

An-other Nihilism: An Euphoria of Transcultural Hybridity

By Kelly Chien-hui KUO

In Taiwan, a highly hybrid space is being created by expanding transnational political and economic strategies, which effectively give rise to a new form of transcultural phenomena. This transnational force shatters the close relationship between cultural representation and national identity, and places stress on individuals' ambivalence about the transformation of their subjectivities. However, as might be attributed to our increasingly hybrid culture today, neither globalism nor localism can sufficiently explain hybrid cultural phenomena or resolve the problems of cultural identity occurring in a transnationalised community. Or, one has suggested the term "global localism" or "global regionalism" (70 percent global and 30 percent local) to describe the present situation created by global capitalism.¹ Yet, I would like to argue that the dyadic relation between the global and the local has reduced the complex of cultural phenomena to the singularity of the relationship between one other (the global) and one self (the local). Instead, contemporary cultural phenomena have shown us that the cultural representation is comprised of multiple others and even multiple selves as a "fractured whole".

Boundaries between cultures are ambiguous and cultural forms are rather transculturally syncretistic. This transcultural hybridity has spelled out the loss of such monoculturalism as localism or globalism or any dyadic structure. As the post-colonial theorist Homi Bhabha points out, "culture as a strategy of survival is both transnational and translational."² We need to consider the interaction, cross-border movements of coalition and interference, integration and disintegration, between different cultural theories, contents or forms. . We do not want to narrow cultural analysis to a structuralist treatment in terms of a binary opposition – globalism, localism or even global localism – in which no other relation would take place. We have to look at intimacies between cultures in which their differences are conflated.

Transnationalisation has dispersed its effects upon cultural forms and contents as well as identity politics. Celebrating the tolerance and understanding of diverse cultures, a

metropolitan city such as Taipei abounds with metaphorical references to identity. "It is a reality that is multiformed, heterogeneous, diasporic." "The city suggests a creative disorder, an instructive confusion, an interpolating space in which the imagination carries you in every direction, even towards the previously unthought."³ It becomes a cultural arena in which citizens have been experiencing this riddle with the diversity of the cultural representations, to which individuals' identities can be related. The city has lost the function of providing a readable and comprehensible metaphorical image in the ongoing process of translation between cultures. A transcultural city landscape is delineated as a place of "an absence of character".⁴

The city becomes a site of hybridity lacking coherent references to individuals' identities. In this circumstance, the determinants or preconditions of subject positions, to which a citizen in a multicultural city might conform, are ambiguous. The recognition of the "self" is at stake whereas Identity references abound. While all references to identity are fractured and juxtaposed in a collage of time and space, and while few things are perceived as permanent or as serving as referents of identity, "the individual does not dominate, but rather lets go and loses him- or herself in order to explore and find parts of that self."⁵ The local is the site of hybridity without a centre. Nothing can be perceived as the worthiest extension of the ego while all references are equally represented. Cultural representations, in which things can be chosen metaphors for identity, are so discursive and turbulent that subjectivity shatters in multiple choices. There is hybridity, and there is a kind of anxiety and yearning from participants praying for the "dominant".

The change of the outside world and the transformation of individual subjectivity both shift towards a form of "plurality". As culture diversifies or multiplies, so do identity formations. According to Stuart Hall, by means of juxtaposing "otherness", cultural heterogeneity discloses the pressure of difference, and therefore confronts the hegemonic form of identity and challenges its singularity in terms of historicity and continuity.⁶ Living in the transcultural pantheon, expressing a protean abundance of cultural differences, one moves into the realm

of uncertainty, and struggles to locate him/herself in “a world of dissolving boundaries and disrupted continuities”.⁷ As Hall makes the lucid observation,

*The full unified, completed, secure and coherent identity is a fantasy. Instead, as the systems of meaning and cultural representation multiply, we are confronted by a bewildering, fleeting multiplicity of possible identities, any one of which we could identify with – at least temporary.*⁸

“This opens up the possibility of ‘dislodging the inertia of the “I”.’ It leads to the release of diverse voices, an encounter with an ‘other’ side, an unfolding of the self, and negates the possibility of reducing diversity to the identical.”⁹ Therefore, it becomes a legitimate concern of cultural studies to examine these effects particularly in terms of hybridisation and pluralisation, whereas the term ‘identity’ is related to cultural specificity, or, more exactly, cultural solipsism. These aspects have become associated with the term multiculturalism, in an attempt at subverting cultural solipsism, advocating a request of equal representation of different cultures, and promising a new form of identity politics. Multiculturalism has been considered as a capacious vehicle for presenting cultural diversity in a transnational society. “It (multiculturalism) had become a fad and a style, and everyone knew what to think about it. Indeed it seemed that we were living in a new monolithic *culture* of multiculturalism.”¹⁰ Therefore, in this paper, I intend to reconsider this culture of identity under the heading of multiculturalism.

Multiculturalism has become a buzzword in political, economic, social and cultural exchanges. While multiculturalism is becoming a “programme” of social, economic and political transformation,¹¹ however, I would like to argue that multiculturalism is fraught with theoretical and practical dangers. I will set out my argument in three aspects. Firstly, I would like to pose the question of cultural plurality whereas the term ‘identity’ somehow is bound to cultural specificity. In some sense, multiculturalism does not successfully subvert cultural solipsism in terms of the self-subject position as it intends. Secondly, I would like to point out the problematic principles of cultural separatism. In spite of the insistence on the fissuring of cultural differences and the upholding of national identity, I argue that multiculturalism fails to avoid the strong tendency of transcultural intermixture. Finally, I would like to address the issue of multiculturalism as risking “legitimizing” cultural democracy and thus becoming a

political or economic programme. Also, I argue that if multiculturalism cannot successfully represent minority groups, it will become an accomplice to cultural imperialism.

Before we go further into the question of multiculturalism, I would like to use an example to give us a general idea of hybridity in terms of architectural presentation. The case I would like to introduce here is the “National Museum of Prehistory” located at Taitung and designed by Michael Graves Architect and Haigo Shen & Associate. In this case, according to Michael Graves himself, he attempted to recapture and express an image from the memorised space of our everyday life, as well as “locality” in terms of tradition, materials and the surroundings of the site. In so doing, the ideas and transformed symbols will be produced as a guideline for architectural design. Let’s not go into the question as to whether this is a successful architectural design in terms of function and aesthetics at present or as to how it might be that culture can be ‘represented’ in architecture. Rather, in doubt about the desirability of multiculturalism, what I would like point out here is the predicament of narrating the locality in the site of hybridisation taking into multiculturalism’s strategies and attempts into account. A museum, a place that represents and elaborates identity, might simply serve as an interpretation of Michael Graves’ idea of postmodernity rather than narrating the locality or identity of Taiwanese ethnicity.



(Source from: Dialogue, No. 4. June 1997, Taipei)

Much of the multiculturalist project lies in the notion that it will be able to open the enclosure of relational inequality between ethnicities. It denounces monoculturalism or cultural solipsism in favour of institutional exclusions or assimilation of racial or cultural differences. By celebrating multicultural diversity or heterogeneity, multiculturalism is committed to pursuing equality of cultural representation, confronting cultural consensus, cautioning against the imposition of ideological tenets on social values, and contesting hegemonic norms. As

multiculturalists believe, “[h]eterogeneity necessitates incessant reiteration, the conscious and active and repeated renewal of the conditions of its possibility.”¹² According to the multiculturalists’ perspectives, the alignments of cultures, made across borders, types, and theories, generate the multiplicities of cultural representations and subject positions, and hence enable multiculturalism to challenge the static notion of identity in virtue of desiring novelty.¹³ This seems to suggest that multiculturalism is able to distract individuals’ subject-positions from the homogeneous totality of monolithic culture, and then carve out a safe space for marginal voices. However, we ought to critically examine these multiculturalist claims, and ask whether multiculturalism can break into the structure of cultural solipsism involved in subject positions in case it can shatter, decentre, or dislocate the profound stability of identity by shoring up cultural heterogeneity.

Cultural heterogeneity has swept us away from the conventional way of thinking identity in the singular as an integrated subject. With an emphasis on cultural diversity, “it (multiculturalism) promised independence to various cultures to negotiate their own relations to the national whole, and it looked like a cornerstone of national union in a more flexible guise.”¹⁴ It intends to endorse alliances among minority groups grounded in resistance to the normalisation of a putative common culture. Proponents of Multiculturalism believe greater diversity enables the subversion of formerly static metanarratives and re-opens the enclosure of subject positioning. As Butler writes, “that emphasis on difference is the occasion for an ethical stance of openness, one that counters the closed circuitry of the subject-position and its self-referential declarations.”¹⁵ However, from a Freudian and Foucauldian perspective, Butler argues that the pursuance of “identities” in the plural form does not resolve the epistemological problem of how to surmount solipsism if subjects are conceptually “positioned” in a fixed way. Subject positions precede the act of speaking and consistently pose the risk of cultural solipsism. On the one hand, every cultural theory is a subject-positioned one that can never be located outside of solipsism. On the other hand, one cannot deconstruct the solipsism without being expelled from his/her subject-position. She points out that

One finds, for instance, a continued emphasis on the language of “positions” and a recourse to an inarticulate map of social power on which various subjects are said to

be placed – or “positioned.” Subjects are said to speak “from” these positions, and these positions are conceptually fixed in ways that persistently pose the risk of cultural solipsism. In such a view, a position preceded the act of speaking and remains that which is “reflected” in and by that speaking. (...) To what kinds of cultural effects do we seek recourse when we seek to ground ourselves in a subject-position? (...) What any of us speak “of” is, unsurprisingly, our “position,” and so speaking becomes the delivery of a report on my “position,” a term signals a historical restriction of the Marxist term condition. (...) If we begin with the requirement for such grounds, then pluralism emerges as an epistemological problem of how to surmount the solipsism that follows definitionally from this view.¹⁶

She continues to question: “[w]hat form does listening take when the presumption is that “the position” from which one listens precludes the possibility of listening? Can the exchange of speech or writing be the occasion for a disruption of the social ontology of positionality?”

Butler indicates that

To conceive of racism primarily as a problem of psychic projection requires that dyadic structure by which a dominant subject projects and a subordinated Other is projected upon. But the complex distribution of institutional processes of racialization and racism are not simply a matters of psychic projection; the racialization of the subject requires an account of subject formation through the terms of race, but this account could not taken place within the term of an analysis in which a subject-status were taken for granted as a “ground” or “presupposition.”¹⁷

The shift from identity to identities would be invalid if subject positions of both the sovereign subject and the minority subject do not wither away. “Multiculturalism ... is understood at its most simplistic to mean exposure to different cultures. Simple exposure, however, is absolutely meaningless without a reconsideration and restructuring of the ways in which knowledge is organized, disseminated, and used to support unequal power relations.”¹⁸ In this circumstance, as the similar question raised by Spivak: “Can the subaltern speak?” within “the effaced itinerary of the subaltern subject”,¹⁹ we might doubt multiculturalism’s ability and sincerity to stand for the equal representations of different cultures while the subject is fixed in repression. In other words, this reminds us to read the possibility of an unwitting perpetration of multiculturalism as a new politics of upholding the utopia of equal representation and recognition particularly while multiculturalism continuously prevails upon minority groups to celebrate cultural diversity. Multiculturalism may be naïve to think racial or cultural inequality would disappear by simply carving out a safe space for minority groups to speak without subverting the subjective consciousness of both one who speaks and one who listens. What we encounter here are inflections in mesmerised subject-positions.

Calling for the tolerance of differences, the strategy of multiculturalism to ensure cultural diversity is registered in cultural separatism in many ways. By diversity, this means the demarcation between recognisable and definable cultural enclaves. In other words, group differences are conceived categorically as a distinct entity.²⁰ And yet, this would have marked something other than simply drawing the boundaries between cultures. Judith Butler incisively indicates that

If one could ground a reading in a subject-position, then there would be no need to ask how such subject-positions are formed and with what kind of legacy they arrive on the contemporary political scene. And, yet, to read from above the fray is equally impossible. Although the move from identity to identities appears to undermine the regime of the singular subject, making identity plural may do no more than reiterate that subject if relationality is conceived of as neither quantitative nor homologous. Pluralization disrupts the social ontology of the subject itself when that relationality is understood not merely as what persists among subjects, but as the internal impossibility of the subject as a discrete and unitary kind of being. Identity as effect, as site, as dynamic, as simultaneously formed and formative is not equivalent to the notion of identity as subject and ground. Reading identities as they are situated and formed in relation to one another means moving beyond the heuristic requirement of identity itself.²¹

It would be unfair to conclude that multiculturalism does not realise the significance of relationality, and simply draws the boundaries between cultures, since it attempts to break off the dyadic relation of the dominant and the subordinated other. Taking relationality into account, on the one hand, somehow, cultural separatism is implicated in the withdrawal from the reality that to a great extent is constituted by the hierarchy and asymmetry that multiculturalist rhetoric denies. On the other hand, in some ways, it is implicated in the insertion that blocks the road ahead along the linearity of a historical course and prevents us from stepping into a future that has been designated by the present. These implications are a kind of retrogression that makes us step back and reconcile identity with a legacy, tradition, the signification of a specific location of time and space, that we used to seek recourse to in positioning subjects. We are dragged back willy-nilly into the recurrent perplexity of our tradition, or our “originality” that has become “a fact of political relevance.”²²

The staging of a breaking-off in the relation of the dominant and the other involves the relation of the past and the future. There is a clash of the past and the future implicated in multiculturalism’s attempt at subsuming and maintaining cultural diversity by means of cultural separatism. Multiculturalism as an insertion “splits up the time continuum into forces” – the

past and the future – that begin fighting each other.²³ Where precisely is one's subject-position directed to while both the forces of the past and the future are giving directions? Arendt suggested that we are living in "the odd in-between period" of which "no tradition had foreseen its appearance or its reality" and "no testament had willed it for the future."²⁴ Although she was writing in the 1950s, that breakdown of a coherent meta-narrative still casts its shadow upon this post-modern time. She turned to Kafka's parable to delineate this bewilderment of positioning human subjects. In Kafka's story,

He has two antagonists: the first presses him from behind, from the origin. The second blocks the road ahead. He gives battle to both. To be sure, the first supports him in his fight with the second, for he wants to push him forward, and in the same way the second supports him in his fight with the first, since he drives him back. But it is only theoretically so. For it is not only the two antagonists who are there, but he himself as well, and who really knows his intentions? His dream, though, is that some time in an unguarded moment – and this would require a night darker than any night has even been yet – he will jump out of the fighting line and be promoted, on account of his experience in fighting, to the position of umpire over his antagonists in their fight with each other.²⁵

In this metaphorical scene, man is positioned in the battle between his antagonists – the forces of the past and the future – and the presence of himself whose standpoint is not the present, namely, the reconciliation with reality.²⁶ Arendt assumes that the third force, the resultant of these two forces, would be theoretically found by constructing a parallelogram that offers the man a position as an umpire with an impartial eye.²⁷ This notion might also be found in Gilles Deleuze's "What Is a Multiplicity?": "free the line and the diagonal, draw the line instead of plotting a point, produce an imperceptible diagonal instead of clinging to an event elaborated or reformed vertical or horizontal."²⁸ As Deleuze indicates the diagonal has broken free from the vertical and the horizontal,²⁹ the parallelogram of forces would enable the man to sufficiently remove himself from the fighting-line between past and future. If theoretically so, subject positions are no longer constrained in the unidirectional system of past and future.

Seemingly, one may suggest that the cultural separatism of multiculturalism as an "insertion" has succeeded in liberating repressed subject positions from their historical ties, and at the same time given a new beginning to their future through this diagonal force constituted by the forces of past and future. Where Deleuze points out that the proliferation of lines marked by the points between the horizontal and the vertical orchestrates multiplicity, Arendt thinks that

the eventual end of the diagonal force lies in infinity.³⁰ One may find the coherence of multiculturalism in terms of the correspondence between its insistence on cultural diversity and its implication of the multiplicity and infinity of subject positions. Taking the impulse within subjects into account, the terms of identity in a relation to cultural specificity would become clouded by infinity and multiplicity. Arendt considered that what is much more likely happen is that the man is not capable of finding the diagonal,³¹ and will “die of exhaustion, worn out under the pressure of constant fighting, oblivious of his original intentions, and aware only of the existence of this gap in time, which as long as he lives, is the ground on which he must stand, though it seems to be a battle field and not a home.”³² Taking account of cultural separatism as celebratory heterogeneous representations, we are indeed in the face of a “schizoid syncretism” of subjects wandering in obscurity.³³

Furthermore, the role of multiculturalism in the appropriation of political consciousness should not be ignored. As Spivak points out, “[t]here are many subject positions which one must inhabit; one is not just one thing. That is when a political consciousness comes in.”³⁴ “In this new interest-group pluralism, the shopping center of identity politics makes a fetish of the virtues of the minority, which, in the end, is not only intellectually stultifying but also politically suicidal.”³⁵ Taking up the question of cultural separatism in terms of the resistance of cultural interaction, one might still remain suspicious of multiculturalism’s ability to fissure ethnic identities and cultural difference at the stage of supporting cultural autonomy and political democracy that allow a cultural sphere of free play. This means that multiculturalism’s claims attempt to “de-politicise” the cultural sphere, however, to a great extent, by means of political appeal. They resist political and social hierarchy and power over cultural consciousness by means of putting these issues in a political agenda. Nevertheless, it is still far from clear whether a conception of the multicultural stressing cultural autonomy is able to result, intrinsically, in an increase of possibilities for the equality of recognition and representation of subordinated groups. Indeed, under the banner of multiculturalism, monoculturalism to a certain extent is lead to decline through the advocates of equal representation of different cultures, and the construction of cultural identity within a new structure of a whole society is reformed by the knowledge of multiculturalism. However, taking identity formations,

subjectivity orientations and cultural heterogeneity into account, it is not too difficult to realize that a kind of tension is taking place in this multicultural arena of folkloric spectacles.

Multiculturalism is risking “legitimizing” the idea of cultural autonomy and democracy. “Under the multicultural, single cultures may continue to exist in their pure forms”³⁶, but, I would argue, it is highly possible that they may not. Cultural forms cannot be contained neatly without coercion. Jameson asserts that

*Without a conception of the social totality (and the possibility of transforming a whole social system), no properly socialist politics is possible. It involves trying to imagine how a society without hierarchy, a society that has also repudiated the economic mechanism of the market, can possibly cohere.*³⁷

Gary B. Nash claims that “[i]f multiculturalism is to get beyond a promiscuous pluralism that gives every thing equal weight and adopts complete moral relativism, it must reach some agreement on what is at the core of American culture.”³⁸ If “the pure forms of single cultures can survive in spite of general mixing”³⁹, (namely it is assumed that cultural separatism is practical), if it is true; then yet, in the spirit of liberal autonomy without political interference, the neutrality or equity that multiculturalism attempts to achieve would form a cultural black hole that accommodates all differences. A locus inhales all kinds of cultural presentations and implodes any centre within which individuals might orient themselves. Individuals, “who are trapped in a kind of ‘monadic relativism’, cannot negotiate the disorienting new spaces that have become both fragmented and compressed owing to the insidious saturation of voids, the suppression of distances, and the barrage of immediacy.”⁴⁰ We are schizoid-syncretic subjects as I have mentioned previously.

In fact, the world has not turned out to be one in which the coherence of identity, related to cultural solipsism in virtue of cultural separatism, could be sufficiently articulated. It is only a multiculturalist utopian fantasy of that, by acknowledging cultural diversity, equal recognition of cultural identity would be maintained. Said argues that “all cultures are involved in one another; none is single and pure, all are hybrid, heterogenous, extraordinarily differentiated, and unmonolithic.”⁴¹ In other words, cultures are inevitably drawn into interconnections with each other. In fact, the term “multiculturalism” evokes a complex realignment and interweaves a rhizomatic tissue between and within cultures. Celebratory heterogeneous representations

have been sucked into multicultural public sphere as though with the force of a vacuum. A metropolitan city, transformed by the rubric of multiculturalism, becomes a provocative site for cultural hybridisation. Here, identity is invisible because of the equality of representation, the democracy of the exchange of symbols, and the fracture caused by cultural hybridisation. Transcultural hybridity through synergy, affiliation or confrontation transforms the texture and the trace of identity and reshapes the structure of feeling or subjectivity in the subject.

Multicultural heterogeneity is concerned with contesting oppressive power, marginality, and exclusions in its local context. Nevertheless, if multiculturalism has its political agenda and engagement, this has to be examined in a critical vein from the viewpoint of subordinated groups. As Butler argues that “the unmediated first-person voice is offered as the final phenomenological legitimation for a political claim may well attest to the requirements of political rhetoric rather than any exigencies of truth”⁴², Spivak argues that “[t]he theory of pluralized ‘subject-effects’ gives us an illusion of undermining subjective sovereignty while often providing a cover for this subject of knowledge.”⁴³ I do not intend to reject the importance of the multiculturalist’s attempt to deconstruct the hierarchy, repression and discrimination that a monolithic culture signifies. Yet, if “multiculturalism is proving to be fluid enough to describe very different styles of cultural relations”⁴⁴, one may discover a danger that multiculturalism may become a way of obscuring cultural identity/difference by over-emphasizing cultural plurality where choices abound. On the one hand, though bringing in the experiences and struggle of minority groups’ inequity as a central focus of attention is a very important corrective, I am concerned that under the avocation of equal representation in principle or in practice, multiculturalism does not convince majoritarian culture to recognise and reconcile any particularities of minority culture. On the other hand, since the “authenticity” of subaltern groups’ identities has been repressed, replaced, or distorted, the idea of equality sequentially shapes a cultural arena bringing about a challenge to minority groups who are not ready to join this fray of cultural competition. In this case, positioned in the plurality of otherness, minority groups do not obtain a real chance to restore or rearticulate their own identity without any affection for otherness. Rather, they are forced to open their cultural enclosure protecting their identity to multiculturalism’s false sympathy.

Above all, transcultural hybridisation leaves minority groups in this peculiar predicament. In some sense, and to a certain extent multiculturalism has been implicitly dismissed as a political and economic purpose and become a freshly legitimate reason for entering the cultural site of subaltern groups and replacing their local culture. It seems particularly unfortunate when the perspective of multiculturalism turns out to be another cultural imperialism particularly through the transnational marketing strategies of a late-capital society. Multiculturalism has mis-transformed into another wave of colonisation or imperialism, and inflicts the severe wound of crippling minority groups' identities again. To a great extent, multiculturalism fails to preserve cultural characters and to guarantee sanitising them against impurity, interference or disturbance from other cultural involvements. Multiculturalism can be conceived as a great project intending to dissolve the identifiable coherence of the local by means of taking up the politics of pluralism which superficially celebrates the display of a range of unities. Also, on the other hand, through the moment of the loss of identifiable coherence in a transnationalised society in which the narration of history or tradition is inarticulate, multiculturalism downplays the existence of hegemony and supremacy over subordinated groups by drawing away their attention from racial inequality to the equality of cultural representation. The broad stroke of my interpretation is that, implicitly, a multiculturalist political consciousness is hastening the death of the national identity of subordinated groups.

¹ see Arif Dirlik "The Global in the Local" in WILSON, Rob and DISSANAYAKE, Wimal (eds.), *Global/Local, Cultural Production and the Transnational Imaginary*, Durham: Duke University Press, 1996, pp. 31-34

² Bhabha, Homi K. (1994), *The Location of Culture*, London: Routledge, 1998, p. 172

³ Iain Chamber, "Cities Without Maps", in BIRD, Jon, CURTIS, Barry, PUTNAM, Tim, ROBERTSON, George, and TICKNER, Lisa (eds.), *Mapping the Futures, Local Cultures, Global Change*, London: Routledge, 1993, p. 189

⁴ in *Were All Women Sex-Mad* by A. Couani, "– You know I've traveled all over the world don't you – any place you can name. Well I'll tell you this – Australia's great for a holiday but I wouldn't want to live there. It's unique I'll say that. Anyone can feel at home there because it has a strange character or atmosphere which is like an absence of character, a kind of neutrality. I think it's very tolerant or maybe just very anonymous. Not really, I do like Australia. When I live there I liked it. But I realize coming away again that there's some strange pressure there. It's subliminal, very subtle. I don't think I could describe it exactly because it's an abstract quality which pervades everything there, the work situation, the

politics, the social life. (...) the real Australian attitude is never expressed. " quoted by Sneja Gunew "Denaturalizing Cultural Nationalisms: Multicultural Readings of Australia" in Bhabha, Homi K, (ed.), *Nation and Narration*, London: Routledge, 1990, p. 107

⁵ Iain Chamber, *Op. cit.*, p. 190

⁶ HALL, Stuart and HELD, David and McGREW Tony (eds.), *Modernity and Its Future*, Cambridge: The Open University, 1992, p. 307

⁷ quoted by HALL, Stuart and HELD, David and McGREW Tony (eds.), *Ibid.*, p. 308

⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 277

⁹ Iain Chamber *Op. cit.*, p. 190

¹⁰ RAJCHMAN, John (ed.), *The Identity in Question*, London: Routledge, 1995, p. vii

¹¹ Terence Turner, "Anthropology and Multiculturalism: What Is Anthropology that Multiculturalists Should Be Mindful of It?" in GOLDBERG, David Theo (ed.), *Multiculturalism: a Critical Reader*, Oxford: Blackwell, 1994, p. 421

¹² GOLDBERG, David Theo, *Ibid.*, p. 27

¹³ *Ibid.*, pp. 30-31

¹⁴ GORDON, Avery E. and NEWFIELD, Christopher (eds.), *Mapping Multiculturalism*, London: University of Minnesota Press, 1996, p. 4

¹⁵ Judith Butler, "Collected and Fractured: Response to Identities", in APPIAH, Kwame Anthony and GATES, Henry Louis, Jr. (eds.), *Identities*, London: The University of Chicago Press, Ltd., 1995, p. 441

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 439-440

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, 443

¹⁸ quoted by Christopher Newfield and Avery F. Gordon, "Multiculturalism's Unfinished Business" in GORDON, Avery E. and NEWFIELD, Christopher (eds.), *Op. cit.*, p. 105

¹⁹ Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak "Can the Subaltern Speak" in ASHCROFT, Bill and GRIFFITHS, Gareth and TIFFIN, Helen (eds.) (1995), *The Post-colonial Studies Reader*, London: Routledge, 1997, p. 28

²⁰ see individualism Joan W. Scott "Multiculturalism and the Politics of Identity" in RAJCHMAN, John (ed.), *The Identity in Question*, London: Routledge, 1995, p. 9

²¹ Judith Butler, *Op. cit.*, p. 445

²² The gap between past and future "was bridged over by what we have called tradition, That this tradition has worn thinner and thinner as the modern age progressed is a secret to nobody. When the thread of tradition finally broke, the gap between past and future ceased to be a condition peculiar only to the activity of thought and restricted as an experience to those few who made thinking their primary business. It became a tangible reality and perplexity for all; that is, it became a fact of political relevance." ARENDT, Hannah, *Between Past and Future: Six Exercises in Political Thought*, London: Faber and Faber, 1961, p. 14

²³ "In the words of Faulkner, "the past is never dead, it is not even past." This past, moreover, reaching all the way back into the origin, does not pull back but presses forward, and it is, contrary to what one would expect, the future which drives us back into the past." *Ibid.*, pp. 10-11

²⁴ At the very beginning of her book *Between Past and Future*, Hannah Arendt quoted that "our inheritance was left to us by no testament" p. 3; She explained that "[t]he testament, telling the heir what will rightfully be his, wills past possessions for a future. Without testament or, to resolve the metaphor, without tradition – which selects and names, which hands down and preserves, which indicates where the treasures are and what their worth is – there seems to be no willed continuity in time and hence, humanly speaking, neither past nor future, only sempiternal change of the world and the biological cycle of living creatures in it." *Ibid.*, pp. 5-6, p. 9

²⁵ quoted by ARENDT, Hannah. *Ibid.*, p. 7

²⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 8

²⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 12

²⁸ DELEUZE, Gilles, *The Deleuze Reader*, edited by Constantin V. Boundas, New York: Columbia University Press, 1993, p. 50

²⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 52

³⁰ ARENDT, Hannah, *Op. cit.*, p. 12

³¹ "The situation, however, became desperate when the old metaphysical questions were shown to be meaningless; that is, when it began to dawn upon modern man that he has come to live in a world in which his mind and his tradition of thought were not even capable of asking adequate, meaningful questions, let alone of giving answers to its own perplexities." *Ibid.*, pp. 8-9

³² *Ibid.*, p. 13

³³ "Since the past has ceased to throw its light upon the future, the mind of man wanders in obscurity." quoted by ARENDT, Hannah, *Ibid.*, p. 7

³⁴ Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak and Sneja Gunew, "Questions of multiculturalism", in DURING, Simon (ed.), *The Cultural Studies Reader*, London: Routledge, 1993, p. 195

³⁵ quoted by Terence Turner, *Op. cit.*, p. 409

³⁶ Peter Caws, "Identity: Cultural, Transcultural, and Multicultural" in GOLDBERG, David Theo (ed.), *Op. cit.*, p. 383

³⁷ Fredric Jameson, "Cognitive Mapping" in Nelson, Cary and Grossberg, Lawrence, (eds.), *Marxism and the Interpretation of Culture*, London: Macmillan Education, 1988, p. 347

-
- ³⁸ quoted by GORDON, Avery E. and NEWFIELD, Christopher (eds.), *Op. cit.*, p. 4
- ³⁹ Peter Caws, *Op. cit.*, p. 383
- ⁴⁰ Katharyne Mitchell, "In Whose Interest? Transnational Capital and the Production of Multiculturalism in Canada" in WILSON, Rob and DISSANAYAKE, Wimal (eds.), *Op. cit.*, p. 225, also see Fredric Jameson, "Cognitive Mapping" in Nelson, Cary and Grossberg, Lawrence, (eds.), *Op. cit.*, p. 351
- ⁴¹ SAID, Edward W. (1993), *Culture and Imperialism*, London: Vintage, 1994, pp. xxix
- ⁴² Judith Butler, *Op. cit.*, p. 440
- ⁴³ Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak, "Can the Subaltern Speak" in WILLIAMS, Patrick and CHRISMAN, Laura (eds.) (1993), *Colonial Discourse and Post-colonial Theory*, Hertfordshire: Harvester Wheatsheaf, 1994, p. 66
- ⁴⁴ Chicago Cultural Studies Group, "Critical Multiculturalism", in GOLDBERG, David Theo (ed.), *Op. cit.*, p. 115