TRACES

A MULTILINGUAL SERIES OF CULTURAL THEORY AND TRANSLATION

"Race" Panic and the Memory of Migration

Edited by
Meaghan Morris and Brett de Bary

The name *Traces: A multilingual journal of cultural theory and translation* has been changed to *Traces: A multilingual series of cultural theory and translation.*

Secure On-line Ordering
http://www.hkupress.org

CONTENTS

CONTRIBUTORS

Ien ANG is Professor of Cultural Studies and Director of the Institute for Cultural Research at the University of Western Sydney, Australia. With a background in communication studies, she is currently doing research on culture and globalization. She has published *Living Room Wars* (Routledge, 1996) and *On Not Speaking Chinese: Living Between Asia and the West* (Routledge, 2001).

Jacqueline ARMIJO teaches Religious Studies at Stanford University, USA. A scholar of the history of Islam in China, her current research projects include Islamic education in China and the impact of Chinese Muslims studying in Islamic universities overseas. She has recently published "The Customs of Various Barbarians" in *Under Confucian Eyes: Texts on Gender in Chinese History*, edited by Susan L. Mann and Yu-yin Cheng (University of California Press, 2001).

Brett de BARY teaches Asian Studies and Comparative Literature at Cornell University, USA. Recently, she edited *Gender and Imperialism*, a special issue of the *US-Japan Women's Journal*, Spring, 1997 (Japanese edition, 1998). She is currently doing a study of late twentieth century Japanese and American fiction and film, entitled *Orientalism in the Inter-Cultural Imaginary*.

Yann Moulier BOUTANG is Professor of Economics at the University of Brittany in Vannes, and at the Institut d'Études Politique de Paris. His *De l'esclavage au salariat, Économie historique du salariat bridé* was published by Presses Universitaires de France in Paris in 1998.

Erica BRINDLEY is a Visiting Assistant Professor in Chinese history at the University of Oregon, USA. She is finishing a dissertation on the issue of authority and human agency during "Warring States" China.

Rey CHOW is Andrew W. Mellon Professor of the Humanities at Brown University, USA. Among her numerous publications in English is, most recently, *Ethics after Idealism: Theory—Culture—Ethnicity—Reading* (Indiana University Press, 1998). Her new book, *The Protestant Ethnic and the Spirit of Capitalism*, is forthcoming from Columbia University Press in 2002–2003.

Luke GIBBONS teaches English and Film, Theatre and Television in the University of Notre Dame in both the USA and in Dublin, Ireland. His most recent book is *Transformations in Irish Culture* (University of Notre Dame Press, 1996) and his current project is a study of *Edmund Burke and Ireland: Aesthetics, Politics and the Colonial Sublime*, forthcoming from Cambridge University Press.

Joshua GOLDSTEIN is a historian of China teaching at Franklin and Marshall University in Lancaster, Pennsylvania, USA. He has recently published "Mei Lanfang and the Nationalization of Peking Opera," in *positions east asia cultures critiques*, Winter, 1999.

Ghassan HAGE teaches in Anthropology at the University of Sydney, Australia. His research focuses on migration, settlement, and viability, and his most recent book is *White Nation: Fantasies of White Supremacy in a Multicultural Society* (Pluto Press, 1999). He has also edited *Arab-Australians: Citizenship and Belonging* (Melbourne University Press, 2002).

HUANG Ping is a member of the Institute of Sociology at the Chinese Academy of Social Sciences. Currently he is doing research on young rural laborers in urban China. *Seeking for Survival: A Sociological Study of Non-Agricultural Activities in Contemporary China* (Kunming: Yunnan Press, 1996) is among his many publications.

JUNG Yeong-hae teaches at Otsuma Women's University in Tama City, Japan. She is currently studying the issue of cultural/ethnic diversity and mental health

care. With Lisa Go, she has written *Watashi to iu tabi: jenda to neishizumu o koete* [*The Journey Within: Beyond Racism and Gender*], published by Seidosha, in Tokyo, in 1999.

KIM Seong-nae teaches in the Department of Religious Studies at Sogang University in Seoul, Korea. She is currently researching modernity and popular religiosity in Korea. In addition to her publications in Korean, she has published the English-language article "Lamentations of the Dead: The Historical Imaginary of Violence on Cheju Island, South Korea" in the *Journal of Ritual Studies*, Summer, 1989, Vol. 3, No. 2.

KOMAGOME Takeshi is on the Faculty of Education at Kyoto University, Japan. His research and publications investigate aspects of Japanese colonial rule in Taiwan and Korea. His book *Cultural Unification under the Japanese Colonial Empire* (*Shokuminchi teikoku nihon no bunka tôgô*) was published by Iwanami Shoten in 1996.

Victor KOSCHMANN teaches in the History Department at Cornell University, USA. He is doing research on the philosophy of technology in 1930s Japan. His *Revolution and Subjectivity in Postwar Japan* was published by the University of Chicago Press in 1996.

MÔRI Yoshitaka teaches in the Graduate School of Social and Cultural Studies of Kyushu University in Fukuoka, Japan. He is the co-author, with Ueno Toshiya, of *Introduction to Cultural Studies* [*Karutyuraru stadeizu nyûmon*] (Tokyo, Chikuma Shobô, 2000) and has published the English-language article with Hiroki Ogasawara, "Cultural Studies and Its Discontents: The Pacific Asia Cultural Studies Forum in Britain" in *Japanese Studies* (Japanese Studies Association of Australia, 1998).

Meaghan MORRIS is Chair Professor of Cultural Studies at Lingnan University in Hong Kong. Her research is on popular historiographies in cinema, mass media and journalism, and her most recent book is *Too Soon, Too Late: History in Popular Culture* (Indiana University Press, 1998).

Tessa MORRIS-SUZUKI is Professor of Japanese History at Australian National University. She is well-known for her work on the economic and technological history of Japan. Recently she has published *Re-inventing Japan: Time Space Nation* (M.E. Sharpe, 1998).

Bernard G. PRUSAK is a Ph.D. candidate in philosophy at Boston University and an adjunct professor in the Institute for Liberal Arts and Interdisciplinary Studies at Emerson College. He works in philosophical anthropology. His translation of Dominique Janicaud's critical essay *The Theological Turn of French Phenomenology* appeared recently from Fordham University Press.

OKA Mari teaches in Osaka Women's University in Osaka, Japan. She is now writing about the Palestinian refugee issue from a philosophical perspective. She has translated the writings of Edward Said and has recently published *Kanojo no "tadashii" namae to wa nanika: Daisan sekai feminizumu no shiso [What Is Her "Proper" Name: Third World Feminist Thought]* (Tokyo: Seidosha, 2000).

SAKIYAMA Masaki teaches in the Department of International Relations at Ritsumeikan University in Kyoto, Japan. He does teaching, research, and publication in the area of Latin American Cultural Studies, including work on the Chiapas rebellion. He has also translated the writings of Gayatri Spivak.

Jiwon SHIN is a Ph.D candidate in Korean Literature at Harvard University. She is writing a dissertation on the spatio-temporal imaginary in nineteenth-century Seoul, focusing on urban poetry clubs.

TOMOTARI Mikako is a sculptor who teaches at the Kyushu Institute of Design in Fukuoka, Japan. Her sculpture memorializing Ainu lifeways stands near the recently completed Nibutani Dam in Hokkaido. She is now working with disabled persons on a new project, *Able Art*.

INTRODUCTION

MEAGHAN MORRIS

This is the second volume of *Traces*, an international series of cultural theory and translation established to challenge the ways in which "theory" and "culture" are distributed and "translation" is imagined and structured in the long aftermath of old colonial and Cold War regimes. *Traces* is not alone in issuing this challenge. Many scholars today lament the assumption continuing in practice that a universalizing "West" produces and exports theory to a "Rest" that is brimming with cultural data but bereft of intellectual means to evaluate its rich particularities and render them intelligible to "Western readers." Debate is everywhere increasing about the legacy of the division between the "humanities" (defining the universal) and "area studies" (redeeming the particular), the value-laden distinction between theoretical and pragmatic or everyday knowledge, and the role played by other divisions (East and West, South and North, ex-colonial periphery and metropolis) in a so-called "new global economy" of knowledge. At the same time, however, the power to widely *distribute* such debate is increasingly concentrated in the hands of a few transnational English-language publishers based around the North Atlantic. An "old colonial" division of labor sustains a new hierarchy of languages even more narrow than that inscribed by imperial maps on which Spanish, French, and German were privileged, as were Japanese and Chinese. We may lament and have local debates in many tongues; to produce "international" theory today we must write or *be read* in English.

As a multidisciplinary translation series, *Traces* seeks a different circulation of academic conversation and debate. This series is published in multiple language versions; in principle, each essay is made available simultaneously in Chinese, Japanese, Korean, and English editions. (Other languages may be added as resources and labor permit.) Each author contributing to *Traces* uses a language and scholarly frame of reference of his or her choice, but on the understanding that writing for *Traces* entails a "heterolingual" address:[1] each essay is written to be read not only in multiple languages but by mixed readerships that are neither enclosed in a common culture nor neatly divided into separate "communities." Translation is understood here not as a form of diplomacy between rival national-linguistic states but as a means to form a new international space of theoretical exchange, in which questioning and counter-questioning about "the same" issue — and "the same" text — can occur between people who might otherwise never converse. In the practice of forming this multilingual space, *Traces* seeks a new conception of cultural theory.[2]

The inaugural volume, "Specters of the West and the Politics of Translation," outlined the series project for a genuinely comparative cultural theory that would not (as the introduction puts it) "neglect the form of the act which gives rise out of differences to that which is commensurate and thereby brings heterogeneous items onto the plane of comparison."[3] The difficulties as well as the urgency of that project are foregrounded in this second volume, which focuses on the mobilization of virulent racism and xenophobia in response to escalating migration, severe economic displacement, and geopolitical upheaval across the world in recent decades.

The value of a multilingual response to such a global problem seems obvious. In all of the languages of *Traces,* there is discussion of this frightening development and there exists a supply of sociological, economic, and political analysis on which to draw. An immediate aim of this collection, then, is to bring some of these discussions and analyses into a shared intellectual space. Translation works as a means to link diverse readerships as well as authors who might not otherwise converse; in encountering critical responses being developed in languages other than those we speak, often addressing situations that differ greatly from those we think we know, we gain new ways of understanding contexts that directly concern us.

This is a traditional benefit of international academic exchange, and it is a

vital one in conditions where the catch-phrases of transnational capital's *political* legitimation — "the new economy," "global restructuring," "information revolution," "level playing field" and so on — circulate globally to create a policy continuum that not only generates real social conflicts and economic distress but offers utopian promises of remedy: racist outbreaks (one version of the story goes) may occur in the transition to a new economy amongst the "losers" of globalization, but these are merely "irrational" surges or atavistic "returns" of a primitive fear of the Other that can be dispelled by technological progress and further economic "reform." In recent years, "ethnic cleansing" in Bosnia, the re-emergence of unashamed anti-Semitism across Europe from France to Russia, attacks on ethnic Chinese in Indonesia, attacks on migrant workers from Africa and the Middle East in France, Germany and Sweden, and the "white panic" of Pauline Hanson's One Nation Party in Australia (to name but a few) have all been seen in these wishfully reductive terms. By bringing together scholars who work in different zones of the globalizing policy continuum (discussed here for its impact on Ireland by Luke Gibbons, in China by Huang Ping, more obliquely on Japan by Jung Yeong-Hae, and in Japan and Australia by Tessa Morris-Suzuki), this volume of *Traces* establishes a "plane of comparison" on which the promises of market utopianism can be questioned at the same time as racist reactions to its practical effects are contested.

Between these two broad activities, our more specific aim is to examine the historical and affective complexity of particular migratory and racializing movements. The lived burden of colonialism and patriarchal nationalism is a primary focus here, along with emigrant and immigrant experience. In many of the violently racializing clashes of recent years, new forces of economic and social dispossession have been impacting on people still struggling with the legacy of earlier or other imperialisms and nation-building campaigns. The essays collected here explore the work of cultural memory as it responds to and *participates in* densely layered situations of conflict and displacement; they ask how memories and stories of conflict in the past inform the tensions of the present, as well as analyzing the contemporary contexts in which memories of displacement are mobilized.

In the process, a different tracing of the global is written on to the world-historical map still implicitly assumed by a great deal of "theory" that circulates in English. This is a map of the distribution of Eurocentrism, European imperialism,

and White supremacism over the past few centuries. It emphasizes the global spread of their impact, and yet does so in a way that dramatically foregrounds key areas of Western Europe and the United States; the eye is continually drawn back to the intensively micro-mapped "centers" of this theoretical world, while the rest remains shadowy and vague: a broadly-brushed background indispensable for framing a critique yet never the focus of critical attention. This map tells us little about the responses to Eurocentrism and White supremacism shaping thought and politics in other places that took themselves to be central, still less about how such movements in thought and politics impacted in turn on "the West"; it does not feature events in which "Whites" and "Europeans" were minor players, third parties, or unimportant.

This map is not up to the job of helping us think globally today. The problem lies not with what it shows us or even with what it leaves out of account but with the obstacles posed to thought by the *form* of a theoretical geography that repetitively channels critical desire towards the familiar bits of "the West" even as it limits our capacity for thinking through histories other than those that it gives us to inherit (wherever we are) as our own.[4] The difficulties that ensue are practical and mundane: vast new works of scholarship add detail to the vague parts of the map, but few are widely read for their theoretical import and methodological innovations beyond the boundaries of an allocated discipline or field (in an English-language context, usually "area" or "postcolonial" studies).[5] Anyway, what is to be done? Life is short, time is limited: even if it were feasible and desirable to produce such a thing, a panoramic map of the theoretically world-historical would be impossible to use in academic working conditions today.

The multilingual tracing of the global that emerges from this volume of *Traces* is neither an exhaustive nor a "more representative" picture of, say, the world distribution of racisms and migrations today. The contributors were not expected to set aside "parochial" interests or to abandon projects that matter in their usual working lives, and they were not brought together on the basis of achieving a judicious spread of national, ethnic, or disciplinary belongings; *Traces* is not a United Nations of theory. Vast areas of the world, many racisms, and many modes of migration forced and voluntary are not considered here; this volume does not deal with slavery nor directly with refugees. Rather, it came together "in translation" as an international discussion of a *problem* urgently felt but loosely defined; the contributors were asked only to think simultaneously about a context of crisis (or

a "panic") of immediate concern to them, and about its lived historical dimensions — to work through what Komagome Takeshi calls "successive layers of violence."

The global is traced, then, *between* the essays by the emergence of unplanned lines of connection, surprising points of convergence, and unexpected passages of overlapping research and reflection. For example, Komagome's study of the racializing role of religion under Japanese colonial rule requires an "intertwined history" of Britain, China/Taiwan and Japan that links directly to Luke Gibbons's account of the colonial force of the Scottish Enlightenment, and his critique of its invocation in the work of Richard Rorty. Gibbons's reflection on rising racism against immigrants in Ireland presents material for thought along the lines suggested by Yann Moulier Boutang's critique of schemas or "protocols of rationality" predominant in histories of immigration, on the one hand, and powerfully shaping anti-immigrant traditions of action and feeling in the international labor movement on the other. Along another "diagonal" of the collection, Gibbons's essay also touches (in a different mood) on some of the "secrets of ethnic abjection" that preoccupy Rey Chow in her essay on the politics of *writing* about ethnicity in a North American context of "euphoria" for a multiculturalism fraught with "unresolved tensions" of racism and class discrimination.

Chow's exploration in her context of an "*affective* dissonance" between theoretical writing about cultural hybridity and fictional or autobiographical writing echoes the efforts of Ien Ang and Ghassan Hage to find a mode of discourse capable of articulating, respectively, the sense of "victimhood" lived by Chinese Indonesians, ambivalent between violently shifting historical registers of ethnic, national, and economic belonging, and (for Hage) the dilemmas of responsibility and participation facing non-British/Irish migrants in an Australia torn by conflicts not simply between "black" and "white" but between "indigenous people" and "settlers" — conflicts arising from a colonialism for which those migrants, targets of racism themselves, are not ancestrally responsible but which they more or less inherit. And in their attention to the autobiographical all three essays participate in the sense of "responsibility" that Kim Seong-nae defines, in her essay on the April Third Massacre that took place on Cheju Island off the Korean peninsula in 1948, as beginning with an act of "*listening attentively* to the individual stories of each victim."

The emphasis on Kim's words here is mine, but the listening-based mode of

learning and solidarity that she sees in Korea as both a "task" and a "debt owed to the body in pain" is variously practised by Jacqueline Armijo in her study of how commemorative narratives "engender" survival among descendants of the state-sponsored massacre of Muslims in Southwest China in 1873; by Tomotari Mikako's meditation on the making of her sculpture in response to the Nibutani Dam that submerged former homelands of the Ainu people of Hokkaido; and by Môri Yoshitaka's commentary on Tomotari's artwork. An art as well as a politics of listening is also fundamental to Huang Ping's sociologically inflected study of the "subsistence rationality" practised by peasants out-migrating on a vast scale across contemporary China, and of the ways in which its positive significance as well as its unintended consequences may conflict with a logic of "economic rationality." Such listening is also, of course, a basic enabling condition of the texts written closely in response to others by Victor Koschmann, Tessa Morris-Suzuki, Sakiyama Masaki, Oka Mari, and my co-editor Brett de Bary.

There would be many other ways to trace connections between the essays in this volume. My point is simply that the "value" of a multilingual response to a global problem is methodological as well as informative; as we encounter new ways of approaching apparently familiar questions, their "familiarity" is transformed and the frameworks in which we pose them are opened up and multiplied. Repeatedly reading through the essays for this project, Brett and I both learned a great deal about situations differing greatly from those we thought we knew; perhaps we each learned even more about our own. Reflecting on this process and the everyday labor it entails, Brett's essay "Editing Journal" concludes the volume with (in my view) the most lucid, subtle, and suggestive argument I have read during the years of *Traces*'s development for a conception of cultural theory grounded in the *work* of translation and comparison involved in shaping a multilingual space of intellectual exchange.

However, let me draw attention to a difficulty; let me not neglect "the form of the act" (of editing, as well as of translation and of writing *for* translation) that has enabled the commensurating claims I have just made to frame as a "volume" the essays assembled here. The essays were first written in five languages (English, French, Chinese, Japanese, and Korean), from academic locations in Australia, the United States, Ireland, France, the Chinese mainland, Japan, and South Korea, and they deal with conflicts and historical burdens not only in those nations, in Indonesia, and in Taiwan under Japanese colonialism, but also in places and for

people whose difference has been sanctioned — with great violence in some cases — in the process of its *definition* by diverse national or imperial norms: *peranakan* and *totok* Chinese, Asian-Americans, Cheju Islanders, the Hui of Yunnan, the Ainu people, the *yamabushi*, Aboriginal Australians, Arab-Australian youth, Kyushu. I write this list a little carelessly, emphasizing its almost random nature as a grouping of "heterogeneous items." A few of these names are familiar to me, but some I had never heard of before beginning work on this project for *Traces* in 1999. Yet, here I am presuming to introduce studies organized by these names and written in some cases by scholars whose academic lives and languages are largely or entirely unknown to me.

I am writing in English, from an institutional location in Hong Kong but with a sense of "agenda" and a set of protocols in my mind that are shaped both by my involvement as a white Australian with the highly charged and entangled politics of "race" and migration in that country, and by my more sporadic participation in an Anglo-American academy that spans the Pacific. From each of these sources (which are not the same) of my academic and personal experience, habitual questions arise as I write. For example: have I used the phrase "heterogeneous items" with sufficient care? Cited out of its context in the first volume of *Traces* (a technical discussion of the act of translation), is it likely in this new context of discussion about racism and migration to create the impression of an "ethnic collection" in the zoological sense?[6] Will it make *Traces* appear to be a liberal pluralist exercise in marveling at how much diversity we can pack between two covers? And if it will have this appearance for some, no matter what I say — in this context, do I care? On the other hand, should I justify or regret more explicitly the limitations — or the "omissions" (as one usage influential today terms any act of selection or product of chance) — structuring this list? These questions I can do my best to deal with as I go. Much more difficult, however, is a problem to which I cannot even begin to imagine a response: what will be the significance of these same questions — and of my posing of them as "*habitual*" — when this text is read in Korean, Japanese, or Chinese as the Introduction to a volume of essays in those languages? Indeed, what *kind* of sense will be made of my outline of the themes of this volume and my claims about the global when this outline and those claims are read in languages and academic cultures other than those in which I make them?

The fact is that I have no idea. I do know that "heterogeneity" does not

necessarily carry in all the languages of *Traces* the same reified, glamorized force that it can have in academic English today. I know that not every academic culture in the world ("the West" included) is given to affirming "diversity" as an intrinsically good thing and "difference" as a positive value — at least, not in the same ways as those that have come to prominence in societies founded, like my own, on settler colonialism and state-sponsored mass immigration. I know that deep misunderstandings easily arise when discussions of migration make simultaneous reference to situations where a "guest worker" model of temporary residence is entrenched as a norm (as in Hong Kong), those in which immigration has long been debated in terms of the conditions of real or potential national citizenship (as in Australia), and those in which economic changes have recently rendered immigration a sensitive and in some ways new topic of debate (as in Ireland and Japan, for example). To these shreds of knowledge, I can add my certain ignorance of the possible agendas and protocols that might have shaped this Introduction if I were conversant with theoretical debates occurring today not in "Korea," "China," and "Japan," but in Korean, Chinese, and Japanese *languages*.

This difficulty is at the heart of the *Traces* project. You simply don't know what the significance of your words and assumptions might become when translated into unfamiliar languages and unknown contexts of reading. This is no doubt true of all writing that circulates beyond the author's vicinity, but most writing also depends on ignoring or rendering insignificant both the form of the act of translation and the *uncertainties of address* (and therefore of reference) that are multiplied by this act. Of course, scholars who must routinely change languages to secure an "international" hearing are familiar with these uncertainties and their unsettling effect in thought. In standard "academic English," however, translation is a secondary event; we write for imagined readers with whom we share not only a language but a set of intellectual priorities, an etiquette, and a political as well as professional frame of reference. Under this regime of translation, any wider circulation of a text is taken to be subsequent and more or less accidental; a pleasant but unexpected sign of success. Writing for *Traces*, that familiar simulacrum of audience loses definition; for everyone, "other readers" are there from the beginning and actively shaping the text. To put translation first involves a loss of control, even as it weakens the force of the defensive strategies that can consume so much time and space in routine critical work. Misunderstanding is inevitable in this project and it must be accepted as a factor

intrinsic to our effort to converse with each other. The emphasis of labor, therefore, shifts away from preemptive avoidance and towards the effort to converse itself. To write and to theorize together multilingually is not a declaration of linguistic particularism. Rather, it involves taking the risk of sometimes *making generalizations* mundanely across linguistic as well as national and cultural borders. I do stress "making"; the process involved is practical and collective. It is erratic and it can fail.

The stakes of making such an effort are clear in conditions of intensifying confusion about the relations between biological and cultural racism, nationalism, colonialism, and economic exploitation active *at present* across the world. Some scholars work on these issues surrounded by confident debates about the decline of the nation-state, and/or the kind of elite consensus I mentioned earlier that racism of any kind is a vicious but historically outdated phenomenon. Others inhabit contexts where a different version of the transnational moment prevails: "new" or resurgent nationalisms, chauvinisms, and/or racially exclusive paradigms of belonging are mobilizing feelings and memories, if not always at the level of a "nation"-state, then variously also around a neighborhood, a town, a city or city-state, a sub- or supranational region, or even a "civilization."[7] This contrast is overdrawn, and it obscures a variety of situations in which it would indicate only two ends of a spectrum, or two poles of an antagonism which might itself be one of many. However, my point is simply that by engaging in a multilingual discussion of these issues we complicate but do not abandon the effort to make sense transnationally of a globally complex present.

Under what conditions may any worldly issue be considered "the same" issue debated in different languages? What happens as it circulates between distinct academic cultures that may or may not overlap? When I agreed to edit this volume for *Traces*, these questions had bothered me vaguely over the years. Trained to think academically in French, I puzzled in the 1970s and 1980s over those strange outcomes of English translation called "post-structuralism" or just plain "Theory" in Britain and the United States; I stopped when those outcomes had so transformed intellectual agendas in the Australian contexts I worked in that French became a distant memory. Yet around the same time, it seemed to become more difficult to pursue those agendas beyond Australia *in English*.[8] I began to see enough awkwardly international debates about "multiculturalism" to be convinced that diverse Americans, Australians, Canadians, and New Zealanders (for example)

do not easily understand each other on "this issue," because of differing historical experiences and forms of affect about the state — and because not all parties to a given discussion will equally accord value and significance to the ways in which they differ.

Moving from Sydney in Australia to Hong Kong during the editing of this volume greatly sharpened my sense of urgency about the need to question "the same" in contexts of translation. I do not speak Cantonese, and on leaving a life in which I used an overwhelmingly dominant language that had happily been for me (as for my Irish family before me) a medium of upward class mobility, I expected difficulty in adjusting to the limitations of an English powerfully marked in Hong Kong as the minority language of former colonial elites, now of local or "expatriate" (like me) post-repatriation elites — yet also devalued by other measures of race and class in Hong Kong when used by migrant workers, especially women from the Philippines, India, and countries in South-East Asia. Having taken pleasure in *thinking* through Australian popular idioms in my theoretical work on national culture, I was prepared for a sense of displacement (more strongly, *dépaysement* in French) to inhabit my efforts to work in a place where I have no access to popular cultural life beyond badly subtitled movies, and insufficient knowledge both of China and the complex politics of the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region (HKSAR) even to join discussions in English of matters "national" here. In short, I was prepared for difference. However, coming to Hong Kong from a country racked by the entry of open racism into "respectable" public discourse for the first time since my schooldays, I was not at all prepared for a disconcerting sameness in Hong Kong media stories screaming *in English* about "illegal immigrants" and "snakeheads" ("people smugglers" in Australia) and about mainlanders "pushing down salaries" (as legal migrants in Australia are also held to do). Nor was I prepared for the terrible familiarity of the controversies that followed an inquest into the death in a Hong Kong hospital of Harinder Veriah, an Indian Malaysian solicitor, about whether Han Chinese racism against darker-skinned people is a problem in Hong Kong or not ("is Australia the most racist country in the world or one of the best multicultural societies?").[9]

I do not read Chinese and hear only reports in translation of how these controversies are dealt with by the more extensive and, I'm told, diverse Chinese media. The English stories that startle me with their familiarity are signed, like the responses they elicit, by predominantly Chinese and Anglo-something names;

most seem to arise from a fairly narrow spectrum of more or less liberal opinion on issues of race and migration. I share the values expressed and the politics at work in many of the articles and letters attacking racism and class exploitation in Hong Kong. Yet their uncanny impact for me (as I wonder if I've really left home) derives from the way they carry another kind of divisive force: these are media stories and controversies framed by a syndicated continuum of "global news" that delivers *similarly to each market* an atomizing image of its own distinct, uniquely awful, social conflicts.[10] Along this continuum comparisons are rare and often polemically twisted — reading a Hong Kong story about how much more dynamic young people are on the mainland, I remember learning the same thing in Australia about young people in Hong Kong and Taiwan — and the *genres* of narration are fixed and standardized: reportage, human interest, op-ed, think piece, scare story, lifestyle, profile. Trying not to panic over reports in the *South China Morning Post* of a "resurgence" of the One Nation party in Australian state elections in early 2001 (at which its vote in fact declined), I find a light-hearted "fluff piece" about Pauline Hanson's plans to launch a fashion label.[11]

This is a fluent English for watchful elites, in which every place is much the same yet disconnected from all the others. In contrast, the stammering English of the classroom strains continually for comparison and "cross-cultural communication" without always being able to produce much of either. Teaching debates about racism and multiculturalism in my first semester is a strain all around. My examples, diverse and pressing in an Australian or U.S. context, are suddenly remote and monotonously "Western"; the parochial limits of my reading are painfully on display, and the students' patience with this is remarkable to me. So is their capacity to make me read these "Western" materials in a different way: one group insists that an American essay about how hierarchies of race, color, class, and language are internalized and relayed socially is really just about status relations between bosses and employees; I can't agree (nor do others in the class) but I think I see what they mean.[12] Sometimes I am jolted by a positive use of the English word "racism" to describe a natural outlook on the world, and by the categories of a blood-and-motherland raciology affirmed as common sense; I feel I'm listening to Pauline Hanson, or my grandparents. I'm not, so I learn more about this by reading.[13] But at these times, I have no idea what these students think I have been saying, or what I would think of what they might say if I understood Cantonese. Frequently my denseness in response to their comments is the major classroom problem; too often, I simply do not know what to say.

At all times, my students' fluency in my first language is far greater than mine in theirs and we do the best we can. It takes an enormous effort each week to create a working sense of security that we are *trying* to talk about "the same thing," and if this effort to construct a referent often fails in its objective, it transforms the conditions of our effort in a way that brings the objective closer. No "standardized" genres of class discussion really work to help us: my "read this and we'll talk about it" approach fails dismally when they can't manage enough English reading; their way of talking loudly in Cantonese throughout a lecture (often, it turns out, discussing the translation of things said five minutes ago) drives me crazy. Eventually, we improvise a genre that works for the topic at hand: something like a translation *relay* where students help each other in Cantonese to gloss what I'm saying in English, and students tell me in English what they've been saying in Cantonese. It takes a lot of trust and I'm not always sure why they're laughing. But in the process, it is from them that I learn enough about Hong Kong's Chinese debates about "race" and migration to become a more critical consumer of the English language media.

The question of genre in translation should be central to the theoretical projects of *Traces*, and it is formidably difficult. For this particular collection it arose from the outset as a practical problem: in what conditions might it be possible not only for widely dispersed contributors to write on highly sensitive matters in the language that suited each best, but also for each to participate in defining the topic? Two levels of editorial self-interest were at work: first, the desire for a volume to hang together well enough to be readable as cohesive; second, the need for that "same" topic to be of useful interest in every language edition of the series. Reconciling these two pressures is not an easy task. However, I believe that publishing in multiple languages is not enough to challenge the prevailing distribution of theory unless academic genres and protocols, too, are opened up for critical scrutiny and reworking. The English language academy now has globally powerful ways of talking, and of criticizing others talking, about racism on the one hand, and migration on the other. To translate the intellectual strength and political force of work in English on how these concerns intersect and interact with others to do with class, gender, and sexuality, it is vital for scholars working in other languages *also* to be able to make available for translation their own "ways of talking," their ways of doing criticism, their ways of formulating what counts as an "issue."

For this reason I am grateful, in retrospect, that we were not in a position to hold one big international conference and publish the proceedings. A productive genre for many kinds of academic work, magically exciting at times, it can too soon close off the process of *establishing* a shared concern. The American practice of reading aloud a written paper followed by discussion followed by tightening revisions (good for generating books in English, but also widely used in East Asia as a comprehension aid when English is the *lingua franca*), has a way of rendering discussion ritually agonistic: I give a finished paper, you find the flaws, I defend the paper and go home to fix the flaws. This approach was all the more unsuitable for this particular volume of *Traces* in that for a long time we could not decide what the *title* of our project should be. While we were happy to leave it to authors to interpret "panic" in connection with "memory" and "migration," how to name that *site* of panic where a mobilized violence erupts became a framing problem of producing the volume not only across languages but between several cultural contexts of usage.

As an outcome of both necessity and chance, this collection was shaped slowly by its contributors under four working titles in English and across a series of events including a great many emails and three separate workshops attended by different people. Naoki Sakai invited me in 1998 to edit a volume of *Traces* to be called "White Panic" after an essay I'd written on how the White Australia policy (1901–1973) created a racially phobic imaginary of "Asian invasion" that drew on myths of the terrifying loss of home experienced not by the Aboriginal owners of the land but by the white settlers who violently displaced them. For *Traces*, I was unhappy with that title: the kind of panic I had in mind is by no means the province only of white *people*, but this is not obvious from the English phrase alone. Nevertheless, a meeting in Tokyo pragmatically used this title to sketch a huge list of potential themes and contributors; when I shared my doubts a suggestion of "Yellow Panic" created amusement and, since the emphasis of that meeting was largely on East Asian-based conflicts, some support. But what sense might that make in other contexts of discussion? In English, such a title could well be scandalous, with its overtones of the lurid color typologies and "perils" of late nineteenth century racism.

Making a generalization, I wrote a formal proposal under the title "Race Panic and the Memory of Migration" and began corresponding with contributors. Serious collective discussion began with a workshop in English held, with the

support of the Society for the Humanities and with a great deal of help from Yukiko Hanawa, at Cornell University in October 1999; Luke Gibbons and Ghassan Hage presented work-in-progress papers, and a moving response to Gibbons was given by the Korean scholar of Irish literature, Kim Young-min. Along with participants from *Traces* a group of about twenty people came along to share ideas throughout the day. This workshop had yet another title, "Ethnic Panic and the Memory of Migration," which some organizers felt worked better for a U.S. context where the word "race" and the propriety of using it are much contested, and where "ethnicity" is a term widely used to cover a broad range of issues to do with heritage and cultural belonging.

I found it a little too diffuse for the broader international context of the project, or perhaps too easily dissociated from the critical study of racism and racialization that we wished in that context to foster. Two months later a workshop on "Race Panic and the Memory of Migration" was held in Japanese, English, and a little French at the Asian Art Museum in Fukuoka on the island of Kyushu, Japan. A heavy burden of translation, impromptu and unpaid, fell over two days on a few participants: Brett de Bary, Victor Koschmann, Môri Yoshitaka, Tessa Morris-Suzuki, and Naoki Sakai. The essays published here by Ien Ang, Jacqueline Armijo, Yann Moulier Boutang, Jung Yeong-hae, Komagome Takeshi, and Tomotari Mikako had a first hearing at this workshop along with the responses published by Koschmann, Morris-Suzuki, Sakiyama Masaki, and Oka Mari; so did Môri's collaboration with Tomotari. Among other interventions that could not be published here (including a paper by Hage), an eloquent closing response by Lee Chonghwa questioned the modes as well as the "rationality" of our discourse in terms of its impact, and lack of impact, in displaced women's lives. These responses were informal and intended to assist authors preparing to write for a more varied readership than monolingual publication assures. However, so great was their contribution to the conceptualization of the project (as it was now beginning to emerge) that I asked those discussants not already burdened with an essay to send us their texts in writing. I am deeply grateful to everyone who accepted this unexpected and unprogrammed task, which in some cases generated substantial new essays, and I very much regret that circumstances prevented Lee Chonghwa from writing her contribution. The memory of her words, however, has had a lasting effect.

At the end of this workshop, I again raised the question of the title — white? yellow? ethnic? "race"? — but no obvious solution arose. (Nor did anyone but

me seem to mind, perhaps the first indication that a conversation was actually forming). We put the problem into suspension as the huge labor of collecting, refereeing, revising, translating, and correcting texts in five languages began. During this period three authors who had been unable to attend any workshops — Rey Chow, Huang Ping, and Kim Seong-nae — generously added their thoughts and advice by correspondence to a project of which they had only a sketchy description. Soon into this process it became obvious that Brett de Bary was doing from Cornell (and later the Reischauer Institute at Harvard University) quite as much conceptual and certainly more practical work than I was in Australia, and she agreed formally to co-edit the volume with me; had she refused, the project would have collapsed. Brett also did more than her share of translation into English of texts in Japanese, and she liaised with all those "translators to English" whose unstinting, meticulous scholarship made this volume possible in no routine way. For without the work of Victor Koschmann, Jiwon Shin (who acknowledges the helpful editorial suggestions of David McCann), Erica Brindley, Joshua Goldstein, and Bernard Prusak along with Brett in producing an English version, and without the manifold forms of assistance provided throughout by Kojima Kiyoshi in Tokyo, I would not have been able to read most of this volume that I am now introducing.

These acknowledgments belong in the middle of things, not at the end where they usually go. Translation is not only an enabling condition and a theoretical object for *Traces*; it also composes the very substance of our intellectual project. It is a salutary experience to chair a workshop mostly held in a language that you don't understand and then to edit a publication you cannot read until the very last minute. Only after the labor of translation was finished did the long-distance editors have the pleasure and relief of finding that the collection does hang together, its cohesiveness a product not of editorial fiat but a multilingual collaboration developed through several layers of discussion and translation and extending across various networks of activity. We grouped the essays loosely into Parts that were not planned in advance but arose in our reading of and across the essays. The section headings are interpretations that we have imposed, combining essays posing intimately difficult questions of conduct and feeling, self-regard and self-composition in migrant experience ("Migratory Questions of Ethics"); essays examining the relations between labor mobility, nation or population building, and policy frameworks and stories rationalizing the management of these ("Logics

of Labor"); essays exploring deep histories of state violence — in two cases, violence especially against women — and the questions of commemoration and testimony that arise for survivors and for witnesses ("Memories of State"); and essays that push the boundaries of form to articulate what Ghassan Hage calls a "sea of subjectivity" that tosses around struggles for identity in contact with others as migrants, displaced people and indigenous peoples are caught up and "settled" by nationalizing narratives of land ("Displacement and National Ground").

These are the lines of connection we chose to emphasize, but among others that we might have taken up the themes of family, education, and religion are perhaps equally strong. Having made our choice, however, the matter of the title was easily settled; across a spectrum that runs from Huang Ping's essay, wholly about migration, to Kim Seong-Nae's on the racialization as "Red" of the bodies of the inhabitants of Cheju Island, most of the essays deal with the fabrication of an *idea* of "race" — with "the arbitrariness of racial divisions, the absurdity and pettiness of racial typologies, and the mortal dangers that have always attended their institutionalization" — and they grapple with "raciology," that "lore," as Paul Gilroy defines it in a powerful new book, "that brings the virtual realities of 'race' to life."[14] In *Against Race*, Gilroy calls in a utopian spirit for a "fundamental change of mood" away from the ambivalent relationship to the idea of "race" that he finds historically installed in black political culture and towards "a heterocultural, postanthropological, and cosmopolitan yet-to-come." Invoking the future of the planet as the temporal horizon that should orient political tasks in the present, Gilroy draws on Franz Fanon's memorable refusal, in *Black Skin, White Masks*, to be a "prisoner of history." If this volume participates (as I would wish it to do) in the urgent project that Gilroy describes as "making raciology appear anachronistic," then it will be because the "*planetary* humanism" that he calls for cannot develop — in time for the planet — only in English and for intellectuals based in the West. Utopian it may be, but it is indeed on a planetary scale that "careful judgments" need to be made about what "histories of our heterocultural present and our cosmopolitan future" should entail for a "new" agenda.[15]

I am less sure how to name the genre that we improvised in order to produce this heterocultural volume; insofar as it included some passages of fumbling but none the less productive partial communication, it had something of the translation relay about it. However, I think I prefer the simple and unheroic term, "workshop."

Introduction

A workshop held as a meeting is a singular event of convergence, as Oka Mari points out in her essay; for her, the Fukuoka workshop left its participants facing questions at the end. A finished publication has a different temporality, slow-release and expansive: the authors' work on these texts is over for now, and the singularity and eventfulness of whatever "plane of comparison" it has established (for no such plane was given at the beginning) pass over to the contexts of reading. However, Oka's questions also pass on and prolong or reiterate a creative moment of doubt: "we were left to ask," she writes, "what it really means to 'speak different languages' or even to 'speak the same language.' And what it could mean to share the experiences of the Other."[16] For other questions arising for the future rather than from the past of this publication, I pass over to Brett de Bary's essay at the end of the volume.

ENDNOTES

1. On "Writing for Multiple Audiences and the Heterolingual Address," see Naoki Sakai, *Translation and Subjectivity: On "Japan" and Cultural Nationalism* (Minneapolis and London: Minnesota University Press, 1997), 1–17.

2. This account is based on a prospectus for *Traces* co-authored by Naoki Sakai, Thomas Lamarre, and Peng Cheah.

3. "Introduction," Naoki Sakai, *Traces* 1, "Specters of the West and the Politics of Translation" ed. Naoki Sakai and Yukiko Hanawa, 1 (March 2001).

4. This line of thought was suggested by Pred's remarks in a different context on the mechanisms of denial involved in "a certain popular geographical imagination" that projects racism elsewhere by regarding it as "typical of a limited number of places associated with hideous events"; Alan Pred, "Memory and the cultural reworking of crisis: racisms and the current moment of danger in Sweden, or wanting it like before," *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 16 (6, 1998), 635.

5. I have in mind such innovative works as Heather Goodall's *Invasion to Embassy: Land in Aboriginal Politics in New South Wales, 1770–1972* (St. Leonards, NSW, Australia: Allen & Unwin, 1996); Gail Hershatter's *Dangerous Pleasures: Prostitution and Modernity in Twentieth-Century Shanghai* (Berkeley, Los Angeles, and London: University of California Press, 1997); Anne McClintock's *Imperial Leather: Race, Gender and Sexuality in the Colonial Context* (New York and London: Routledge, 1995).

6. Ghassan Hage, *White Nation: Fantasies of White Supremacy in a Multicultural Society* (Sydney: Pluto, 1999).

7. See Kuan-Hsing Chen, "Not Yet the Postcolonial Era: the (Super) Nation-State and Transnationalism of Cultural Studies," *Cultural Studies* 10 (1, 1996), 37–70.

8. I discuss this in "Afterthoughts on Australianism," *Cultural Studies* 6 (3, 1992), 468–475.

[9] Veriah, 33, died in Ruttonjee Hospital on January 2, 2000, after suffering an epileptic fit. Before her death, she told her husband, Martin Jacques, "I am at the bottom of the pile... I am the only Indian here, everyone else is Chinese." A campaign subsequently developed to press for antiracist legislation in Hong Kong, deemed unnecessary by the SAR government. See "More could have been done for lawyer," *South China Morning Post,* November 22, 2000.

[10] In an example of this, Veriah's death was taken up (to the outrage of Martin Jacques) by some of the English press as a "scare story" about Chinese nurses in British hospitals. For his own account see Jacques, "Life and death of the bottom of the race pile," *South China Morning Post,* March 6, 2001.

[11] "Hanson fashions career change," *South China Morning Post,* February 15, 2001.

[12] The reading in question was Patricia Williams's wonderful essay on "The Ethnic Scarring of American Whiteness" in *The House That Race Built,* ed. Wahneema Lubiano (New York: Vintage, 1998), 253–263.

[13] Frank Dikötter, *The Discourse of Race in Modern China* (Stanford, CA; Stanford University Press, 1992).

[14] Both quotations in this sentence are from Paul Gilroy, *Against Race: Imagining Political Culture Beyond the Color Line* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2000), 305, and 11. This book is published in Britain under the title *Between Camps: Race, Identity and Nationalism at the End of the Colour Line* (London: Allen Lane, 2000).

[15] This paragraph draws on Gilroy, 324–326.

[16] Oka Mari, "Words of the Other," p. 383 below.