On Global English and the Transmutation of Postcolonial Studies into "Literature in English"

Rita Raley

On Global English and the Transmutation of Postcolonial Studies into "Literature in English"[1]

Rita Raley
University of Minnesota

"English Literature is dead—long live writing in English." The multiplication of Englishes throughout the world and their attendant literatures, the impossibility of holding literary development within any one centrally agreed form, [sic] it is this explosion of writing in English which reflects back on the past to fissure the monument that is English literature into a plurality of writings.
— Colin MacCabe

What does it signify to speak of a World Literature in English? In what ways might diaspora studies and transnationalism be linked to the contemporary phenomenon of global English, with a mode of comprehending the world that holds English at its center? What can diaspora studies and transnationalism learn from the "language question" frequently raised in discussions of both cultural imperialism and postcolonial writing? What can they learn from the question of globalism now so ubiquitous in contemporary criticism? How does the Literature in English concept relate, on the one hand, to Edouard Glissant's outline of the "liberation" that results from compromising major languages with Creoles (250), and, on the other, to Fredric Jameson's implicit yearning for a philosophical universal linguistic standard not circumvented by linguistic heteroglossia (16–7)? These questions outline the conceptual terrain of this article, in which I read the discursive transmutation of the discipline of Postcolonial Studies into "Literature in English" as both symptom and cause of the emerging visibility of global English as a recognizable disciplinary configuration situated on the line between contemporary culture and the academy. Over the course of this article, I chart this discursive transmutation and its necessary preconditions—the critical investiture in the "global," the renewed attention to dialects, the abstraction of the "postcolonial"—as a way of articulating profound reservations about the "new universalisms," of which Literature in English is a primary instance. As a sub-field of academic study, Literature in English is marked by critical attention to linguistic heterogeneity and internal differences among English-speaking cultures, and it thus signifies a destabilization of

the whole notion of a standard language that has historically been aligned with colonialism. Building as it does on the critical concepts of hybridity and cultural creolization, this celebration of a global linguistic heterogeneity seeks to locate emancipatory possibilities within the literal "speaking back" to the imperial force of monolingualism. However, Literature in English, global English, global studies, and cosmopolitanisms can be read as new universalisms that are merely simulations of the old, that themselves contain a homogenizing and totalizing impulse, and that signify an epistemic and literal violence that the academy cannot afford to ignore.[2]

Having come of critical age in an academy that reverberated with the newly felt influence of Postcolonial Studies and the profound critique it brought to bear on Western epistemologies and their attendant assumptions about the world, scholars of my generation are now witness to a dramatic transformation that is also a mutation of this critical field into Literature in English.[3] The consequences of the globally common language this new disciplinary configuration implies have yet to be articulated. Without suggesting the possibility of total disciplinary coverage, I argue that Postcolonial Studies has still to come to terms with global English, and that it is important to effect such scrutiny because it is precisely through this language that the field has most prominently come to exist in the Western academy. Within English and Comparative Literature departments, which is where it has had its first crystallization as such in the West, Postcolonial Studies is still primarily a study of the *English* empire, despite the loosely metaphoric terms in which it has been employed and despite the burgeoning body of criticism on East Asia. Even though a substantial history of English as a linguistic, cultural, and literary program has accumulated, the problem of an assumed global language needs still to be thought, and the centrality of English in particular needs further consideration, for this "language of culture" continues to enjoy academic and social privilege (Zachrisson 10). Despite the fantastic promises of a benign and neutral means of communication that attend upon a vision of a globally common language, the inexorable twinnings of language and culture are such that this mythic common language is still bound to a particular cultural value, albeit one masked by universalism.

Wesley Enoch and Deborah Mailman's play *The Seven Stages of Grieving* offers one counter to the myth of English's neutrality when an Australian Aboriginal "Everywoman" appears on stage dancing and singing a Murri song until her movements and voice are arrested by the letters of the English alphabet, which flash in succession upon her body.[4] While this metaphoric inscription dramatizes the violence of linguistic imperialism and the inextricable connections of language and power, it also indicates the extent to which—twenty-five years after Louis-Jean Calvet's *Linguistique*

et Colonialisme—the world and the academy must still contend with the colonial impositions of language and, more specifically, with both overt and implicit claims for the sovereign rights of English. A critical discourse about the functions of language in the context of colonialism does exist, embodied in a discursive terrain most notably outlined by Ngugi wa Thiong'o in *Decolonising the Mind*. His reading of language as the constitutive vehicle of systemic power structures has been a touchstone for the development of Colonial and Postcolonial Studies as a mode of critical inquiry; yet the need to critique the tyranny of major languages and the inextricable connections of writing and violence is forced upon us with a renewed urgency by the phenomenon of global English.

Broadly conceived, global English is at once a descriptive and a performative phrase—one expressive of the "truth" that the English language is ideally, ineluctably destined to be, or even already is, universal. Produced by economic, social, and cultural forces it has not yet fully thought through, global English is a discursive feature of a late-capitalist episteme, and one with decidedly material effects; yet, at the level of the micrological, it has also to do with a kind of myopia that is at once linguistic, cultural, and critical. It is, in other words, what lies behind the notion that "everyone now speaks English."[5] This overconfident belief in linguistic superiority is reinforced in our current moment by the proliferation and popularity of trade books and journals on English since the 1950s, texts made both possible and culturally necessary by a new form of US hegemony and by the "return" of British colonial subjects during post-war reconstruction. Ultimately invested in reinforcing the conceit that the English language cannot be qualitatively improved upon, these texts range from a 1962 special issue of the *Times Literary Supplement* (see "Language") to Joseph Shipley's *In Praise of English* (1977) and Bill Bryson's *The Mother Tongue: English and How It Got That Way* (1990). Usually accompanied by a statistical computation of the number of English speakers in the world, however general or inexact, these confident testaments to the global status of English tend also to insist that the English language is enforcing networks of relation that supersede those of nation and ethnicity.[6] Global English is *not* simply a descriptive phrase for the imperial force of language and the new generation of cosmopolitan writers this force has produced. Neither is it simply the replacement term for "Literature in English" and as such the unifying conceptual force that sutures such transnational literary studies as Rosemary Marangoly George's *The Politics of Home* (1996). Rather, it is precisely the notion that the possibility for such a unification and consolidation behind a global language exists, *a notion that is dependent upon English itself as the condition of possibility for the very idea of the global*.

What remains to be said now that English is taken to be inevitably, ineluctably *here*—now that the power and global status of the English language are taken to be self-evident? The provisional answer is that the space for critical intervention on this issue is *not* best located, as it often has been, within the study of linguistic appropriations, the study of the destabilizing and dehegemonizing of English through the formation of dialects, Creoles, and neologisms. Another space for inquiry and critical intervention is located within the discursive monumentalizing of English. Such inquiry is necessary to counter the insistent long-term critical discourse of the inevitability of English. The monumentalizing of English found within general accounts of English as a *lingua franca* and within academic studies of "World Literature in English" is indicative of a desire for (an inexorably interlinked) cultural-linguistic hegemony over both literal and metaphoric global spaces. For example, we might do well to focus critical attention on the kind of universalizing gesture exhibited by Robert Burchfield and Hans Aarsleff's claim that "What was once an isolated group of local dialects has become an immensely potent group of international superdialects. The only circumstance that could change things now, it would seem, is a nuclear winter and the reduction of whole English-speaking communities to blocks of cindered ice" (30). In this vision of English caught up in the force of a teleological projection of history, language gains in power by being a kind of collective of the sort whose progress can only be cut short by a disaster of apocalyptic proportions. More specifically, English emerges as an "international superdialect" because it has been able to consolidate a unity in the midst of diversity, to re-impose a standard in the midst of fragmentation. However ironic it may be to figure English as an über-language, a tone one can read in Burchfield and Aarsleff's claim, it would be difficult to argue that dialects have resulted in radical upheavals in the power, status, and positioning of the language "group," in critical circles or in the world.

Indeed, now that dialects have themselves accumulated a sizable history via the proliferation of academic "guides" or "companions" to them, "English" as such seems to have undergone a semantic expansion unequaled even by the "postcolonial."[7] It is no accident that I turn to the academy at this moment, for what is ultimately at issue here is at least one visible and ideological effect of this semantic expansion: to work from my epigraph, *what is at issue is the rebuilding of a "monument of English literature," a renewal of the category of "literature in English," out of vastly dissimilar documents, even as this very difference is incorporated as both constitutive and axiomatic* (MacCabe 18). This literary monument is being constructed in the disciplinary terrain known as Colonial and Postcolonial Studies, a terrain occupied and reoccupied by the

British empire in particular, and this occupation is a matter of the monumentalized primacy of the English language.

Ideas about the worldwide adaptability, primacy, and privilege of the English language have come into circulation through the investiture of English as "the lingua franca of the TNC era" (Miyoshi, "Borderless" 742), as a language of consumer culture and exchange, and through commentary on its use in the film industry and in the realms of technology,[8] science, economics and finance,[9] where certain concepts in everyday use are held to be untranslatable and thereby bound to the English language.[10] The problem of global English is one of a "major" language, a language believed to be dominant, pervasive, and universal, and a language granted access to the technological and economic means to ensure its hegemony. Trade, finance, high technology, and industry have been attached to English, but there are both literal and symbolic economies involved, for English has become a kind of industry in and of itself. The industry of English is such that it has come into being with the modern capitalist state, and it has adapted, altered, and otherwise remade itself as both instrument and specter of late capitalism. In the context of any discussion of this industry and its material manifestation on the Web, in economics and finance, or in scientific and technological circles, one must necessarily comment both on the resources shifted in the direction of English and on those produced from it. Writing of the mandatory curricular training in English and of the "business" of English itself in "The Invention of English Literature in Japan," for example, Masao Miyoshi notes that "what all this means is both a massive dose of English for everyone and an immense pool of English faculty and instructional resources, that is to say, a thriving multibillion-dollar industry" (271).[11] In this scenario, as in others, English functions in many parts of the world as an industry with a corrective or medicinal purpose, in a repetition of the colonial logic: "first create needs, then help" (Trinh 89).

In sum, I am suggesting that global English is reflective of the intersection of late capitalist cultural and academic practices. Further, as a disciplinary configuration, *global English not only realigns literary studies with postcolonial studies, but goes beyond that to realign both of them with a paradoxically transnational yet also culturally myopic vision of globalism.* There are parallels, then, between these new disciplinary categories and the discourses of globalization: even as they thrive upon an unresolvable tension between the universal and the particular, they promise an impossible heterogeneity that not only stabilizes difference and masks a homogenizing impulse, but also conceals one of the most important power/knowledge configurations of the current moment.

Global Structures, Global Strictures

How have we moved from a moment in which James Bradshaw, for example, imagines English as an "international language" in his *Scheme for Making the English Language the International Language of the World* (1847), or, almost a hundred years later, Robert Zachrisson imagines "World-English" in his *Anglic* (1932), to a moment in which David Crystal imagines it as *global*, as he does in *English as a Global Language* (1997)? These are not just syntactic substitutions, and *the move from "world" to "global" in particular signifies a crucial epistemic shift*, one that can be made visible through a careful scrutiny of the transnational structures of capital, technology, information, and media. It is now almost a commonplace that globalization marks a severing of the links of one sort or another between nation and—in no particular order—capital, technology, world systems (economic or diplomatic), information, knowledge, culture, and identity. Despite this sense of globalization as a monolithic, impregnable, and omnipresent force, however, the specific critical significations of the term are by no means univocal.

So far globalization has been described in several distinct, though overlapping, terms: (1) as the reconfigured, transnational economic relationships that have been made possible by new technologies, including the outsourcing and subcontracting of production processes, and particularly as practiced by transnational and multinational corporations such as IBM and General Motors;[12] (2) as the project of enterprise, marketing, and sales on a worldwide scale, manifest in the opening of a KFC in Tiananmen Square, or in Niketown "going global" with plans for new sports-entertainment-mall complexes overseas;[13] (3) as the "global cultural flows" and multidirectional migrations of people, capital, information, media, and the new technologies, as Arjun Appadurai has most notably described them;[14] (4) as the trans-, even supra-, national communication networks and "global media landscapes" formed by the new technologies and the use of these networks to transmit information.[15] Most of the theorizing of globalism from a European or North or South American perspective to date has occurred within cultural studies; media and communication studies and science and technology studies (Ang; Mattelart, Delcourt, and Mattelart); political science and international relations (Ostry and Nelson); the social sciences, particularly economics,[16] anthropology, and sociology; and business literature. Literary theorists are quickly turning their attention in this direction, however, and beginning to articulate a field marked by a renewed concern with anglophone writing and third world literature, the attendant theoretical problems of subjectivity and identity, and a thematic concern with the rereading of Empire, the heart of darkness story, the witnessing of disaster,

border cultures, and diasporas. To invoke the global, then, is to invoke long and not necessarily discrete historical and intellectual traditions drawn from disciplines across the university.

Globalism is taken to be the governing logic of institutions, a constitutive part of a late capitalist, postmodern episteme, and the fabric out of which are spun the patterns of everyday lives in the late twentieth century. Its very name has been made to signify both territorial and spatial incursions *and* the dismantling of these same spatial boundaries; that is, it simultaneously embodies the movements of capital into nations defined as emerging markets and the construction of "Geocities" on the World Wide Web. The loss of the temporal and epistemological specificity of the terms *global, globalism*, and *globality* is a testament to their academic currency within contemporary criticism. That is, *the designation of globalism has come to lend texts, authors, and historical moments a kind of legitimation by association with an oppositional and even euphoric academic politics that continues to battle critical work taking the concept of nation to be foundational*. In this context, the "global" as such does part of the critical work that used to be done by the "postcolonial," but now, instead of an abstracted general metaphor for oppression, we have a general metaphor in part for hybridity and re-imagined cultural matrices, with an added emphasis on spatiality and a political engagement with a variety of regional—rather than specifically post-colonial—communities.[17]

The lingering dilemma of globalization is whether it is to be read as a force of homogeneity or as one constituted by heterogeneity: whether it is to be read, then, as a territorializing or as a deterritorializing process.[18] In its wake, the "three worlds theory"—the alignment of continents, countries, and hemispheres in a hierarchical tripartite order based on general structures of capital and government—has left behind a number of replacement mythologies, only one of which is the singular, homogeneous, international-economic-political formation known as the "one world," an idea most frequently represented in investigations of the Americanization, "McDonaldization," or even "Disneyfication" of the world.[19] These creative appellations—none of which can be held as separable from the English language—signify ongoing neocolonial cultural impositions and an attendant economic and political hegemony, and they quite often meet with the same range of critical alarms that greeted Francis Fukuyama's projection of the "end of history" and the "last man."[20] One is reminded in this instance of Erich Auerbach's almost mournful meditation on a lost age of differences, an age that has succumbed in the end to an "economic and cultural levelling" process (488). Powerful statements such as these have been made about the homogeneity brought on by global capitalism, though all too often the particular studies of the leveling effects of economic

globalization take a turn toward the apocalyptic in their portrayal of a world in which capital runs rampant, streaming through states and institutions alike, only to pass through to another state and to another market.[21] This vision of a global economic "order" makes the idea of the state an extraneous one: it is a vision of capitalism's future as its present, a vision of capital moving in an unchecked and viral flow, circumscribed only by the 'adjectival insistence' of the critic, who applies breaks to the flow with a cautionary pronouncement of capital's "increasing achievement of total mobility and access to every corner of the world" (Robinson 14, emphasis mine).

The other side of the coin, as it were, is a reading of the processes of globalization as fundamentally a matter of heterogeneity brought on by use and appropriation. Arjun Appadurai has notably argued that global structures constitute diversity, that the physical movement (here termed "global flows") of capital, information, media, the new technologies, and people can only result in difference and not sameness. There are fundamental differences even among the ways the heterogeneity produced by "global" cultural contact is imagined: as a process of *hybridization* that involves a fusion of forms and content; as a process of *transculturation* that involves physical movement; or even as a process of *indigenization* whereby cultural practices and products are made local or "native" (Lull 155–9). However many forms heterogeneity is imagined to take, there remains the danger of inscribing it as the neatly diametrical opposites of homogeneity, sameness, and purity. The trouble with hybridity, in other words, is that heterogeneity once more links up with homogeneity as its all-too-familiar better half. On the one side is the lure of theories of globalization as a totalizing process, and on the other, the valorization of context, with emphasis on positioning, situatedness, and ethnocentrism.[22] My suggestion here is that neither narrative is sufficient and that the heterogeneity–homogeneity problem remains one of the large and irreconcilable structuring problems of globalization, global English, and Literature in English. The new universalisms, as I am terming them here, are bound by a hermeneutic circle of the universal and the particular, or the global and the local, that does not necessarily lend itself to solutions.

One of the more visible effects of the critical interest in globalization and the often attendant theorizing of the evolving status of the nation-state has been the reconfiguration of group identity in relation to particular spaces. Saskia Sassen, for example, has produced influential studies of urban empowerment zones; Joel Kotkin has analyzed the phenomenon of global, ethnic, cosmopolitan "tribes"; and Neal Stephenson has outlined a cyber-punk vision of a world ordered by "phyles" in his novel *The Diamond Age*. In a moment in which territorial disputes, particularly those having to do with the

claims of aboriginal and dispossessed populations, have been increasingly articulated in the public sphere and in the academy, spatiality has become axiomatic. One such example is the reading of the world according to "niches" (whether conceived as economic markets or as enterprise and high-tech industry zones) so as to investigate the relations between urban space and economic and cultural power. Robert Reich has written of this phenomenon in terms of reconfigured spatial zones—they are "global webs," in his terms, and formed by new corporate alignments of high-value, as opposed to high-volume, industry (118–21). Such alliances between spatial orderings of the world and economic power have been powerfully illustrated through taxonomies of labor populations, whereby high densities of information specialists ("symbolic" analysts, as Reich has termed them) and manual laborers are aligned not in accordance with a First World/Third World division, but in accordance with hemispheric divisions of north and south.[23]

In such a critical moment, "English" as such has also contributed to a reordering of the world into separate, and not equal, discursive spaces—the English-speaking world and everywhere else—that accord with neither national nor hemispheric divisions. That is, "the English-speaking world" can be located within a part of New York, China, Sri Lanka, Guatemala, or whatever. The passing into common currency of this cartographic ordering of spaces that are at once material and mythic attests to the assumed importance and hegemony of English, to the presumptions of its unequivocal centrality, and also, ultimately, to the strength of the Foucauldian alliance of knowledge with economic and cultural power. Instead of the euphemistic British Commonwealth, what we are left with, in part, is a spatial formation even beyond the wildest imaginings of empire: a kind of English-speaking diaspora, a group of people for whom there is no need of a homeland and who are universally linked, not really by syntax, idiom, orthography, or orthoëpy, but by a basic vocabulary.

The idea of an English-speaking world presumes a linguistic unity that allows for internal differences, but the differences inherent in regional varieties of English are often assumed to be based only on national categories, when in fact they are not. While it is the case that Great Britain and the US tend in the main to be monoglot, it is important to consider the differences in English even *within* Great Britain and the US, class dialects, and even the dialectic linkages of the underclasses within England with native or colonial populations around the world. Intra-national dialects such as Black English or Spanglish trouble the boundaries of nations and reveal that the question of a common language has less to do with national linguistic standards than with regional socio-economic and cultural formations. They also raise the issue of

linguistic proprietary rights, which are embodied in the phrases "our English," "our native language," or "our mother-tongue."[24] However the mythology of a common linguistic consciousness has been produced and circulated, one has to account for the ubiquity of the pronoun "our" as a reclamation project, even as a project of consolidation that imposes a structure of wholeness over fragmentation. The English language is by no means a uniform structure, and most histories of the language will demonstrate that it has been linked to other language systems from its beginnings—a linkage that has had a seemingly infinite number of combinatorial possibilities and made it impossible to speak of a univocal language system as anything other than an unrealizable dream. As any anecdote of miscommunication will indicate, English as such is rife with internal differences, and it has been and will continue to be caught in ambiguities. In fact, one might even say that the language is always already hyphenated, that it is always a question of dialects, of "which English?" rather than "English," and that it is a structure in which the forces of unification and fragmentation are always at war with one another.[25] But, ironically with the aid of "Literature in English," *we have been lulled out of thinking that the hyphen exists*, and the important problem is not how this has happened, but what the consequences are to be.

One or Several Englishes?

In Charles Doughty's *Travels in Arabia Deserta* (1888)—a wild travel narrative with elements of anthropology, literature, topography, lexicography, and philology—a desert traveler records this exchange: "Mohammed said now, 'He must learn the English tongue whilst Khalîl stayed with him, for who can foresee the years to come, this world is so tickle [*sic*], and it might one day serve him'" (158–9). A documentation of the ability of British imperialists to instill a desire for their language, this passage also demonstrates the desire of the travel writer to record testimonials to the superiorities of the English language in an authentic "native" voice. Doughty was concerned above all else with reforming the "civilized" language of English through a process of exchange with "primitive" Arabic, a project that produced neologisms, such as "townling" (raised in town) and "thick-blooded," that were based on English roots and designed to match expressions extant in Arabic. Such neologisms stand as examples of the linguistic changes ushered in by cultural contact, some with more resulting permanence than others, and now known as dialects, pidgins, Creoles, and "new Englishes."

When an imperial language advances into "foreign" territories, it is defended through various centralizing and codifying apparatuses of the state—dictionaries, grammars, and institutions of

official instruction—all of which function as a means of preserving and constituting a structure of homogeneity in the face of a counter-inhabitation by local populations.[26] Despite the physical spread of English and the assertion of it as a major, dominant, and global language that by extension aims to model a universal colonial subject, the attempt to assemble a homogeneous linguistic structure must necessarily be a failed project because speakers will inevitably make the language their own. Thus, the use and reappropriation of a major language has become a limit case for the way theorists locate agency—a kind of *in situ* assertion of control and resistance—in the instance of a colonial imposition of language. In other words, critical attention has almost definitively shifted to the articulation and theorization of how resistance might work through translation, or by making a colonial language indigenous via dialects and pidgins, with certain theoretical concepts as referents: hybridity, mimicry, and the performative aspects of subjugation and coloniality.[27] An emphasis on appropriation and performativity involves thinking against the grain of the familiar oppositions: will, imposition, and oppression on the part of the colonizer; passivity, receptivity, and powerlessness on the part of the colonized.[28]

In addition to their capacity to signify agency and innovation, dialects can also be understood as constitutive of a kind of oppositional community. They signify both a reformation of the language at the level of the everyday and the presence of a unifying and self-contained insularity in the face of imperial institutional strictures. Countering the powerful and centralizing force of standard languages, they offer instead a dynamic heteroglossia. For example, Ken Saro-Wiwa's "rotten English" precludes the official forgetting of the violence of a neocolonial rule made visible in the "big big Grammar" of those in power. So, too, do pidgins, slang, jargon, and cant[29] function as community-based codes that serve to constitute, unify, and circumscribe various sociocultural groups. Glissant's reading of the social and communicative networks forged by Creoles, by global hybrid languages, is resonant here. Of a writer like Salman Rushdie, one could say that the play inherent in the idioms produced by the encounter of different language systems implies a celebration of the carnivalesque tendencies of the demotic, of its triumph over the rigidity of standard languages and the unidirectional imposition of imperial culture.[30] For Rushdie, as for Glissant and Saro-Wiwa, vernacularity outlines community—the destabilization of a dominant language intertwines with the destabilization of a dominant culture, and a cultural Creole results.

So, too, the emphasis upon linguistic appropriation derives from the critical belief that top-down explanations or models of containment are not adequate to the problem of how English moves

throughout the world, primarily because it is not sufficient to say that money alone moves language or even that it alone creates a desire for language. Like many advocates of the study of global linguistic heterogeneity, I would agree that it is necessary to abide by both economic and ideological explanations for linguistic imperialism: and yet, to begin and end an analysis of a cultural practice with the economic forces that determine it is to miss the ways in which that practice signifies—the way it registers resistance, consent, and desire. Such an interest in signification, or signifying, informs the critical perspective behind the formulation of Literature in English as an emergent disciplinary category. However, we can build a better critical picture along the lines of Deleuze and Guattari's articulation of a unitary language at perpetual war with dialects, "minor" languages armed against the "major" with "the power of variation" (101). That is, *insofar as the territorializing force of standard English is locked in a continual and contestatory struggle with the deterritorializing force of dialects, the homogeneity–heterogeneity structure common to the problem of Literature in English and globalization is common to the problem of dialects as well.* Meaningful curricular and departmental reform has resulted from the theoretical shifts signaled by a renewed critical interest in dialects—for example, not simply the replacement of introductory "Third World" literature courses with courses in "World Literatures in English," but also the large-scale realignments of areas of inquiry within English departments according to chronology rather than according to nation. The theoretical insight Literature in English is meant to signify, however, needs to be modulated in order for us to recognize its homogenizing power and its capacity to domesticate difference.

The myriad possibilities of community formation have been important to contemporary understandings of dialects, but it remains the case that dialects also demarcate the line between Self and Other, between native and foreign. Put more baldly, linguistic difference functions as a trope for alterity and racial difference. George Lucas's *Star Wars, Episode I: The Phantom Menace* character Jar Jar Binks cannot be far from our minds here, particularly given the frequency with which linguistic alterity is coded as comic. For example, the dialect of colonial-era native Indian clerks, so-called Baboo English, was presented to a native English-speaking audience in the form of "amusing specimens" designated as impure, incomplete, and in and among the "scraps" of vernacular languages.[31] In this instance, the mockery and derision of rotten English provided a means of glorifying the idea of a proper cultural-linguistic standard. Another example would be the ubiquitous Internet post "World Signs in English," the list of inadvertent puns and *double entendres* supposedly discovered in territories unequivo-

cally coded as foreign, along with the entire genre of the "humors of the English language" that lies behind it.[32] These collections of subnormal linguistic oddities, positioned as foreign and external to a more learned, civilized, and usually First World community, serve primarily to denigrate the Other and thereby consolidate and secure the spatial ordering suggested by the prefix "sub." In these contexts, in other words, dialects are read not as symptoms of a joyful debilitation of linguistic and cultural norm, but as a means by which to constitute the very idea of a norm.

Pidgins, in particular, have their origins in the signification of a racial difference that is meant to be read as inferior and primitive. Generally understood to be common languages shared by people who do not speak them as first languages, pidgins are based on an etymological mythology that links them to a mutation of a Chinese word for "business."[33] "Pidgin-English" is also applied to a language with English words and pronunciation and Chinese idiom, a language that emerged through contact between Europeans and Chinese in Chinese seaports in the nineteenth century and was held up as a corruption of standard English by a different kind of "native" speaker.[34] Another example of the exoticizing or "making primitive" of other languages is given by Armand Mattelart and Ariel Dorfman in their reading of the cultural imperialism of the Walt Disney Corporation, *How to Read Donald Duck: Imperialist Ideology in the Disney Comic*. As part of a tour through the ideological underpinnings of the world of Donald Duck, they present a farcical guide for travelers with this helpful hint about the customs of the "noble savages" one is sure to encounter: "LANGUAGE. No need for an interpreter or phrase book. Almost all of them speak fluent Duckburgish. And if you have a small child with you, don't worry, he will get on fine with those other little natives whose language tends to the babyish kind, with a preference for gutturals" (45). Such a perspective of linguistic alterity is by no means limited to languages encountered in "foreign" spaces; rather, such a perspective endures as an integral part of a peculiarly American way of seeing. For example, just as pidgins are relegated to the sphere of the racial other in a move that distances them from the centered seat of white privilege, so, too, do foreign or vaguely "other" languages make up part of the din of Don DeLillo's vision of postmodern America, joining washing machines, trash compactors, TVs, radios, and supermarket intercoms as background, "white noise." Exceeding even the designations of minor, "makeshift or minimum" languages, counter-inhabitations of a major language system are quite often written under the sign of the primitive and the barbarous. They are, in other words, the ultimate hallmark of the underdeveloped and the uncivilized. Linked through the signs of linguistic difference, rendered as "Duckburgish," "gibberish,"

"oddities," "babble," "noise," or "marks," these examples demonstrate the extent to which—in a restatement of Derrida's thesis in *Of Grammatology*—the structures of logocentrism and ethnocentrism are deeply intertwined.

While one of Postcolonial Studies' more prominent critical projects has been the exposure and repudiation of both logocentrism and ethnocentrism, Literature in English implicitly allows for a recentering around the notion of English itself and for a stabilization of linguistic heterogeneity as alterity. Like the study of globalization, Postcolonial Studies destabilized the colonial form of the nation as a foundational category; it also considered such phenomena as migratory populations and "traveling cultures" as a means of troubling the binarisms of subject/object and self/other (Clifford). In light of this unsettling of categorical privilege, brought on in part by the phenomenon that the field in particular continues to hold dear—the cementing of cosmopolitan and diasporan identities in the wake of ethnic relocations of all types—the codes of power and authority can for the most part no longer simply be understood as based on race. The codes of power and authority must be understood to be language based as well. As a careful scrutiny of the furor surrounding the Oakland School Board's introduction of Ebonics as a linguistic system will illustrate, the racial other has certainly not disappeared, but it is quite often re-coded and re-emerges as a linguistic other. In other words, while the body continues to be violently inscribed with the markers of racial difference, the voice the body gives utterance to has been undergoing a powerful inscription of its own. The use of "corruptions" of standard English as a trope for racial difference has been a dominant convention in Western discourse, but we have arrived at a moment in which linguistic inferiority in this respect is attendant upon and, arguably, even constitutive of difference. It is fair to say, working from Homi Bhabha's reading of the status of the figure of the Other in theoretico-philosophical discourse, that the Other *does* lose its power to signify in that it is denied agency and in that it functions as a critically strategic object of knowledge (*Location* 19–39). However, it is also fair to say that the Other does *not* lose its power to signify inasmuch as it continues to signify difference, a difference whose ultimate horizon is that of language. What unites the Others of all of the theoretical master narratives of Bhabha's analysis, after all, is not just their general positioning vis-à-vis a Western subject or a Western culture, but their ultimate positioning vis-à-vis Western languages. In other words, I am again articulating a skepticism about the idea that "new Englishes" represent liberatory possibilities. Such a skepticism is provoked both by the subsuming of new Englishes under the unitary rubric of "global English" (which, by implication, renews the embodiment of the

imperialist project within English) and by the alignment of new Englishes with alterity. While pidgins and other means of linguistic appropriation continue to be inscribed as primitive and non-standard, celebrations of linguistic difference remain violent inscriptions of their own.

"English Literature is dead—long live writing in English"

Anyone who has sat down to compose a literature course, a Web page, or an academic list of canonical or otherwise "required" texts by twentieth-century authors can attest to the inordinate difficulties of taxonomical arrangement. When dealing with the phenomenon of diasporan populations, one that presumes a concerted effort to read across the boundaries of nations, how does one classify, order, and arrange the massive number of volumes that continue to be pulled into the space of literatures in English? What to do with the novelist or poet who was born in Bombay, Sri Lanka, London, or Nairobi and now resides in St. Lucia, Canada, or New York? These are the problems that spring from a conflicted nexus of national, ethnic, and cultural identities, a messy terrain of highly unstable and subjective categorical distinctions that can offer the illusion of certainty only when the selection criteria are made almost stringently spatial, as in the granting of a national appellation ("an Indian writer") on the basis of birth plus a variable term of residence.[35] Even more inconstant and abstracted than the category of the national, though, is that of the continental, where what binds one writer to another is seemingly nothing more than a sometime habitation of a body of land: Doris Lessing and Buchi Emecheta, for example, are both "African writers" according to any number of academically produced lists of authors. This monolithic and homogenizing appellation is not without its conveniences and motivations, as its positioning introduces seams and fractures into the web of significations that binds "Africa" to "black" and provides a means of dissociation from the essentially colonial and still bitterly contested form of the nation. It is difficult to see how Lessing can be remade as a Zimbabwean author, but not at all difficult to see how she might be "rediscovered" and situated within the looser and more general canon of African literature in English.

The critical interest in particulars of place and origin might also be seen as part of a larger, some might say postmodern, organization of knowledge along the lines of the local and the particular and even along the lines of "situatedness" as part of a general ethnographic interest in the specificities of culture.[36] While such an interest parallels the critical moves made within various sub-fields of literary and cultural studies, it has still an unmistakably anthropological inclination, one that is often visible in the new

anthologies and collections of Anglophone writing, which are both sign and precondition of global English's emergence as a disciplinary configuration.[37] For the anthropological tone of the anthologies, it is worth noting at some length Doris Lessing's foreword to *The Cambridge Guide to Literature in English,* published 1993, which is rather like an advertisement for literature as a travel guide, setting up Other countries as objects to be "known" through literature:

> What did we know about the feel, taste, texture, the airs and aromas of South America before the recent explosion of wonderful South American novels, most translated into English? Or about Africa until the novels written by Africans in English, which issued from one end of the continent to the other? Nigeria, Ghana, Kenya, Somalia, Zimbabwe, South Africa—we are invited in, for writers are like hosts…. In the last decade or two we have felt at home in Canada. The USA has always been part of our literary domain, because of a language which—though developing so fast—remains a cousin of our own. (n.p.)

It is "because of a language," indeed, that these different literatures are united under the rubric of Literature in English, where "in" signifies an inhabiting or positioning within not just a language but also a culture. "Literature in English" simultaneously signifies the particulars of place and the global, and in this respect it echoes as well the structuring problem for modernity, the local and the global. That is, it signifies a metaphoric and a material positioning, on the one hand, and functions as a replacement for "world literature," on the other, primarily because most academics in the humanities recognize the category as one that encompasses literature from all over the world written originally in English. The category "Literature in English" not only signifies but has replaced Commonwealth, Anglophone, and, now, Postcolonial Literature. In its most fantastic evocations as a question of the "stepmother tongue" (Skinner), it links together not just writing from the former British colonies, but so-called minority writing from within Great Britain and the US as well, which highlights the extent to which these presumably new disciplinary alignments ultimately legitimate the center. Even as it promises to transcend the grand narratives and homogenizing power of the category of English Literature, Literature in English masks its universality as particularity; that is, "English" itself implies unity and sameness even as it promises an attention to multiplicity and differences.

As the Western demand for "Third World writing" has opened up both markets and migratory paths, the distinctions between the

"English" and the "Commonwealth" have become at once ever more murky and ever more definitive. While the ambiguities of the exact meanings of national and ethnic categories remain, an insistence on categorical specificity has developed as well, and it is visible in the persistence of the hyphen that names writers as Sri Lankan–Canadian or Indo-English. The hyphen makes manifest what otherwise seems an implicit desire to assert a fixed signification for the identity of the author. Now that literary production in English comes from any number of locations all over the world, and now that "English literature" is understood as primarily bound to English-born or English-identified authors, there is clearly a need for a replacement term, and that need has come to be realized by the phrase "Literature in English." The rationale for this replacement is often argued to be a matter of historical necessity brought on by "the explosion of writing in English" (MacCabe); by the insufficiency of the label "Commonwealth"; by the schism of American and English literature; by the growth of "other Anglophone literatures" within the US (Bergonzi 76); and by the need to make distinctions between Anglophone literatures in Britain and literary texts in Gaelic and Welsh. Thus, we now have a category that promises to erase borders and boundaries and to organize itself around what an otherwise "multifarious literary community" can presumably hold in common: language (Ramraj xxvii). Without any real national or ethnic boundaries (other than that of the distinction between English and American literatures), the category of "World Literature in English" promises to circumvent the taxonomic problems brought on by transculturation, intellectual migrations, and the phenomenon of the "cosmopolitan celebrity."[38] This is a question of the academic organization and reorganization of literature because the new disciplinary maps of the field—as embodied in anthologies with such titles as Ramraj's *Concert of Voices: An Anthology of World Writing in English*—aim to restructure the boundaries of extant critical fields. In these maps, chronological, national, or otherwise territorial boundaries have ceded to the linguistic.

An initial point of comparison for the new anthologies is Matthew Arnold's claim that everyone contributes to "one great literature—English Literature"—an insistence upon the idea that international English literature both sutures and exceeds national literary traditions:[39]

I see advertised *The Primer of American Literature*. Imagine the face of Philip or Alexander at hearing of a Primer of Macedonian Literature! Are we to have a primer of Canadian Literature, too, and a Primer of Australian? We are all contributors to one great literature—English Literature. The

contribution of Scotland to this literature is far more serious
and important than that of America has so far had time to be;
yet a "Primer of Scotch Literature" would be an absurdity.
And these things are not only absurd; they are also retarding.
(Bergonzi 72)

There are fundamental epistemological differences at work between
the moment of Arnold's primer and the moment of the new anthol-
ogies of Literature in English, not the least of which is that his
belongs to a colonial episteme ruled by ideas of national and civil
progress unimpeded by "retarding" fractures or by claims of dif-
ference. The practical demands of the professions of academe and
of publishing are now qualitatively and quantitatively different, for
authors need to be put into categories insofar as they need to be
placed on bookshelves, on reading lists for field exams, in courses
and syllabi, in books and in book catalogs—all of which has resulted
in a kind of categorical urge to which even alphabetically arranged
collections eventually yield. So, too, are the demands of period-
ization and specificity now different, for there is generally a wide-
spread but unarticulated need to situate both the text and the
author according to place, particularly as the strictly delimiting
confines of national identity are held to be at once theoretically
illegitimate and technically insufficient.

Ian Hamilton's alphabetically arranged *Companion to Twentieth-
Century Poetry in English*, for example, accedes to the necessity of
establishing regional alignments in his introduction: "Of the poets,
550 are British, 550 American. Other territories break down as
follows: Australia (120), Canada (110), Africa (60), Asia (40), New
Zealand (35), Caribbean (30)" (ix). Behind the seemingly neutral
cloak of the alphabet lies a fairly rigid taxonomical system whereby
Great Britain and America are held to be on exactly equal terms,
with the other "Anglophone" nations neatly aligned in descending
order. A geographical desire is also manifested in the drive toward
territorial coverage, and it is worth noting that almost every one of
the new anthologies, collections, guides, and compendia devoted to
the "new" or "emergent" literatures contained by the phrase "in
English" succumbs to it (see Sutherland). Jenny Stringer's *The
Oxford Companion to Twentieth-Century Literature in English*,
published in 1996, is a good example of a geographical desire at
work, "representing as it does all geographical areas of the
Anglophone world and a wide range of writing ... its scope extends
from the United Kingdom, Ireland, and America, *to* Australia,
Canada, New Zealand, Asia, Africa, and the Caribbean" (vii,
emphasis added). What both of these examples make clear is that
the gesture of manifest inclusion in order to unite all of twentieth-
century literature in English under one explanatory category is

ordered along optical-hierarchical lines, with value proceeding *"from"* the old terrain of Anglo-America *"to"* the rest of the English-speaking world. There are three categories at work even within this space of the English-speaking world: English literature, American literature, and Other literature. Stringer's volume is by no means aberrant in its internal organization along the lines of American writing, British writing, and "other areas of the Anglophone world," qualified only as "literature *originally* in English" (xv). Similarly, after he acknowledges that "most people are agreed that 'poetry in English' can no longer be thought of in the singular" (vi), Ian Hamilton goes on to locate the central split in his *The Oxford Companion to Twentieth-century Poetry in English*, published in 1994, between the "poetries" and language systems of Great Britain and the United States.

The critical effort to "fissure the monument" of English into "literatures" or "poetries" derives from specific political purposes: to disavow cultural standardization and homogeneity; to celebrate literary, cultural, and historical differences; to dismantle the hegemony of English literature as such in the academy; and to recognize the theoretical and practical differences among linguistic traditions within English. The crucial example of the latter purpose is Rey Chow's "In the Name of Comparative Literature":

> The many different types of postcolonial writings which continue to be produced in the "single" language of English or French should require us to rethink comparative literature's traditional language requirements, so that, in principle at least, it should be possible for some students to do work in comparative literature using one language (even though I very much doubt that that would ever be the case). (114)[40]

In these terms, the rapidly evolving discipline of Literature in English is by its very nature comparative. Chow's implicit assumption is that any serious academic study of the different literary texts produced in the English language must by necessity engage with the dramatically different conditions of historical and cultural production that mark each one. What links literature produced in Kenya with that produced in Australia or Jamaica in her formulation, then, is the very notion of a common language. Beyond this link, one must engage not only with the differences within that language, but also with the problem of each person's different inhabitations of the language and different experiences of its imposition. In the end, arguments like Chow's lead us to the conclusion that texts produced in Kenya, Australia, and Trinidad are linked by a common language that is not really held in common at all.

The real dangers of this critical and curricular approach, though, are both that it widens the institutional space in which it is acceptable to evade a serious study of languages other than English and that it occludes the interrogation of the interest in locating fundamental cross-cultural similarities. With the desire to locate kinship within the different traditions of literatures in English, in other words, we are not far from the Orientalism that identifies both sameness and difference between the East and West, as Edward Said has shown. Nor are we far from perhaps the most persistent universalism of them all: humanism. It makes perfect sense, then, that Lessing's brief tribute to the anthropological knowledge made possible by the infinite varieties of literature in English should conclude with a tribute to the literatures themselves, "because every tale is a report from people whose differences are only variations on the theme of our humanity."

Ironically enough, the ethical imperative helping to fuel the development of Literature in English as a discipline—a sense of political obligation to be representative and to undo the hegemony of Anglo-American English literature and culture in the classroom—does not seem to extend satisfactorily to auto-critique. That is, the problem of language embedded in the very idea of "English" is at best under-recognized. Within English departments, the "language issue" is often enough relegated to a pre-modern past or held to begin and end with the Achebe/Ngugi debate, which in itself still sidesteps the issue of a dominant language. So, too, the English language is the most problematic and unspoken question of Postcolonial Studies within Western English and literature departments. To admit to the problems posed by the question is to admit that one of the most influential critical principles in the last twenty years—the power/knowledge critique made so forcefully by Said in the tradition of Foucault—has gone unheeded. It is, further, as if the foundations of Postcolonial Studies itself would become unstable in the face of the revelation of an enormous critical paradox: one must use English to be heard, and yet to do so at one level seems to accede to the very power structures that the field had been constituted to critique. Indeed, the moment in which Arif Dirlik raises the problem of the "language of postcolonial discourse," when the object of his critique is in fact the metaphorics, rhetoricity, and ideologies of this discourse, is quite revealing, for it indicates how unmentionable the language issue, and particularly the English language issue, remains, outside of the problems of subjectivity that are thought through the possibilities of dialects and new Englishes (341–2).

The mutation of "Postcolonial Studies" into "Literature in English" inhibits our ability to critique English itself, to make distinctions among texts, to recognize the ways in which Laurence Sterne's *Tristram Shandy* and Amos Tutuola's *The Palm-Wine*

Drinkard are evaluated differently, and to make visible the differences in the economic, intellectual, and critical forces behind the production and circulation of, for example, Salman Rushdie's *Satanic Verses* and Caryl Phillips's *Crossing the River*. What this mutation does make visible, however, are the tenacious roots still lurking beneath the critical field of Literature in English: fixed and firm oppositions, such as English and not-English, center and periphery, home and colony, continue to insinuate their influence on the academy. I suggest, then, that the academy must think through and come to terms with the new disciplinary configuration of global English if it is to avoid what Gayatri Spivak has termed a "global ignorance" (278). In the context of her work, that remark reverberates with a devastating critique of cultural myopia, the ethnocentric assumptions of Western theoretical discourse, and the inextricable connections between logocentrism and ethnocentrism. Yet, it serves as a cautionary note here as well, for to treat seriously the idea that comparative cultural work may comfortably be done from within the structure of the English language is to become deeply implicated in the processes whereby that language— even as the sum total of a number of different languages—gains a greater and greater hegemony.

Notes

1. This article was first submitted for publication in 1998. Alan Liu, Russell Samolsky, David Simpson, Khachig Tölölyan, and Timothy Wager provided invaluable comments, criticisms, and suggestions. I wish to thank Shirley Lim, Jody Enders, Lyn Korenic, and Vince Willoughby, too, for their careful readings of portions of the text.

2. Although I am arguing for their theoretical similarities, an extensive case can be made as well for the practical differences between universalism (usually held to be the province of the cosmopolitan) and globalism. To invoke the cosmopolitan is to situate these discursive nodes within a philosophical tradition ushered in by Kant. See Cheah and Robbins; Brennan, *At Home*; and Bohman and Lutz-Bachmann; see also Bhabha, "Unsatisfied," on "vernacular cosmopolitanism." An interesting connection can also be made to the idea of a "cosmopolitan accent"; see "Future."

3. For an insistence that postcolonial criticism counters the notion of a unified and programmatic agenda that I imply here, see Spivak's disavowals of both the appellation of "The Post-Colonial Critic" and the formulaic significations of a program of "study."

4. The stage directions read: "letters of the alphabet appear on her dress. At first it is a game but one from which she tires. She attempts to evade the letters by removing her dress. She is left topless with the letter Z on her chest" (50).

5. Dovring's *English as Lingua Franca* is a good example of a text making liberal use of the notion that English is manifest in all of "human life," to the point that "the whole world seems to be talking English" (7, 9).

6. For just one example, see Bergonzi's *Exploding English*: "it has now become, not altogether suitably, the world's first global language, universally studied and spoken in one form or another" (27).

7. Some of the more prominent recent editions of guides to the various dialects of the English language are Orsman; *African-American English; South Asian English*; *Dictionary of South African English*; *Australian National Dictionary*; *Dictionary of Caribbean English Usage*; *Dictionary of Jamaican English*; and *Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary of Current English*. On the expansion of the term "postcolonial," see Frankenberg and Mani.

8. A perusal of related publications on computer terminology is particularly revealing, for words such as "login," "computer," "user name," "byte," and "binary code" protrude from the page in the same way that English-language commands seem to stand out in computer programming scripts like BASIC and COBOL. Though BASIC, the Beginner's All-purpose Symbolic Instruction Code, is devised as a language related to English, COBOL, the Common Business Oriented Language, is also relevant here because it seems to be the programming language most like a spoken language (with its reliance on the commands *read*, *write*, and *perform*) and because it is the basis for the majority of business programs worldwide. A few representative lines of code are as follows (the slash indicates a line break): A=O / PERFORM 2,000—INCREMENT A UNTIL A=30 / 2,000—INCREMENT A / A=A+1. Thanks to Wade Costley for checking the accuracy of my code.

9. It is perhaps a testament to the comforts and attendant myopia of linguistic and economic domination that a perusal of the early volumes of numerous business periodicals issued in Great Britain in the early to mid-twentieth century turns up no real anecdotal evidence of an interest in linguistic differences and no evidence of an acknowledgment of the role that English plays as the "language of business and commerce," even as they display a tremendous interest in worldwide trade and, eventually, in standardizing business English. For example, a lengthy solicitation for essays on the general topic of "Jamaica: A Home for British Capital, Enterprise, and Pleasure"—in other words, how best to exploit colonial resources and assume control of a foreign market—is not at all unusual in that it contains no mention of linguistic difficulties or differences. See *Modern Business: The Magazine to Promote Commercial Efficiency* (July 1908): 667. Thus, a concern with and for language in these periodicals tends to be limited to articles on "proper" public speaking and grammatically correct correspondence, which does relate directly to the formation of what we might now call "business English," a dialect shaped in part by these very volumes. Similar periodicals include *Dixon's Monthly: The New Knowledge Magazine for Business Men and Women* (from October 1991; its tag phrase is also "the world of commerce"); *The World's Business: A Magazine for Men and Women* (from October 1924); *Journal of Business Education* (published weekly by Sir Isaac Pitman & Sons, Ltd., from October 1935). A related publication is *The Colonizer Traveller's Handbook* series "for tourists, settlers and business visitors," especially those for South Africa, British West Africa, Australia, and Malaysia (1937–38), which tends to take more notice of linguistic differences, particularly as it is intended to function as a *vade mecum* for the new resident in foreign territories. See, for example, the little lesson on "Pidgin English" from the manual on British West Africa (26).

10. A careful perusal of a bilingual finance periodical or Web site will make it clear what class of words are only ever expressed in English—words such as *futures*, *options*, *derivatives*, *puts*, *swaps*, and *forwards*, all of which traverse the boundaries of different language systems and yet remain inextricably bound within the English language, modulated only by slight differences in pronunciation. Though there is a crossing, criss-crossing, and trespassing of English words into different language structures, there is no Babel effect—that dizzying, disorienting effect produced from the act of translation and the revelation of the "impure" and mixed origins of language—in this instance precisely because there is no translation. See Derrida, "Des Tours."

11. Miyoshi and Harootunian, *Japan in the World*, in which he traces the beginnings of English literature in Japan to the Institute for Research on the Barbarian Books, established in 1856, from which it developed first into the Institute for Open Development and then the University of Tokyo (276). On the business of English and English for business, also see Gayatri Spivak, "Bonding in Difference," an interview with Alfred Arteaga (275).

12. For a distinction between the multinational corporation (MNC) and the transnational corporation (TNC), see Miyoshi, "Borderless" (736). For Miyoshi, this kind of corporatism is the contemporary manifestation of colonialism. On this last point, see also Sivanandan. For work on MNCs, see also Mattelart 11–20; Sutton-Brady. Finally, Tang and Mansell outline five different definitions of globalization, all of which could be grouped under the first item in my list, as they have all to do with reconfigured corporate structures: "triadization," "transnationalization," "glocalization," "oligopolization," and "globalism vs. regionalism."

13. See, for example, Kurisaki, who reads globalism as the expansion of business beyond the home country.

14. Appadurai. Also see Lull, who describes globalization as "the flow of people, images, commodities, money, ideas, and information on a global scale" (186); Mattelart, Delcourt, and Mattelart for a discussion of transnational spaces of cultural exchange and the "new world information and communications order," especially 8–18; and Clifford (96–112).

15. See Morley and Robins for a thorough treatment of the ways in which "the new media order is set to become a global order" (10) and of what might be the consequences of such a reconfiguration of cultural identity and national boundaries via the new communication networks. See also Mattelart, *Advertising International*.

16. Of the many text- or trade books devoted to the adjustments of corporations to "global" political and economic developments (e.g., the growth of trading blocks such as NAFTA and GATT and international labor issues), Costa and Bamossy's edited collection *Marketing in a Multicultural World* is a good example of the systematic attempt to make culture and cultural identity more prominent in the academic discipline of marketing and in marketing analyses of consumer behavior. In the same volume's "Consumer Culture or Culture Consumed?," for example, A. Fuat Firat suggests that information has become so globalized as to recreate a thoroughly postmodern, eclectic, and "touristic interest in different cultures and in experiencing them," which means that no one product or style predominates.

17. A recently advertised call for papers for a conference on "Early Modern Globality" (1997) is a good example of this kind of critical legitimation.

18. My use of these "territorial" terms is derived from Deleuze and Guattari's "schizoanalysis" of smooth and striated spaces in *One Thousand Plateaus*, from their reading of territorialization as an attempt to impress structure upon a smooth space, an attempt by the striated to capture the smooth, and of deterritorialization as an attempt to disband and usurp that structure. The two terms are in flux and interfused with one another.

19. Schwenger uses the term "Americanization" in his "America's Hiroshima." Hess uses the term "Disneyfied" (viii). "McDonaldization" is used to signify American cultural globalization in Hamelink (111–4). Readings suggests that Americanization and globalization are synonyms (2). For a reading of the "one world" phenomenon, see Buell, and for a critique of the "three worlds theory," see Ahmad.

20. See, for example, Melling and Roper; and Rollin, the tenor of whose work is captured in his claim that "the world has been McDonaldized" (1).

21. On the homogenizing force of global capitalism, attended upon by forces of economic and cultural fragmentation, see Dirlik (349). See also Ritchie's claim that "globalization demands the standardization or homogenization of almost everything and everybody."

22. At times this takes the form of universalism-particularism, as in Robertson (97–114).

23. On the literal and figurative reordering of the world along hemispheric lines, see Robinson's claim that "'hierarchies of labour' are becoming spatially organised across the North-South axis, given global integration processes of Third World labour in the First World, as well as the increasing impoverishment of the once-privileged 'labour aristocracies' of European origin" (24). On the work of "symbolic analysts," see Reich (177–8, 225–40).

24. For just two of the many examples of texts that rely on these pronoun constructions, see Claiborne; Shipley.

25. There are certain strategies of this struggle whereby English has not just inhabited different language systems, but also brought a chosen few words back into its own lexicon. In a repetition of the colonial paradigm, words such as *futon*, *sauna*, *tea*, and *tattoo* have been woven into the larger tapestry, the "superdialect" of English, just as in turn it continues to send out so-called "world words" such as *telephone*, *video*, *fax*, and *computer*. The structure of English is such that

it has a metaphorically colonial past and a corresponding imagined future of imposing itself on other language systems.

26. For history, summary, and analysis of the English language as it has extended into and grown out of the colonial scene (particularly in India, Australia and New Zealand, Canada, and South Africa), see Crystal (*Cambridge* 92–115); McArthur; Burchfield (277–553); Quirk, especially chap. 1.

27. See, for example, Spivak on the ways in which "English words are, and continue to be, lexicalized in these languages in senses and connotations ex-centric to Standard English," an example of what she terms "resistant language practice" (Arteaga 277). Also see her comment in this piece on the necessity of a deconstructive stance vis-à-vis the English language: "We see there a certain kind of innate historical enablement which one mustn't celebrate but toward which one has a deconstructive position, as it were.... we have had to dehegemonize English as one of the Indian languages" (276). On the performative aspect of coloniality, see Fanon's discussion of the performance of race and the colonized subject.

28. See Bhabha, "Of Mimicry and Man," in *Location*. For an excellent critical reading of the pitfalls of a Western liberal stance vis-à-vis the Third World—that it often tends to re-inscribe a narrative of feminized passivity (the whole of the "Third World") at the mercy of a masculinized power structure located in or equated with the "First World"—see Buell.

29. See Barrère and Leland. For an account of cant lexicography (affectations of language that suggest unwarranted claims of learning and sophistication), beginning with the "first" dictionary of Cant, B.E.'s *A New Dictionary* (1690–1700), see Starnes and Noyes (212–27). In their analysis, glossaries of cant may be traced back to Harman, *Caveat* (ca. 1566); Dekker, *Lanthorne and Candle-light* (1608); and S.R., *Martin Mark-All* (1610).

30. For a celebration of linguistic play precisely because its excesses violate the standard, see Cameron.

31. See T.W.J. (ii). The volume consists entirely of these "specimens" of faulty English, presumed to result from both an overabundance and an insufficiency of education. Also, see Wright, which is in the main a lengthy tirade against the laxity, pomposity, and even disloyalty of the native Indian press, and which also revolves around the collection of "curious specimens" (53). For a different instance of the collection of the "specimens" of supposedly false learning and pedantic, pretentious, and over-the-top prose, see Anstey's viciously satirical ventriloquizing of the memoirs of Hurry Bungsho Jabberjee, BA, reportedly "commissioned" as such by *Punch* with accompanying illustrations. The arguments usually made against the attainment of a "smattering" of English are much like the arguments against the attainment of a smattering of Greek and Latin by English youth in the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries. The mockery of "Baboo" is symptomatic of the desire to preserve the purity of English against the corrupting influence of pidgin English, of which Henry Newbolt's "The Future of the English Language" is another example.

32. One version of this document may be found at www.taproom.com/jokes/signs.htm, Aug. 1997. The Web site *Lost in Translation: A collection of mangled English from around the world* is a more ordered version of the widely circulated e-mail collection: hearsay.simplenet.com/translation/index.htm, Jul. 1998. These lists of "amusing" specimens of English constructions produced by non-native speakers are by no means new with the advent of late capitalism or even with the Internet. Similar collections can be found in early publications such as the British Esperanto Association's *International Language: A Monthly Magazine* 1 (Nov. 1924): 235.

33. There is a wealth of linguistic scholarship on the subject of English pidgins. See Elugbe and Omamor (8–21).

34. See Graddol, Leith, and Swann (206); Hayter; Leland; Matthews; Zachrisson (8). For an argument that the language of the seaports has invaded domestic spaces as well, see "Canton-English."

35. My thinking on these issues gained a greater sophistication from an exchange with Alan Liu on the categories in use in his *Voice of the Shuttle*, particularly on the topic of the "proper" placement of Salman Rushdie.

36. The series editors of the Oklahoma Project for Discourse and Theory refer to the "particularity of the postmodern age"; see the "Foreword" to Goux (viii). For a discussion of situatedness, see Simpson. I am grateful to Russell Samolsky for raising this issue with me.

37. See Benson and Conolly; James; Myers; Ramraj; and Stringer.

38. See Brennan, "Cosmopolitans." On "transnational cosmopolitanism" and the production of a new class of elites able to traverse national and other regional boundaries with ease, see Hannerz (246).

39. Bergonzi situates this appeal of Arnold's within an idealized notion of *weltliteratur* (74).

40. For a similar argument, see Talib.

Works Cited

African-American English: Structure, History, and Usage. New York: Routledge, 1998.

Ahmad, Aijaz. *In Theory: Classes, Nations, Literatures.* London: Verso, 1992.

Ang, Ien. *Living Room Wars: Rethinking Media Audiences for a Postmodern World.* New York: Routledge, 1996.

Anstey, F. *Baboo Jabberjee.* London: J.M. Dent & Co., 1897.

Appadurai, Arjun. "Disjuncture and Difference in the Global Cultural Economy." *Public Culture* 2 (1990): 1–24.

Arteaga, Alfred. "Bonding in Difference." Interview with Gayatri Spivak. *An Other Tongue: Nation and Ethnicity in the Linguistic Borderlands.* Durham, NC: Duke UP, 1994. 273–85.

Auerbach, Erich. *Mimesis: The Representation of Reality in Western Literature.* 1946. Trans. Willard Trask. Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1953.

Australian National Dictionary. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1988.

Barrère, Albert, and Charles Leland, eds. *A Dictionary of Slang, Jargon & Cant: Embracing English, American, and Anglo-Indian slang from pidgin English, tinkers' jargon and other irregular phraseology.* Edinburgh: Ballantyne P, 1889.

Benson, Eugene, and L.W. Conolly, eds. *Encyclopedia of Post-colonial Literatures in English.* New York: Routledge, 1994.

Bergonzi, Bernard. *Exploding English: Criticism, Theory, Culture.* New York: Oxford UP, 1990.

Bhabha, Homi. *The Location of Culture.* New York: Routledge, 1994.

———. "Unsatisfied: Notes on Vernacular Cosmopolitanism." *Text and Nation.* Ed. Laura García-Moreno and Peter C. Pfeiffer. Columbia, SC: Camden, 1996. 191–207.

Bohman, James, and Matthias Lutz-Bachmann, eds. *Perpetual Peace: Essays on Kant's Cosmopolitan Ideal.* Cambridge: MIT P, 1997.

Bradshaw, James. *A Scheme for making the English Language the International Language for the World: Shewing the desirableness of some language being adopted for such purpose; that the*

English has peculiar claims for it; and that its use may be greatly accelerated by making sundry alterations in its orthography and construction; the whole being recommended to the consideration of the British government. London: E.T. Brain & Co., 1847.

Brennan, Timothy. "Cosmopolitans and Celebrities." *Race and Class* 31.1 (1989): 1–19.

———. *At Home in the World: Cosmopolitanism Now*. Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1997.

Bryson, Bill. *The Mother Tongue: English and How It Got That Way*. New York: Morrow, 1990.

Buell, Frederick. *National Culture and the New Global System*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP, 1993.

Burchfield, Robert, ed. *The Cambridge History of the English Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1994.

Burchfield, Robert, and Hans Aarsleff. *The Oxford English Dictionary and the State of the Language*. Washington, DC: Library of Congress, 1988.

Calvet, Louis-Jean. *Linguistique et Colonialisme, petit traité de glottophagie*. Paris: Payot, 1974.

Cameron, Deborah. "Mixing It: The Poetry and Politics of Bad English." *Critical Quarterly* 40.4 (1998): 107–10.

"Canton-English." *Household Words* 9 May 1857: 450–2.

Cheah, Pheng, and Bruce Robbins, eds. *Cosmopolitics*. Minneapolis: U of Minnesota P, 1998.

Chow, Rey. "In the Name of Comparative Literature." *Comparative Literature in the Age of Multiculturalism*. Ed. Charles Bernheimer. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP, 1995. 107–16.

Claiborne, Robert. *Our Marvelous Native Tongue*. New York: NY Times Books, 1983.

Clifford, James. "Traveling Cultures." *Cultural Studies*. Ed. Lawrence Grossberg, Cary Nelson, and Paula A. Treichler. New York: Routledge, 1992. 96–116.

Costa, Janeen Arnold, and Gary J. Bamossy, eds. *Marketing in a Multicultural World: Ethnicity, Nationalism, and Cultural Identity*. London: Sage, 1995.

Crystal, David. *The Cambridge Encyclopedia of the English Language*. New York: Cambridge UP, 1995.

———. *English as a Global Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1997.

Deleuze, Gilles, and Felix Guattari. *One Thousand Plateaus*. Trans. Brian Massumi. Minneapolis: U of Minnesota P, 1987.

Derrida, Jacques. *Of Grammatology*. Trans. Gayatri Spivak. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP, 1976.

———. "Des Tours des Babel." *Difference in Translation*. Ed. Joseph F. Graham. Ithaca, NY: Cornell UP, 1985. 165–248.

A Dictionary of Caribbean English Usage. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1996.

A Dictionary of Jamaican English. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1980.

A Dictionary of South African English. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1996.

Dirlik, Arif. "The Postcolonial Aura: Third World Criticism in the Age of Global Capitalism." *Critical Inquiry* 20 (1994): 328–56.

Doughty, Charles. *Travels in Arabia Deserta*. Vol. 2. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1888.

Dovring, Karin. *English as Lingua Franca: Double Talk in Global Persuasion*. Westport, CT: Praeger, 1997.

"Early Modern Globality." Call for Papers. Online. 1997. Available: gopher://dept.english.upenn.edu:70/0R9158692422/Announce/CFP/Renaissance.

Elugbe, Ben Ohi, and Augusta Phil Omamor. *Nigerian Pidgin: Background and Prospects*. Nigeria PLC: Heinemann, 1991.

Enoch, Wesley, and Deborah Mailman. *The Seven Stages of Grieving*. Brisbane, Austral.: Playlab P, 1996.

Fanon, Frantz. *Black Skin, White Masks*. Trans. Charles Lam Markmann. New York: Grove P, 1967.

Frankenberg, Ruth, and Lata Mani. "Crosscurrents, Crosstalk: Race, 'Postcoloniality,' and the Politics of Location." *Displacement, Diaspora, and Geographies of Identity*. Ed. Smadar Lavie and Ted Swedenburg. Durham, NC: Duke UP, 1996. 273–93.

Fukuyama, Francis. *The End of History and the Last Man*. London: Hamish Hamilton, 1992.

"The Future of the English Language." *Chambers's Journal* 71 (1894): 296.

George, Rosemary Marangoly. *The Politics of Home*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1996.

Glissant, Edouard. *Caribbean Discourse: Selected Essays*. Trans. J. Michael Dash. Charlottesville: UP of Virginia, 1989.

Goux, Jean-Joseph. *The Coiners of Language*. Norman: U of Oklahoma P, 1994.

Graddol, David, Dick Leith, and Joan Swann, eds. *English: History, Diversity and Change*. London: Routledge, 1996.

Hamelink, Cees J. *Trends in World Communication*. Penang: Southbound and Third World Network, 1994.

Hamilton, Ian. *The Oxford Companion to Twentieth-Century Poetry in English*. New York: Oxford UP, 1994.

Hannerz, Ulf. "Cosmopolitans and Locals in World Culture." *Global Culture: Nationalism, Globalization and Modernity*. Ed. Mike Featherstone. London: SAGE, 1990. 237–52.

Hayter, H.W.G. *Pidgin English Rhymes: Being the Strange Adventures of Wei Man-Man and Ossaw Tee*. Shanghai: China Printing Co., 1909.

Hess, David J. *Science and Technology in a Multicultural World*. New York: Columbia UP, 1995.

James, Trevor, ed. *English Literature from the Third World*. Harlow, UK: Longman York P, 1986.

Jameson, Fredric. *Postmodernism, Or, The Cultural Logic of State Capitalism*. Durham, NC: Duke UP, 1991.

Kotkin, Joel. *Tribes: How Race, Religion, and Identity Determine Success in the New Global Economy*. New York: Random, 1993.

Kurisaki, Yoshiko. *The Changing Role of Telecommunications in the Economy: Globalisation and Its Impact on National Telecommunication*. Paris: Org. for Economic Co-operation and Development, 1995.

"A Language in Common." *Times Literary Supplement* 10 Aug. 1962.

Leland, Charles G. *Pidgin-English Sing-Song or Songs and Stories in the China-English Dialect*. London: Trübner & Co., 1876.

Lessing, Doris. "Foreword." Ousby n.pag.

Liu, Alan. *Voice of the Shuttle: A Web Site for Humanities Research*. Online. Available: humanitas.ucsb.edu. Accessed Dec. 1996.

Lull, James. *Media, Communication, Culture: A Global Approach*. Cambridge: Polity P, 1995.

MacCabe, Colin. "Towards a Modern Trivium: English Studies Today." Inaugural Lecture at U of Strathclyde, Scotland, UK, 1982.

Mattelart, Armand. *Advertising International: The Privatization of Public Space*. Trans. Michael Chanan. New York: Routledge, 1992.

———. *Multinational Corporations and the Control of Culture*. Trans. Michael Chanan. Sussex: Harvester P, 1979.

Mattelart, Armand, and Ariel Dorfman. *How to Read Donald Duck: Imperialist Ideology in the Disney Comic*. 1971. Trans. David Kunzle. New York: International General, 1984.

Mattelart, Armand, Xavier Delcourt, and Michele Mattelart. *International Image Markets: In Search of an Alternative Perspective*. Trans. David Buxton. London: Comedia Pub., 1984.

Matthews, Brander. "The Future Literary Centre of the English Language." *The Bookman* 12 (1900): 238–40.

McArthur, Tom, ed. *The Oxford Companion to the English Language*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1992.

Melling, Phil, and Jon Roper, eds. *Americanisation and the Transformation of World Cultures: Melting Pot or Cultural Chernobyl?* Lewiston, NY: Mellen P, 1996.

Miyoshi, Masao. "A Borderless World? From Colonialism to Transnationalism and the Decline of the Nation-State." *Critical Inquiry* 19 (1993): 726–51.

Miyoshi, Masao, and H.D. Harootunian, eds. *Japan in the World*. Durham, NC: Duke UP, 1993.

Morley, David, and Kevin Robins. *Spaces of Identity: Global Media, Electronic Landscapes and Cultural Boundaries*. New York: Routledge, 1995.

Myers, Robin, ed. *A Dictionary of Literature in the English Language from 1940 to 1970*. Oxford: Pergamon, 1978.

Newbolt, Henry. "The Future of the English Language." *Transactions of the Royal Society of Literature of the United Kingdom* 3 (1923): 1–16.

Ngugi wa Thiong'o. *Decolonising the Mind: The Politics of Language in African Literature*. London: Heinemann, 1986.

Orsman, Harry, ed. *Dictionary of New Zealand English*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1998.

Ostry, Sylvia, and Richard R. Nelson. *Techno-Nationalism and Techno-Globalism: Conflict and Cooperation*. Washington, DC: Brookings Inst., 1995.

Ousby, Ian, ed. *The Cambridge Guide to Literature in English*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1993.

Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary of Current English. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1997.

Phillimore, John, ed. *Local Matters: Perspectives on the Globalisation of Technology*. Murdoch, Austral.: Inst. for Sustainability and Technology Policy, Murdoch U, 1995.

Quirk, Randolph. *A Grammar of Contemporary English*. London: Longman, 1972.

Ramraj, Victor J., ed. *Concert of Voices: An Anthology of World Writing in English*. Orchard Park, NY: Broadview P, 1995.

Readings, Bill. *The University in Ruins*. Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1996.

Reich, Robert. *The Work of Nations*. New York: Simon, 1991.

Ritchie, Mark. "Globalization v. Globalism: Giving Internationalism a Bad Name." Online document. Available: www.panix.com/~jimcook/globalization/gl_vs_gl.htm. Accessed Nov. 1997.

Robertson, Roland. *Globalization: Social Theory and Global Culture*. London: Sage, 1992.

Robinson, William I. "Globalisation: Nine Theses on our Epoch." *Race and Class* 38.2 (1996): 1–24.

Rollin, Roger. *The Americanization of the Global Village*. Bowling Green, OH: Bowling Green State UP, 1989.

Said, Edward. *Orientalism*. New York: Vintage, 1977.

Saro-Wiwa, Ken. *Sozaboy: A Novel in Rotten English*. 1985. White Plains, NY: Longman, 1994.

Sassen, Saskia. *Globalization and Its Discontents*. New York: New P, 1998.

Schwenger, Peter. "America's Hiroshima, Hiroshima's America." *Boundary 2* 21.1 (1994): 233–53.

Shipley, Joseph T. *In Praise of English: The Growth and Use of Language*. New York: Times Books, 1977.

Simpson, David. *The Academic Postmodern and the Rule of Literature*. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1995.

Sivanandan, A. "New circuits of imperialism." *Race and Class* 30.4 (1989): 1–19.

Skinner, John. *The Stepmother Tongue: An Introduction to New Anglophone Fiction*. New York: St. Martin's, 1998.

South Asian English: Structure, Use, and Users. Champaign-Urbana: U of Illinois P, 1996.

Spivak, Gayatri Chakravorty. *Outside in the Teaching Machine*. New York: Methuen, 1993.

Starnes, DeWitt T., and Gertrude E. Noyes, eds. *The English Dictionary from Cawdrey to Johnson (1604–1755)*. Amsterdam: Benjamins, 1991.

Stephenson, Neal. *The Diamond Age, or A Young Lady's Illustrated Primer*. New York: Bantam, 1995.

Stringer, Jenny, ed. *The Oxford Companion to Twentieth-Century Literature in English*. New York: Oxford UP, 1996.

Sutherland, John. "Introduction." Stringer xxi–xxi.

Sutton-Brady, Catherine. "Globalisation and the Role of Multinational Corporations." Phillimore 44–9.

Tang, Puay, and Robin Mansell. *Telecommunication, Multinational Enterprises and Globaliza-tion: Implications for Future Network Development*. Brighton, UK: Science and Technology Policy Research Unit, 1993.

Talib, Ismail. "Nonnative English Literature in the World Literature Syllabus." *No Small World: Visions and Revisions of World Literature*. Ed. Michael Carroll. Urbana, IL: Natl. Council of Teachers of English, 1996. 81–90.

Trinh T. Minh-ha. *Woman, Native, Other*. Bloomington: Indiana UP, 1989.

T.W.J. *Baboo English: Our Mother-tongue as Our Aryan Brethren Understand It. Amusing Specimens of Composition and Style, or English as Written by Some of Her Majesty's Indian Subjects*. Calcutta: H.P. Kent and Co., 1890.

Wright, Arnold. *Baboo English as 'Tis Writ. Being Curiosities of Indian Journalism*. London: T. Fisher Unwin, 1891.

Zachrisson, Robert. *Anglic: An International Language with a Survey of English Spelling Reform*. Cambridge: Heffer, 1932.