scholars find their disciplinary “homes” in academic departments as various as art history, history of science, cultural studies, women’s studies, sociology, French and Italian, Spanish and Portuguese, comparative literature, and English, and in locations that span three continents. These transnational and transdisciplinary scholarly alliances occur, in part, from the very forces of globalization that they critically explore. As global flows and capitalist accumulation break down cultural, economic, and social barriers, academics follow these formations, sharing approaches and knowledge in ever widening circuits of exchange.

In introducing their path-breaking essay collection on transnational exchange, *Minor Transnationalisms*, Françoise Lionnet and Shu-mei Shih explain their unlikely collaboration (between a Francophone, African and African-Americanist and a Sinophone, Chinese and Asian-Americanist) in terms that resonate with the present volume.1 Their scholarly partnership eschews the hierarchical and vertical integration of disciplinary formations in favor of the relational form that “globalization increasingly favors,” namely, the “lateral and non-hierarchical network structures” that Deleuze and Guattari call a “rhizome.”2 The notion of lateral affiliation provides a useful paradigm for thinking about the scholarly transnational exchanges within these pages. Take, for example, the hierarchical and vertical integration behind the institutional pressures within English departments, where the English and American literary canons continue to dominate curricula and “serious” scholarship while ethnic and other forms of “minor” literature remain marginal to the discipline. In contrast, the lateral affiliations of various “minor” transnational discourses avoid repeating the center-margin binary, a structural problem that occurs, Lionnet and Shih point out, even in the wake of deconstruction:
The deconstructive procedure has the paradoxical effect of exercising the muscles of the European philosophical and literary tradition, which becomes even more complex and indeterminate for an infinite play of meanings. Critiquing the center, when it stands as an end in itself, seems only to enhance it; the center remains the focus and the main object of study. The deconstructive dyad center/margin thus appears to privilege marginality only to end up recontaining it.³

As many of the contributors demonstrate in these pages, transnationalism, with its emphasis on lateral exchanges, offers alternative ways of thinking about globalization that bypass outworn critical paradigms of center-margin. Rather than fixing on Eurocentric understandings of the world, they show how the transnational circulation of forms (whether of experimental art, popular jingo poems, literature, small magazines, or Internet and pop culture expressions of queer identities) unleashes marginality in a manner that skips and weaves around the world, seemingly oblivious to dominant discourses and practices. These transnational exchanges are reterritorialized, as the contributors show, within local and regional contexts in ways that unsettle the notion of colonial imitation.

Many of the essays gathered here concern the pre-history of globalization, especially as it intensified via new technologies such as the telegraph, steamship, and train, and was accelerated by the rate of colonization and modernization around the world in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. These emergent technologies of global exchange fostered early forms of lateral affiliations amongst colonized territories. During the modernist period, however, transnational exchanges often could not avoid reflecting the dominance of empire, given the universalist aspirations the West held of and for itself. For example, Elleke Boehmer’s essay in this collection, “Circulating Forms: The Jingo Poem at the Height of Empire and Beyond,” examines the circulation among the British colonies of that arch-form and ideological vehicle of empire: the jingo poem. She builds upon Arjun Appadurai’s recent argument concerning the global circulation of forms to suggest that the jingo poem served as “both a powerful catalyst and a conduit for imperialist attitudes” (12).⁴ That is, the jingo poem was at once a circulating form and a form of circulation, both a carrier of meanings and also a mode of carrying meaning. She writes,

Much like the commodity within world capitalism, the jingo poem sought out colonial contexts (markets, audiences) that already shared cultural features in common through being networked by empire, and then, by way of its own networking operations, confirmed, embedded, and further homogenized those common features. (17)

Though she tracks a form of dominant discourse, she concludes by finding aspects of jingo rhetoric in such unlikely places as speeches by Mahatma Gandhi and Nelson Mandela. That is, jingo resurfaces in aspects of anticolonial nationalism.

Though Sarah Fedirka’s essay, “Reorienting Modernism: Transnational Exchange in the Modernist Little Magazine Orient” examines roughly the same historical period as Boehmer, the 1920s, she begins where Boehmer’s essay leaves off. She takes up a print
forum for anticolonial nationalism and shows how the Orientalist rhetoric of empire reappears within its pages. Fedirka discusses the monthly magazine *The Orient*, first published in 1923 in New York City by Indian nationals Hari Govind Govil and Syud Hossein. The magazine published prominent Eastern and Western writers, artists, and philosophers, including Ananda Coomaraswamy, Rabindranath Tagore, Kahlil Gibran, Romain Rolland, AE, Bertrand Russell, H. G. Wells, John Dewey, and Albert Einstein, [. . . as well as political firebrands such as] Mahatma Gandhi, Sarojini Naidu (President of the Indian National Congress), and former Turkish Premier Rauf Bey. (77)

Since the magazine's audience was a mainstream Western one, it often relied on Orientalist tropes to represent India. However, it also countered such stereotypes with biting criticism of the empire and accompanying promotion of Indian independence, much to the alarm of the British India Political Intelligence Service (IPI), as Fedirka recounts. Her essay shows how “modernism circulates beyond such binaries [of East and West], disrupting and unsettling them, even as it at times reinscribes them” (87).

Emily Hage likewise investigates modernist periodical culture, but from the angle of the transnational avant-garde artist group, the Dadaists. Protesting the nationalism surrounding World War I, Dada art journals published images of experimental artwork by loosely defined Dada groups located in cities ranging from Paris, Zagreb, Bucharest, to New York, thus creating affiliations across enemy lines. Analyzing specific Dada journals, Hage demonstrates that the Dadaists played with recontextualization by “reposition[ing] texts, images, collages, photomontages, and their journals in incongruous settings, where they contributed to new, often illogical compositions and expressed Dada's radical diversity and transnational reach” (63). These texts, Hage argues, produced a new kind of space that resists center-margin configurations by means of lateral exchanges across geographical, epistemological, and linguistic boundaries and through the formal experiments themselves. Though Dada remained inscribed within European discourses, Hage shows how artists as varied as Marcel Duchamp, Tristan Tzara, Hannah Höch, Max Ernst, and Dragan Aleksić forged a global movement by means of their Dada periodicals and “paradoxically sabotaged easy legibility, thus flouting ideals of communication and rationality and calling out differences between connecting and actually transmitting information” (63). Hage demonstrates how Dada critiqued the homogenizing forces of incipient globalization, yet used such connectivity to its advantage.

Lisa Shaw's essay shows, too, how global connectivity worked in favor of Afro-Brazilian theater performers during the modernist period. Shaw analyzes the complex ways in which Josephine Baker's Brazilian performance of the *baiana*, a stylized version of the Afro-Brazilian women street vendors of the cities of Rio and Salvador and made famous by Carmen Miranda, was both a form of blackface and a breaking of the race barrier. She writes, “representations of black identity by black performers were only rendered acceptable to white elite Brazilian tastes by virtue of the cultural capital afforded by associations
with Parisian *negrophilie*" (100). That is, Baker’s cosmopolitan prestige across the Atlantic world allowed her to take the Brazilian stage to perform the *baiana*. Her distance from the actual street vendors injected playful mimicry and difference—blackface—into the role while, as a *mulata*, she participated in “a play of mirrors” (101) that comprise black Atlantic popular performance. Shaw’s investigation of both popular Brazilian vaudeville theaters and elite casinos demonstrates the multi-directional voyages and exchanges between Afro-Brazilian popular culture and the travelling cultures of the African diasporic world. These exchanges both erased and made palatable (by their very distance from local histories and groups) racial difference in the public sphere.

Other contributors to this special issue discuss the lateral affiliations formed in order to combat globalization’s nefarious effects. Prior to introducing those contributions, I consider briefly the work of two important theorists of transnational exchange in order to situate the stakes of this resistance. The anthropologist Arjun Appadurai captures globalization’s spatial organization (“disjunctures”) and its simultaneous fluidity (as global cultural flows) with the terms ethnoscapes, mediascapes, technoscapes, financescapes, and ideoscapes. He writes, “These terms with the common suffix –scape [. . .] indicate that these are not objectively given relations that look the same from every angle of vision but, rather, that they are deeply perspectival constructs, inflected by the historical, linguistic, and political situatedness of different sorts of actors.”5 These fluid and flexible movements of goods, peoples, capital, media, and ideas within and across national spaces—in other words, these transnational exchanges—and their subsequent solidifications—their reterritorializations—provide the material ground upon which to characterize the abstract term globalization. Rather than flatten out and render equivalent these five “–scapes,” Gayatri Spivak maintains that the category of history and the process of capitalist accumulation must be kept in view along with the postmodern emphasis on space. She claims that the current age of globalization is a virulent recapitulation of earlier modes of transnationality predicated on world domination and material inequity: namely, colonization, imperialism, and neocolonialism. She calls these earlier modes of globalization, the “old diasporas”:

> What do I understand today by a “transnational world?” That it is impossible for the new and developing states, the newly decolonizing or the old decolonizing nations, to escape the orthodox constraints of a “neo-liberal” world economic system which, in the name of Development, and now “sustainable development,” removes all barriers between itself and fragile national economies, so that any possibility of building for social redistribution is severely damaged. In this new transnationality, what is usually meant by “the new diaspora,” the new scattering of seeds of “developing” nations, so that they can take root on developed ground? Eurocentric migration, labour export both male and female, border crossings, the seeking of political asylum, and the haunting in-place uprooting of “comfort women” in Asia and Africa. What were the old diasporas, before the world was thoroughly consolidated as transnational? They were the results of religious oppression and war, of slavery and indenturing, trade and conquest, and intra-European economic migra-
tion which, since the nineteenth century, took the form of migration and immi-

gration into the United States.\textsuperscript{5} Spivak argues that contemporary transnationalism is a significantly new epoch distinct from former eras, but that it is also a repetition from earlier forms of conquest, slavery, migration, and trade.\textsuperscript{7} While Spivak emphasizes the massive economic violence and disparity of these transnational flows—including the breakdown of national civil societies—it is important to overlay Appadurai’s emphasis on global flows onto Spivak’s historicity. By doing so, we see both the economic and institutional disparities of transnationalism as well as the fluid exchange of ideas, peoples, and cultures in diasporas both old and new that give rise to circulations of resistance, struggle, and transformation. Spivak would agree with this dual lens, though she cautions those who would represent diasporas old and new that:

\begin{quote}
The so-called “immediate experience” of migrancy is not necessarily conso-
nant with transnational literacy, just as the suffering of individual labour is not consonant with the impetus of socialized resistance. In order that a transna-
tionally literate resistance may, in the best case, develop, academic interven-
tions may therefore be necessary; and we should not, perhaps, conflate the
two.\textsuperscript{8}
\end{quote}

Matt Hart’s essay in this special issue beautifully illustrates Spivak’s point above. He demonstrates that representations of the most vulnerable of migrants and political asylum seekers are always problematic. Hart explains why it is that the photographer, Melanie Friend, whose photograph provides this issue’s cover, left her images unpeopled. Such a decision not only suggests the detainees’ invisibility within the public sphere, but it also indicates how any image or—we might add—any verbal representation can only represent the expe-
rience of “extraterritorial captivity,” as Hart puts it, “in negative form, as a spectral imprint upon an inhuman institutional landscape” (37). In his essay, Hart pairs Melanie Friend’s extraordinary photo exhibit of the U.K.’s Immigration Removal Centers with novelist Chris Cleave’s \textit{The Other Hand} (2008, published in the U.S. as \textit{Little Bee}). He suggests that just as Friend’s photographs render invisible, but differently, both citizen and detainee, so, too, do the novel’s representations of two women protagonists (one a Nigerian refugee, the other a British citizen) both held apart and driven together. Such ambiguities draw our attention to “the cultural, economic, and legislative contingencies through which this division has been reconstituted” (46). Thus it is that political, economic, and cultural forces shape the present transnational moment and potentially allow for future transformations to occur.

Turning to the topic of literary agency and asking how it might foster such transformations, Firat Oruc’s essay tracks the development of the concept of world literature since Goethe. Criticizing recent attempts to conceptualize world literature, especially those by Franco Moretti and Pascale Casanova, and emphasizing literature as a hegemonic form, Oruc sides with Brazilian critic Roberto Schwarz in his notion of “misplacedness,” or cachetresis, as a key site for postcolonial transformation and literary agency. “Misplacedness,” which perhaps echoes the tactics of Oswald de Andrade’s foundational “Cannibal Manifesto” (1928),
makes the disparity between local periphery and global metropolis a “constructive principle of the narrative itself,” what Schwarz calls “the autochthonous ‘form-giving content’ of the Latin American social formation” (55). Rather than hold Latin America’s “backwardness” to task, Andrade and Schwarz embrace its local specificity and historical particularity as a starting point for interrogating the very global system that produced it in the first place. Considering global literature as various as Moshid Hamid’s *The Reluctant Fundamentalist* (2007), Don DeLillo’s *Cosmopolis* (2003), Aravind Adiga’s *The White Tiger* (2008), Rick Moody’s *The Diviners* (2006), and Viktor Pelevin’s *Homo Zapiens* (1999), Oruc argues that “world literature describes a mode of measurement, rather than a passive absorption, of the forms imposed by modernity and functions as a framework for exploring the triangular relationship of positionality, comparativity, and globality and forms of reinventing language, culture, and tradition” (56).

Oruc’s emphasis on translation and comparativity brings us to the issue’s special topic clusters that emphasize methods of understanding transnational exchange. Introducing the topical cluster on “QueerTransnationalisms in China,” Howard Chiang notes that the formation of the field of queer studies in the early 1990s was focused almost exclusively on American and European cultures. He asks: how might transnational flows of capital, commodities, words, and people and the transregional networks and circuits of queer epistemology not only decenter attention on Western queer formations but also interrupt the localized cultures within East Asia? His own work on Chinese history of science traces the migration of Western biological concepts of sex and sexological categories, such as “homosexuality,” and shows their impact in China in the early twentieth century. To add a transnational twist to this story, he also demonstrates the complexity of “trans postcoloniality” in the Pacific Rim that eschews any direct appropriation of Western knowledge. He tracks the saga of Xie Jianshun, dubbed China’s first transsexual by the Taiwanese press, and argues that emergence of transsexuality in China “also illustrate[s] how the Republican government regained sovereignty in postwar Taiwan by inheriting and embracing a Western biomedical epistemology of sex from the Japanese colonial regime” (112–113). Rather than viewing Chinese discourses on transsexuality as imitative of the West, Chiang asserts that:

> in order to fully capture the history of sex change in modern China, one needs to account for the demise of eunuchs as much as the emergence of transsexuals, to chronicle events and processes of change as much as to theorize the genealogy of sex change and the historicity of transsexuality. (113)

Fran Martin, next in the cluster, interrogates the persistent binary at work in transnational debates: between a homogenizing globalization and a heterogeneous *glocalization*. This rather unattractive neologism, she argues, participates in what remains an abstract and general debate: what are the global effects on local cultures? Instead, she proposes to side-step this stale binary in favor of investigating the effects of an imaginative transnationalism—as a form of community and cultural geography—for Chinese lesbians who visit same-sex Internet sites. They describe this imagined global community in familial terms that relate less to Chinese cultural or ethnic identity than to their sexual identity. Secondly,
Martin examines the lived effects of globalization as an assemblage of material regulatory structures. She notes that Taiwan, following Australia’s lead, has passed restrictive legislation prohibiting potentially obscene material in its bid to meet international standards, including the benchmarks set by the UN’s Convention on the Rights of the Child. She demonstrates how global conventions to protect against the exploitation of children become a means to restrict adult minority sexual practices and representations. Offering a cautionary tale, Martin shows that transnational exchange may not always be beneficial to emergent queer subcultures.

The next two contributors examine how translation impacts transnational exchange. Given that translation is an interpretation, in Lawrence Venuti’s words, “that is partial and altered, supplemented with features peculiar to the translating language,” it produces yet another layer of wayward travel. Helen Hok-Sze Leung and Hongwei Bao demonstrate how linguistic differences prevent globalization as homogenization. Both scholars address how the term used in China to designate “sexually deviant subjects” cannot simply be translated as “queer.” Leung argues, “the absence of queer in the language, however, does not mean the absence of similar kinds of critical and resistant endeavors” (125). She tracks the transmutation of queerness as it travels across languages, cultures, and legal systems. Her first case study is the canto-pop songwriter and scholar Chow Yiu-Fai who compares Dutch gay marriage laws to gay marriage debates in China, but not in a straightforward way. Also avoiding simple one-to-one correspondences with the West, Bao uncovers a fascinating genealogy of the term tongzhi (comrades) in its shift from the socialist term for shared political revolutionary struggle to its new usage as a term for queers. Bao sees in the former usage an inherent queerness. He writes that the Socialist tongzhi “expresses an ideal of egalitarianism and utopianism. It thus maps social relations in a new way [. . . ] that opens the traditional family and kinship structure to relationships and connections between strangers who share the same political views, and it transforms private intimacy into a public intimacy” (132). The term both reflects Chinese history and difference from the West and breaks from that past by parodying it. Thus it is that tongzi expresses the multiple and uneven temporalities of the postsocialist present, by both invoking and cancelling the recent past.

Deeply critical of China’s move to a neo-liberal market economy, Travis Kong’s contribution builds on Bao’s analysis of the uneven present by providing a class analysis of one kind of rural-to-urban migrant, the money boys. He notes the burgeoning of the informal [. . . ] sex market which encourages young people to sell their bodies whilst criminalizing such commercial activities; and the emergence of a new gay discourse of “cosmopolitan respectability” which rejects the old pathological gay persona but privileges a new gay subject that celebrates cosmopolitan middle-class sensibilities. (140)

In effect, the new cosmopolitan gay subculture manifests a strictly middle-class sensibility that excludes the money boys from their queer enclave. While the money boys enjoy urban freedom to express their sexuality, Kong tracks different “zoning technologies” (140), polit-
ical regulations, economic autonomies, and social and cultural variations. Highlighting trans-regional disparities, he notes uneven “effects on money boys in terms of their access to various citizenship rights, market conditions for commercial sexual activities, and different social and cultural environments responsive to sexuality” (140). He demonstrates, as do all of the cluster contributors, that transnational exchanges might be best conceptualized as rhizomes that are unevenly and multiply distributed around the globe. These configurations offer surprising pathways that fundamentally diverge from top-down or center-margin regimes of order.

“Transnational Exchange” concludes with a reproduction of a roundtable discussion of “Comparative Modernisms” held at the 2010 annual conference at the Modernist Studies Association in Victoria, British Columbia, Canada. Returning to the questions that opened this introduction, the participants of the roundtable consider various methodological questions concerning the global reach of the new transnational modernist studies. Building their discussion from a summer 2009 special issue on “Comparison” published in *New Literary History* and guest edited by Rita Felski and Susan Stanford Friedman, these contributors focus their exchange on the concept of modernism and how and in what manner it travels, translates, and alters given the local terrain and history in which it is recontextualized.10

Mark Wollaeger discusses the dangers of Eurocentric constructions of global modernisms, given the field’s historical construction by the Anglo-American and European academic and literary institutions. He stresses the importance of collaboration to escape the limitations of Eurocentric linguistic and cultural backgrounds. The byproduct of such collaborative efforts, however, threatens to dilute and decenter the very term modernism, but that, and here Wollaeger quotes another participant, Eric Hayot, is precisely the exciting and productive heart of transnational comparison: “We need to act like we don’t already know what [modernism] is” (154). Wollaeger also relates his experience of teaching comparative modernisms, where the conjunction of the Japanese novel *Streets of Fiendish Ghosts* and *Ulysses* “replicates the tension between the genealogical and the comparative that structured the syllabus as a whole” (155). Such tension, he warrants, leads to further refinement and complications of the concept of modernism.

Christopher Bush continues in this vein of comparative East/West modernisms to speak about his own work on East/West comparative discourse at the beginning of the twentieth century. He finds that while earlier nineteenth-century East/West comparisons functioned to “define the distinctiveness if not uniqueness of Western identity,” turn-of-the-century European discourses on Japanese modernization, as it was one of the first non-Western nations to modernize, believed that Japan had a world historical role to play (170). European writers, however, still qualified Japan’s elevation to being a subject of history with hierarchies of racial and civilizational differences. The clear divisions between East and West, Bush argues, function differently than “traditional ‘Orientalism’” (172). Rather, speaking of Ernest Fenollosa, Bush notes that while he still maintained the notion of historical progress, “he is also quite right that Japan […] was in fact sorting, mixing, and fusing a range of political,
economic, and cultural traditions into what would become a powerful and influential non-Western modernity” (172). Comparison here is not so much what Fenollosa does to Japan but what Japan does in its own process of modernization, adapting a variety of transnational forces and ideas to find what works for her.

Rebecca Walkowitz foregrounds an implicit aspect of Bush’s paper, namely, that given the critical consensus that we need to go beyond the “nation-container,” have we simply replaced that rubric with “the language-container”? Addressing her remarks to literary historians at the Modernist Studies Association, she notes that, “Speaking of poetry alone, Anglophone literary history partitions the corpus of writers who work in multiple languages, such as Rainer Maria Rilke, Fernando Pessoa, Theresa Hak Kyung Cha, and the contemporary multimedia artists Young-Hae Chang Heavy Industries” (158). Not only that, but literary studies tends not to consider within its parameters influential works translated either into or out of the English language. If we seek understandings of the transnational, how can we afford to neglect the impact of translation on global circulations of literature, ideas, and identities? Walkowitz also draws our attention to the multidirectionality of transnational comparisons. Offering a reading of Virginia Woolf’s Three Guineas, Walkowitz argues that Woolf’s move to compare England against Germany “emphasizes [. . .] the transnational networks in which violence is nurtured—and possibly remedied. Woolf’s text thus finds a compromise between emphasizing the nation (and blaming it) and emphasizing past and future ‘connections’ that are both smaller and larger than the nation” (159). Walkowitz’s reading of Woolf provides a stereoscopic view of transnational comparison, one that simultaneously holds synchronic and diachronic dimensions in view and that “generates collectivities at several scales at once” (159).

It is the multidimensionality of transnational comparison—both synchronic and diachronic—that my own contribution addresses. Discussing R. Radhakrishnan’s essay in New Literary History in which he delineates two temporalities/spaces at work in comparison: the utopian realm that enables a level playing field and the political realm of global and colonial histories, I extrapolate from this philosophical meditation to read Ayi Kwei Armah’s The Beautyful Ones Are Not Yet Born and Claude McKay’s Banjo in terms of a “chronotopic doubleness” that holds both the everyday realm and the utopian promises of modernity in view at once. I then conclude with a brief look at how colonial literary forms negotiate multiple scales using a case study of the 1926 South African controversy over the publication of the little magazine, Voorslag.

Anna Stenport’s contribution to the cluster on Comparative Modernisms invites a reconsideration of what Eurocentrism is from the standpoint of someone working on a marginal European literary tradition, namely, Scandanavian modernism. She takes to task the critical reluctance of those working on Scandanavian literature to move outside of a national or monolingual context. When Scandanavian critics look beyond the confines of, say, Sweden, it is at mainstream European contexts that they gaze and offer a straightforward center-margin influence model. Such comparative models are shorn of political, his-
torical, and geographical specificity and tend to be formalist in practice. Instead, Stenport outlines the complex composite that is Scandanavia: replete with competing languages, under-acknowledged native peoples, and divided loyalties between local, national, and transnational forces and institutions.

All told, the essays collected here reveal that transnational exchange moves in unexpected directions, with different historical sedimentations and creative appropriations and revaluations. They produce lively new forms and these forms in turn proliferate different modes of transnational exchange. Accordingly, the scholarly approaches to transnational exchange in this issue reject national, center-periphery, or strict disciplinary frameworks as they seek to understand their material. Instead, their ground breaking work probes the fault lines between language traditions, East/West and North/South divides, genders and sexualities, racial groups, refugees and hosts, enemies and patriots, and between competing definitions of literary movements. Such work, no doubt, redresses critical blind spots and, as Mark Wollaeger suggests, provides “a radically decentering experience” (154). This experience occurs when we follow transnationalism’s logic into how and what we know and compare. It provides a sense of intellectual restlessness: of thought, of disciplinary parameters, of probing locational and linguistic sedimentations. And it will, without a doubt, spark new avenues of inquiry and open new fields of investigation for further discussion and exchange.

Laura Winkiel
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