University of Massachusetts Amherst

ScholarWorks@UMass Amherst

Masters Theses 1911 - February 2014

2010

Un pie aquí y otro allá: Translation, Globalization, and Hybridization in the New World (B)Order

Jorge Jimenez-bellver
University of Massachusetts Amherst

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarworks.umass.edu/theses

Part of the Chicana/o Studies Commons, Comparative Literature Commons, Latin American Languages and Societies Commons, and the Latin American Literature Commons

UN PIE AQUÍ Y OTRO ALLÁ: TRANSLATION, GLOBALIZATION, AND
HYBRIDIZATION IN THE NEW WORLD (B)ORDER

A Thesis presented

by

JORGE JIMÉNEZ-BELLVER

Submitted to the Graduate School of the
University of Massachusetts Amherst in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of

MASTER OF ARTS

May 2010

Comparative Literature

Translation Studies

UN PIE AQUÍ Y OTRO ALLÁ: TRANSLATION, GLOBALIZATION, AND
HYBRIDIZATION IN THE NEW WORLD (B)ORDER

A Thesis Presented by

by

JORGE JIMÉNEZ-BELLVER

Approved as to style and content by:

_____

Edwin Gentzler, Chair

_____

Maria Tymoczko, Member

_____

Agustín Lao-Montes, Member

             _____

             William Moebius, Director
             Comparative Literature Program
             Department of Languages, Literatures, and Cultures

             _____

             Julie Candler Hayes, Chair
             Comparative Literature Program
             Department of Languages, Literatures, and Cultures

DEDICATION

To Antonia Carcelén-Estrada

"¿Seremos capaces de pensar por nuestra cuenta?

¿Seremos capaces de pensar?

¡Basta ya de interrogar!"

Café Tacvba, "El fin de la infancia"

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This thesis is the result of a process of translation—or, better said, translations—that began in late 2005 when, as a doctoral student of technical translation at the University of Alicante, I expressed my interest in pursuing a Master's degree in the United States to my doctoral supervisor, Professor José Ramón Belda-Medina. After doing a bit of research on the (few) universities that offered postgraduate degrees in translation, I decided to apply at the University of Massachusetts Amherst, whose strong emphasis in translation theory was precisely what I felt I was lacking at the time.

Professor Edwin Gentzler's "Translation and Postcolonial Studies" was the first class that I took as a graduate student at UMass, where I developed the analytical and critical skills to begin to view translation as something more than the semantic and syntactic transfer from one language to another. The following semester I was lucky enough to take Professor Maria Tymoczko's "Theory and Practice of Translation," a class that not only intensified the taste of translation discourse I had acquired in the previous semester, but also elicited very insightful discussions that made our weekly meetings particularly inspiring.

It was one of those evenings during my second semester that Professor Gentzler made me an offer I couldn't refuse: he had been invited to give a talk in Lima (Peru), so he asked me to translate his presentation into Spanish, titled "Translation and Border Writing: Fiction, Performance Art, and Film." Professor Gentzler's presentation introduced me to border writing and, more specifically, to the work of Guillermo Gómez-Peña as a starting point to rethink translation—interestingly, it was the assignment of a

v

translation that inspired me to problematize translation further. Soon, the interest I was developing in translation as a, say, cultural condition was followed by the translation that I carried out of Guillermo Gómez-Peña's Spanglish novella *Friendly Cannibals* into Canarian Spanish for Professor Tymoczko's class, which provided me with an invaluable opportunity to experiment with my own developing thoughts and ideas from a hands-on perspective. This thesis is a continuation of those thoughts and ideas.

Yet, the arguments I articulate in this thesis are also informed by an array of other classes and talks that I was fortunate enough to attend. In particular, I wish to thank Professor Patricia Gubitosi, whose courses on "Bilingualism and Language Contact" and "Hispanic Dialectology" proved an excellent introduction to issues of language, power, difference, and identity in the field of Hispanic studies and the sociology of language. My gratitude also goes to Professor Julie C. Hayes for putting together a course on "The History of Translation" that not only provided an extensive overview of the main paradigms of Western translation theory but also filled a significant gap in the curriculum of the Master's Program in Translation Studies. I specially want to thank Professor Agustín Lao-Montes, whose continuous involvement with the Center for Latin American, Caribbean, and Latino Studies gave me the chance to become acquainted with issues of sociology and globalization.

One of the most rewarding aspects of being a Master's candidate has been to participate in conferences—both as a presenter and as an organizer. Special thanks are due to Professor Tymoczko for her support and assistance with the organization of the Fourth Amherst-Binghamton Translation Studies Conference. I also wish to express my

only has been a demanding reader of my work but also a continuous source of inspiration and insight.

I am most grateful to my friends and family. Thanks to my parents, José Vicente and Ana, and my sisters, Silvia and Cristina, for their continued love and support. Thanks to Alfonso, Jorge, and Roberto, with whom I've participated in unforgettable intellectual exchanges for the last fifteen years. Thanks to Carolina for her enduring encouragement and friendship. And I wish to pay a special tribute to the memory of my late grandfather, Salvador—*Te digo adiós para toda la vida, aunque toda la vida siga pensando en ti*.

Finally, I wish to express my sincere thanks to Professor José Ramón Belda-Medina at the University of Alicante for his assistance and support during the application process, to Professor William Moebius and Linda Papirio at the UMass Comparative Literature Department for their admirable administrative efficiency, and to the members of my committee—Professor Gentzler, Professor Tymoczko, and Professor Lao-Montes—for their active participation and inspiring engagement with the ideas presented in this thesis.

ABSTRACT

UN PIE AQUÍ Y OTRO ALLÁ: TRANSLATION, GLOBALIZATION, AND
HYBRIDIZATION IN THE NEW WORLD (B)ORDER

MAY 2010

JORGE JIMÉNEZ-BELLVER

B.A., UNIVERSITY OF ALICANTE, SPAIN

M.A., UNIVERSITY OF ALICANTE, SPAIN

Directed by: Professor Edwin Gentzler

Keywords:
  Translation; identity; coloniality; borders; language contact; multilingualism;
  translation as a cluster concept; Guillermo Gómez-Peña

This thesis explores the role of translation in the production and manipulation of
identities in the contemporary Americas as exemplified in the work of Guillermo Gómez-
Peña. Underscoring the instrumentality of borders vis-à-vis dominant constructions of
identity and in connection with questions of language, race, and citizenship, I argue that
translation not only functions as an agent of hegemonic superiority and oppression, but
also as a locus of plurivocity and hybridization. Drawing from the concepts "continuous
variation" (Deleuze and Guattari [1987] 2004), "coloniality of power" (Mignolo 2000),
and "hybridization" (García-Canclini 1995), I discuss the connection of translation with
three main topics: monolingualism, globalization, and racial hybridity. First, I discuss the
influence that the dominant ideology of the nation-state has exerted on the way
translation has been conceptualized since translation studies emerged as a field. Then I
turn to colonial legacies in the Americas and the role of translation in situations of
language hegemony as shaped by forces of assimilation and diversification. Finally, I

look at translation as a crucial agent for the production and legitimization of Latin American identity throughout the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. Viewing translation as a performative and transformative activity, I critique a number of contemporary approaches to translation and I point to new understandings of translation as a cluster concept (Tymoczko 2007) in order to expand translation theory and practice beyond Western paradigms.

CONTENTS

xi

INTRODUCTION: TRANSLATION, IDENTITY, BORDERS

In "Resisting through Hyphenation: The Ethics of Translating (Im)Pure Texts," África Vidal discusses questions of power, ideology, and identity, and points to translation as "an ideal territory for bringing to light a borderland of conflicts, feelings of superiority and the subsequent oppression that some languages exercise over others" (2007: 237). Vidal's problematization of translation reflects some of the major issues that the discipline of translation studies has pursued in the last decade, particularly in relation to the role of translation in the perpetuation and confrontation of asymmetries of power and the construction of identity. Michael Cronin's *Translation and Identity* (2006) illustrates this new focus on translation as a crucial agent not only for the evolution of culture, but also for the formation, maintenance, and transformation of local identities in an increasingly "borderless world," as inspired by advances in transportation, technology, and communication. Indeed, at a time of economic internationalization and the constitution of a global culture, translation cannot but be engaged in questions of assimilation, marginalization, juxtaposition, resistance, censorship, and interdependency. If, following Vidal, translation is territorialized (or, as Tejaswini Niranjana suggests, sited) within asymmetrical relations of power and prestige and the sociopolitical dynamics of local communities, the attachment of translation to the formation of both individual and collective identities surfaces.

If we take into account that neither translation nor identity are universal concepts but they are instead determined historically (in other words, they have been conceptualized differently at different times and within different cultures), a series of

questions arises: What role has Western hegemony played in the way translation and identity are presently conceptualized and practiced? How have Western ideologies of modernity shaped the notion of identity and how are those ideologies reenacted, adapted, and/or challenged at the current stage of global transformation? How does the discourse of the global village affect identity formation? And where does translation feature in the transition from the discursive global village to the actual local village? Differently put, how does the rhetoric of a global knowledge translate into local circumstances?

Regardless of the globalist utopias of cyberhype championed by supranational institutions, an instrumental mechanism of domination underlies the questions posed above: borders. Borders have played and certainly keep playing a significant part in the way that the relationship of translation and identity has come to be articulated in Western scholarship. They provide the parameters by which populations abide and, in so doing, they construct a simultaneously global and local imaginary that is legitimized through the discourse of the state and its institutions. One need only consider some of the most manifest instances where geopolitical borders do not simply appear to form and divide space, but indeed trace and represent what is largely understood as an essential difference. Israel's Wall in the West Bank and the Gaza Strip not only delimits the boundaries of the state of Israel, but also of its religion and, hence, its cosmology (Judaism, in contrast to Islam), as well as its ethnicity (Jewish). Similarly, the geopolitical boundary that at present separates Spain from Morocco, the Strait of Gibraltar (as well as the North African cities of Melilla since 1497 and Ceuta since 1688, currently bordered by fences) has come to shape and represent the historical boundary between Christianity and the "remainder" of cosmologies of the world, namely Islam and

Judaism. In addition, the Strait of Gibraltar and, by extension, Spain have not only been interpreted as the point of separation and definition of Europe from the African continent but, more significantly, a "frontier" dividing civilization from barbarism.[1] In turn, Spain's geographical position was exploited in the nineteenth century to justify colonial aspirations in Africa by asserting the blood-brotherhood of Spaniards and North Africans (Martin-Márquez 2008).[2] Likewise, the border between the United States and Mexico has come to divide what in time has come to be conceptualized as Anglo and Latin America. The border has embodied the alleged line of separation between industrial and agrarian forms of social organization, primarily since 1945, when the so-called European Age came to a halt and the United States became the new imperial power (Mignolo 2000: 98).[3] In addition, it has historically been interpreted as the point of division of materialism and spirituality, capitalism and communism, and "melting pot" and "*mestizaje*" ideologies.

These arguments indicate that borders are not merely physical instruments of spatial organization. They are also dominant forces of control that work both

---

[1] Here I follow Walter Mignolo's use of "frontier" as the epistemologic line dividing civilization from barbarism, as developed in late eighteenth and early nineteenth-century England and France (2000: 298, 299).

[2] Interestingly, the spread of Spain's "*leyenda negra*" ("Black Legend"), facilitated by the translation of Bartolomé de las Casas' *Brevísima relación de la destrucción de las Indias* (*Short Account of the Destruction of the Indies*) into the languages of Spain's rival powers (Dutch, Flemish, French, German, and English) during the second half of the sixteenth century, as well as Spain's Arab and Jewish ancestry, jeopardized Spain's position in Europe, and, consequently, its role in the European colonization of Africa in the nineteenth century. The Black Legend motivated English poet Edmund Spenser's 1596 characterization of Spain as "the most mingled, most uncertain and most bastardly" of Europe's nations (quoted in Williamson 1999: 161).

[3] In this regard, the ensuing Cold War did not just operate between west and east, but also between north and south, as reflected for example in the tensions between the United States and Nicaragua throughout the twentieth century.

centrifugally and centripetally, producing an outside that is imagined and manipulated from the lens of the dominant discourse, and legitimizing an inside that not only provides citizens with the parameters they need to live within, but also often seeks to shape their identity by subordinating it to hegemonic centers of power. One is born into a space imagined and limited by geopolitical borders, within the confines of a state territory, an allegedly original fatherland. From that moment, an omnipresent though invisible link is shaped between citizens and the multiplicity of borders that surround them. These are largely determined by the identity politics of the state in its intersection with questions of language, class, race, ethnicity, gender, sexuality, community, and so forth.

However, to disregard borders altogether as artificially-constructed obstacles to the emergence of a supposedly authentic identity would be a rather uninformed and infelicitous idea. Borders are certainly necessary for the construction of identity, and identities could not be understood as such without borders (not just geopolitical or cartographic, but also functional and systemic). By extension, identities of difference are contingent on those same borders they trace, for it is in opposition to identities of sameness that difference is constituted. In this regard, one of the main goals of the present thesis is not to criticize borders *per se* in an anti-essentialist fashion, but to discuss the instrumentality of borders vis-à-vis dominant constructions of identity and in connection with questions of language, race, and citizenship.

Without borders there is no specificity, and without specificity there is no identity. The main fallacy of contemporary critiques of borders is that they rely on an axiomatic conception of culture as independent from purportedly non-cultural factors

4

(predominantly political and socioeconomic). In so doing, they end up simply ignoring those same cultures they claim to represent in the first place. However noble the idea may seem, if culture were actually independent from political and socioeconomic factors, could we actually define cultures as such? Differently put, if cultures, like translation, were not interpreted as historically-determined, would it be possible to speak of a "universal" culture (and, likewise, of a "definitive" translation)? Who would such an understanding of culture benefit predominantly? Indeed, the most significant danger of anti-essentialist approaches to culture lies in their covert tendency to legitimize a dynamics of cultural "sameness through difference" (Cronin 2003: 89). By unproblematically declaring all cultures open and mixed, they remain oblivious to the asymmetries of power and prestige that determine intercultural relationships and promote an expansionism of dominant constructions of identity in the shape of cultural assimilation and in the name of a purported cultural hybridity.

Identities are not as static as they may seem, and translation is certainly involved in the dynamism of identity. To take a case in point, unlike what is commonly assumed (Subirats 2003), Spanish identity or, better said, the dominant discourse in Spain as constructed by politicians, scientists, artists, and intellectuals of modernity has not consistently erased all remnants of Jewish and Islamic influence since the expulsion of the Jews and Muslims in 1492, and the *Moriscos* (Moors converted to Christianity) in 1609. Instead, Spain's multicultural legacy has been interpreted differently depending on the time period and the political agenda of the Spanish leadership, particularly in the post-Enlightenment era. Besides the blood-brotherhood of Spaniards and Africans mentioned above (which paradoxically sought to improve Spain's status within Europe),

5

attempts at negotiating Spanish identity alongside (albeit seldom beyond) the dominant white, male Catholic archetype have been numerous. For instance, in the aftermath of the Peninsular War (1814-1833), Spanish Romantic writers forced into exile developed the idea of a "border subjectivity" as a means to expose the cultural hybridity of Spain, silenced by early formulations of national identity. In more recent years, the Francoist exaltation of cultural, religious, and racial affinities between Spaniards and Moroccans and the portrayal of Spain's Second Republic (1931-1936) as a threat to the future of both Christian Spain and Islam became effective discursive strategies to trigger the coup d'état launched from Morocco and the participation of Franco's Moroccan troops in the ensuing Spanish Civil War (1936-1939) (Martin-Márquez 2008: 12-63; 202-219). I believe that the identitarian practices displayed by the Spanish leadership throughout the modern age are of considerable relevance to the study of identity politics in its intersection with race, as Spain's role in modern articulations of race has commonly been overlooked (Mariscal 1998).

In this regard, translation played a double role in the reconceptualization of Spanish identity. On the one hand, it enabled the national recovery of the Andalusi past, beginning with Miguel Casiri's Castilian translation of all the Arabic inscriptions in the Alhambra palace and more than eighteen hundred Arabic manuscripts throughout the second half of the eighteenth century. On the other hand, the translation of those texts into European languages and of successive histories of medieval Spain written in Castilian throughout the following century became the engine of Northern European and North American interest in al-Andalus and the Anglo-American orientalization of Spain—as illustrated, for example, by the publication of Washington Irving's *Tales of the*

Alhambra in 1832. Indeed, identity politics and translation were closely knit in the formation of Spain as a modern nation-state.

The involvement of translation in both the configuration and confrontation of dominant forms of identity politics lingered well into the era of decolonization in Latin America and the consolidation of U.S. hegemony. A significant instance of the capacity for hybridization of identity and translation can be found within the framework of the so-called "Chicana/o experience." Wandering through the streets of Los Angeles, California, in the late 1940s, poet and cultural critic Octavio Paz wrote apropos of the Mexican Americans he encountered, "They have lived in the city for many years wearing the same clothes as the other inhabitants, and they feel ashamed of their origin... They act like persons who are wearing disguises, who are afraid of a stranger's look because it could strip them and leave them stark naked" (quoted in Tobar 2005: 9). Barely a century earlier, Los Angeles, California, was known as Los Ángeles, Alta California, a Mexican *pueblo* that, only two and a half decades after Mexico's independence from Spain (1821), was annexed by the United States under the Treaty of Cahuenga (1847) and subsequently ratified by the Treaty of Guadalupe-Hidalgo (1848). Initiated by the military conquest of one nation by another and displaced by both as a minority, the process of identity formation for Mexican Americans was shaped by the border. Derogatory terms to allude to their border condition soon followed: "*pachucos*," "*vendidos*," and "*pochos*" from the Mexican side;[4] "Mexicans" from the United States side.[5] The Chicana/o experience was

---

[4] *Pachuco* alludes to the Mexican American stereotype described by Octavio Paz. *Vendido* translates as "sellout." *Pocho* applies to Mexican Americans who have difficulty speaking Spanish, speak it with an accent, or code-switch between Spanish and English.

not only overshadowed by the shrinking borders of the emerging Mexican nation, but also downplayed by the dominant identitarian discourses of Mexico and the United States.

Understood as deceptively attempting to "go native"—for lack of a better phrase—and deliberately ignoring that in point of fact they were natives (their land of destination was the same as their land of departure), the remarks by Paz point to the construction and legitimization of a congenital bond between Mexican Americans and the Mexican nation ("their origin") and the both spatial and discursive war of positions in which Mexico and the United States were immersed at the time. Rather than a form of identification constructed in the discourses of history and culture, Mexican identity as formulated by Paz was an essential, transparent, and visible reality. The idea of passing as "the other inhabitants" (that is, Anglo-Americans) underlies his representation of those he referred to as *pachucos*. However much they attempted to "disguise," their inner "Mexicanness" surfaced as soon as they caught the eye of an authentic Mexican, a "stranger" to them. The *pachuco* was imagined and conceptualized under the dominant discourse of Mexicanness. What is more, Paz's articulation of Mexicanness was contingent on the *pachuco* as *the* remainder, *the* Mexican that does not conform, and *the* repressed other. Hence, the *pachuco* was instrumental for the construction and perpetuation of *the* Mexican identity in post-revolutionary Mexico. Indeed, Paz's

---

[5] Throughout the nineteenth century, the deep-rooted imperial opposition between England and Spain became reenacted in the opposition between the United States and Mexico (Mariscal 1998: 9).

pachuco was embedded in a history of rejection of those who would eventually come to be grouped under the designation "Chicano."[6]

Attempting to articulate a definition of *pocho*, writer, philosopher, and politician José Vasconcelos provided further coordinates to understand the dominant conceptualization of Mexican identity during the second half of the twentieth century. Vasconcelos defined the outcast as one "who rejects Mexican culture although he has it in its *blood*, and who attempts to adjust all his actions imitatively to those of the present rulers of the region." (quoted in Leal 1979: 20; emphasis added). With Vasconcelos, the relationship of the Chicana/o experience with Mexican identity shifted from a fairly neo-Platonic conception of an origin that could not be covered by the border (as conveyed by Paz) to an affirmation of a blood-brotherhood that, similarly to the turn taken by the Spanish leadership throughout the nineteenth century towards North Africans, sought to redefine the Mexican national identity without questioning the racial hierarchies upon which it had been constructed. In the case of Vasconcelos, culture was determined by blood ties, which underlay his articulation of the Latin American "Cosmic Race," as I discuss in chapter three. Regardless of the Anglo-American occupation of the Southwest and the geopolitical borders that surround it, Vasconcelos portrays Chicana/o identity as primarily determined by biology and heredity, hence denying Chicanos any possibility to translate their identities into local circumstances. Yet, one of the terrains where national identity politics have become most effectively contested is language.

---

[6] The term "Chicano" (a shortening of "*Mexicano*") came into use during the 1930s. Luis Valdez (quoted in Leal 1979: 21) points out that "Mexican American" applied to American citizens of Mexican descent, whereas "Chicano" applied to Mexican immigrants living in the U.S. Southwest. However, they often appear used interchangeably.

Although by 1848 English became the official language of the U.S. Southwest, the cultural and literary tradition of the annexed Mexican territory was not interrupted. Instead, it was transformed into a crucial agent for the self-understanding and self-definition of Chicana/o identity. Walking the streets of San Antonio in 1900, poet Amado Nervo noted by the way of Mexican Americans, "I dare not approach them, because I know that from their lips I can only expect gutter sentences, and I do not wish to witness the profanation of the harmonious treasure of my old Latin language" (quoted in Leal 1979: 20). In spite of its former colonial condition, political and intellectual leaders in Mexico followed similar colonization patterns as those developed by Spaniards (Álvarez 1973: 921). This meant that Indians in Mexico (who, unlike the majority of the Mexican population, were not categorized as racially-mixed) not only had to be Christianized, but they also had to be made "speak Christian"—an old saying inherited from the Christian *Reconquista* of Spain.

By the time *vendidos* entered the imaginary of Mexican nationalism, their physical appearance and their language(s) became the target of criticism. Caught between the supposedly monolithic cultures of the United States and Mexico, Mexican Americans of the Transition Period (1848-1910) molded their identity by using Spanish and, increasingly, English. Bilingualism served to mediate the relation of Mexican Americans with their linguistic environment while providing an insightful sociohistorical commentary—as reflected in the themes of early Chicana/o poetry, such as fear of acculturation, denunciation of Anglo-American politicians, and condemnation of the French invasion of Mexico (Torres 1994). In this respect, translation became not simply a burden imposed upon those who remained in the occupied territories, but indeed a

condition for the constitution of Chicana/o identity. Mistranslated on both sides of the border as renegades, sellouts, and foreigners, the Chicana/o experience found in translation, rearticulation, and "transculturation" (Ortiz 2002) what translation had denied them in the first place: an ethos, a history, a social context, and a language or, better said, multiple languages to articulate and channel them.

Contemporary cultural dynamics—mediated through the dominant discourses of cosmopolitanism, mobility, and transnationalism—make it all the more problematic to speak of identity as determined by national borders. If, as I illustrated above, national redefinitions of identity are contingent on both the assimilation and repression of an alleged outside (al-Andalus in Spain and the U.S. Southwest in Mexico), what is the significance of such concepts as "outside" and "inside" in an increasingly deterritorialized world system? Likewise, where does translation, commonly conceptualized by way of notions such as "domestic" and "foreign," feature at a time when countless languages coexist within the same national territory and English is the dominant language in international affairs worldwide? Where does translation begin and where does it end in the era of cosmopolitanism and transnationalism?

Rather than challenging the asymmetrical situation among national territories, the neoliberal rhetoric of an increasingly deterritorialized world operates under the radar of national expansionism and cultural dominance. As Cronin points out, "434 of the world's largest multinational corporations operate within the privileged triad of the European Union, the United States and Japan. Their business strategies are regional rather than global" (2003: 51). Far from eliciting the disappearance of hegemonic borders and the

asymmetries they generate, globalizing politics favor instead the pervasiveness of borders and the internationalization of the state. Similar to the historical, cultural, and linguistic determination of identity and translation, understanding the dynamics of border tracing requires a flexible approach that imagines borders not simply as barbed-wire fences, but also as rhetorical and discursive devices that shape and reproduce asymmetries of power and prestige while simultaneously enabling the recognition of difference.

Given the multiple layers of action and interaction in the so-called New World Order, the questions posed above may be rephrased as: How are notions such as "outside" and "inside" restructured vis-à-vis the discursive deterritorialization of the world system? Where does translation figure in late modernity in view of the increased linguistic and cultural diversity of contemporary "domestic" spaces? How may the formulation of urban spaces as "translation spaces" (Cronin 2006: 68) and the deterritorialization of the "domestic" and the "foreign" inform the conceptualization of translation? Does translation reproduce, accommodate, and/or challenge dominant identities in the era of cosmopolitanism and transnationalism? If, as pointed out by Vidal, translation underlies a borderland of conflicts and oppression, where does translation feature as a means of both border tracing and border crossing?

This thesis does not aim to provide definite answers to those questions but rather to problematize and explore them in their intersection with identity formation in the contemporary Americas. My argument is that, in the era of corporate cosmopolitanism and transnationalism, translation not only functions as an agent of hegemonic superiority and oppression, but also as a locus of plurivocity and hybridization. As I argued above,

12

translation is fundamental for the formation and manipulation of identity: it simultaneously stands as a means to imagine and legitimize dichotomies such as source and target, domestic and foreign, and Same and Other, and as a tool for understanding the multiple dynamic links that operate in the process of identity formation or, put differently, for questioning the perception of identities as "pure," "authentic," and "immutable." Given that translation is always subject to different political and socio-literary contextual factors (and, hence, the idea of a "correct" translation becomes untenable),[7] translation functions as an "ideal territory" (as suggested by Vidal) to challenge the notion of a fixed identity. If translation or, rather, translations are necessarily bound to cultural-historical "facts" (Toury 1980), translation does not only have multiple and unlimited identities, but identities are indeed contingent on translation. The type of translation I discuss in this thesis differs from the type of translation generally discussed in Western scholarship, which is strongly influenced by the paradigm of the modern nation-state. Quite to the contrary, I intend to challenge the colonial imaginary where translation discourse has frequently appeared embedded by redefining the relations of power and identity that drive the practice of translation.

---

[7] Sixteenth-century translations of Bartolomé de las Casas' *Brevísima relación de la destrucción de las Indias* provide revealing examples of the role of such factors in the translation process, as reflected for example in the titles that were given. Among many others, a French translation published in Antwerp in 1579 was titled *Tyrannies et cruatés des Espagnols pérpetrées ès Indes occidentales, qu'on dit le Nouveau Monde, brièvement descrites en langue castillane par l'évesque Dom Frère Barthélemy de Las Casas ou Casaus,... fidèlement traduites par Jaques de Miggrode, pour servir d'exemple et advertissement au XVII provinces du Païs Bas* (*Tyrannies and Cruelties of the Spaniards, Perpetrated in the West Indies, Called the New World; Briefly Described in the Castilian Language by Bishop Don Fray Bartelemy de Las Casas or Casaus,... Faithfully Translated by Jacques de Migrode to Serve as an Example and Warning to the Seventeen Provinces of the Low Countries*).

In this regard, the image of the Americas as imagined by European powers and translated from European languages—as the terms "Anglo America" and "Latin America" indicate—is being increasingly contested by contemporary artists from the Americas. Rather than abiding by the borders of the nation-state as they intersect with questions of language, class, race, gender, and so forth, they are challenging hegemonic notions of identity by approaching it as the performance of different roles in different situations. In other words, they are consciously disrupting the stabilities of dominant narratives of identity.

Apropos of Mexico, performance artist Guillermo Gómez-Peña explains the malleability of identity as follows:

> There is a point at which you realize that to defend this monolithic concept of identity—*la Mexicanidad*—in a process of ongoing border crossings and reterritorialization and deterritorialization is absurd. What many people in the border say is that we assume a multiple repertoire of identities. We have transitional identities in the making. We are developing new cultures. Jokingly, we have talked about imaginary identities that make more sense than the ones we are offered as possibilities. We call ourselves trans-Chicanos, or post-Mexicans. (Fusco 1995: 153)

A "Mexican by birth" (as the dominant discourse would have it), Gómez-Peña questions the notion of identity as formed and controlled by history, blood, and language—as reflected in the statements by Paz, Vasconcelos, and Nervo discussed above. His problematization points to the deconstruction of an allegedly homogeneous Mexican identity as well as to the existence of multiple identities that coexist, interact, and even

conflict with each other within the self. Indeed, his approach is informed by contemporary improvements in communication and transportation. If the production of an increasingly deterritorialized world has resulted in the relocation and proliferation of borders rather than their disappearance, Gómez-Peña draws on such a "mobile" and "malleable" condition to articulate his notion of the border as a conceptual site that, rather than constructing and dividing space, exposes the multiplicity of linguistic and cultural faultlines where identities operate.

Gómez-Peña's transitional conception of identity evidently includes a translational component. If the imposition of European imperial languages in the Americas instigated the demise of indigenous languages, Gómez-Peña challenges the monolingual foundations of contemporary nation-states through a strategy of fusion and displacement. Such strategy seeks to release the multilingualism covered by prevailing monolingualism and underscore the fluidity of identity as it intersects with language. The border is a space of translation, albeit not between languages but *within* languages. For Gómez-Peña, translation on the border cannot operate from "source" to "target" languages, but languages instead perennially feed into each other. Translation produces new forms of cross-cultural interaction and reveals the fundamentally hybrid character of languages and cultures.

Translation is not a burden, but a necessity for the interaction, negotiation, and redefinition of source and target, domestic and foreign, and Same and Other, as well as the many versions of the self that individuals are constantly performing. If the Western notion of translation implicitly conveys the transmission of an immutable core of

meaning across languages, Gómez-Peña provides a reconceptualization beyond the dominant logocentric view of translation as dependent on an "original" message conveyed from and to *a* language, and toward the multilateral interplay of languages, cultures, discourses, and temporalities that underlie his idea of identity in translation.

Given that the linkages between translation and identity—as well as their connection with hybridity, globalization, coloniality, and borders—stand at the heart of this thesis, the work of Guillermo Gómez-Peña informs the arguments I articulate in it. Yet, rather than focusing solely on the discussion of Gómez-Peña's ideas, my ultimate goal is to connect his redefinition of translation and identity with the problematization of Western conceptualizations of translation and point to new ways of approaching translation and its role in the production of identities in contemporary societies, paying special attention to the United States and Mexico. Since, in compliance with his problematization of the notion of origin, the literary production of Gómez-Peña is a continuous rewriting and retranslation of his performance pieces, I do not focus on any particular volume of his oeuvre. I believe that the intertextual and self-referential character of his literary production makes it pointless to concentrate on his conceptualization of translation as if it were "originated" or "contained" in any one volume—although special attention is paid to the seminal *The New World Border* (1996).

I divide this thesis into three main chapters. In the first chapter, I discuss the influence that the dominant ideology of the nation-state has exerted on the way translation has been conceptualized since translation studies emerged. Although the discipline of translation studies is strongly influenced by monolingualism as the "normal"

status quo, I explore the power of translation in the subversion of dominant conceptualizations of language. In the second chapter, I turn to the colonial legacies produced by European powers in the Americas and the role of translation in situations of language hegemony as shaped by forces of assimilation and diversification. In the third chapter, I turn to racial and cultural *mestizaje* and hybridity in Latin America to approach translation as a crucial agent for the production and legitimization of a Latin American identity throughout the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. Finally, in the conclusion I comment on the main contributions of this thesis for the reconsideration of translation along the lines of "translation as a cluster concept" (Tymoczko 2007) and identity formation in an increasingly "borderless world."

CHAPTER I
BEYOND THE ORGANIC MENDA-CITY: LANGUAGE CONTACT, TRANSLATION, AND HYBRIDIZATION IN THE NEW WORLD (B)ORDER

Introduction: From the monolingual nation-state to the multilingual *barrios*

In contemporary societies, the ever-increasing flow of human capital to the city (a collective destination for diasporic communities not to merely juxtapose, but more significantly to translate and be translated) has instigated a reconsideration of the boundaries that define personal and collective identities within the paradigm of the nation-state and the national language. Whereas nation-building has traditionally been driven by a territorializing impulse that conflates land and language, the hybridization of global space challenges the very concept of linguistic belonging previously legitimated in spatially-defined arrangements and generates transidentitarian, multilingual cultures of cross-fertilization. Migrant subjects embrace an ongoing process of border crossing, both literal and figurative, whereby subjectivity becomes continuously deterritorialized, not simply by way of standing at the heart of two allegedly self-contained national projects, but by rethinking the politics of individual and communal boundaries. Consequently, they problematize widespread Manichean oppositions between dominant and subordinate, native and immigrant, and national language and foreign languages.

An insightful example of this phenomenon is found in the United States, one of the driving forces behind the supranational value system commonly referred to as economic globalization and the highest representative of the "melting pot" ideology under the banner of *E Pluribus Unum* (out of many, one)—albeit in the form of full

assimilation of the dominant Anglo-Protestant culture. Throughout its history, migration flows into North American metropolises have turned the United States into the quintessential multicultural society. Even though the major racial group by far is the so-called "White alone" (74% of the total population, according to the 2006 American Community Survey), the growth of so-called racial minorities stands as a major demographic trend, with Hispanics and Latinas/os being the largest group (14.8% of the total population), to which an estimate of 11.2 million illegal immigrants must be added.

These figures provide a revealing illustration of the power dynamics underlying the currency of the "melting pot" ideology. Although seemingly rooted in the promotion of an egalitarian national integration, the philosophy of the "melting pot" fails to account for the hierarchy under which assimilation operates.[8] In spite of its multicultural fabric and in an apparent effort to realize the ideal of *E Pluribus Unum*, ethnic demographics in the United States have been clearly shaped by the currency of white Anglo-Protestantism as the dominant ethnicity, with the resulting pattern of ethnocultural homogenization as the path to social integration. In other words, while deceptively celebrating the racial and ethnic diversity that underlies the trope of the melting pot, national identity politics in the United States have historically been driven by the dominance of a white racial identity

---

[8] The formation of a racial hierarchy in the United States, characterized by the dichotomization of "whiteness" and "blackness," has been historically affected by the persistency of the so-called "one-drop rule" since the seventeenth century, whereby individuals with any degree of African ancestry are automatically regarded as black. A construction inherited from the colonial past, the one-drop rule paradoxically reinforced black group identity and instigated significant debates on racial categories and multiraciality. See Daniel 2006: 141-174.

developed at the heart of Anglo-Protestantism.[9] As a consequence, the participation of minorities (namely so-called "Americans of color": African Americans, Asian Americans, Native Americans, and Latinas/os) as constituent members of society has been contingent on the assimilation of the prevailing Anglo-Protestant tradition, subsequently reproduced and validated through social interaction. Ultimately, the "melting pot" ideology has covertly served the perpetuation of ethnoracial inequality in the name of a "politics of common culture and a national identity" (Daniel 2006: 213), one that, although apparently premised on egalitarian pluralism, stemmed from protracted Anglo-Protestant domination.

Since the second half of the twentieth century,[10] the dominant articulation of national identity in the United States has found in Latin American—especially Mexican—immigration one of the most dramatic challenges to its Anglo-Protestant foundations. The physical immediacy between the United States and Mexico, separated by a 2,000-mile border but linked by a network of roads, highways, air corridors, and trade agreements, speaks as to why, in spite of increasing restrictions, the newest waves of immigration from Latin America are visibly changing the demographics of the melting pot, particularly in urban areas, where most Latinas/os live. In this new Latin Republic of the United States, as Héctor Tobar (2005) names it, migration is affecting not only

---

[9] Homi Bhabha (1994: xv) argues that the demands of Native Americans and African Americans for recognition and redistribution of lands are often considered to go against the "American grain" because they question its ideology at the *foundational* level.

[10] In particular from 1965 through 1986, when the absence of a legal program for the importation of laborers triggered approximately 27.9 million entries of undocumented Mexican workers into the United States to cope with the national demand for low-wage workers (Spener 2005: 45).

ethnoracial identities in North American territories, but also the geopolitical borders, cultural dynamics, language loyalties, and adjacent discourses derived from them.

However, such transformation is not exempt from systematic procedures of disenfranchisement and repression from those who claim to preserve an apparent "cultural coherence." Profoundly affected by the "disease of late modernity" (Sommer 2003), the defenders of a homogenous national identity attempt to reinstate an apparent normality that moves along the lines of citizenship. Across the confines of the national territory, a border of legal and political consequences exists between those who are said to belong and those who are not; those who are legitimate—or, rather, who have been legitimized—and those who are not; those who claim to represent the community and those who do not; those who hold the status of residents and those who are both illegal and alien.[11] Migrant communities are commonly envisioned in the hegemonic fashion that underlies the territorializing impulse of modern nation-states: as either temporary workers or passive consumers. In this way, dominant conceptualizations of national identity underscore their reliance on human capital as well as their refusal of the adjoining multicultural capital, at least as far as persistent inequality and immiseration are concerned.[12] In addition, those who become naturalized citizens and even those native citizens who are descendants of immigrant families are often forced to waive their right

---

[11] The production of subjectivity and the constitution of citizenship are discussed by Etienne Balibar (1991), who argues that the modern sense of self is contingent on the status of citizenship.

[12] Néstor García-Canclini (2001: 5) notes the dynamics of the territorializing impulse and argues that the socioeconomic submission of Latin America to the United States entails that social participation be organized through consumption, rather than through the exercise of citizenship.

to receive education in "non-English languages"[13] (thus revealing its oppositional character) on account of widespread restrictions to the promotion of so-called "minority languages."

The institutional debate on minority languages generated by the remarkable growth of the native Spanish-speaking population has indeed been part of the fabric of the United States ever since its very foundation. Back in the late eighteenth century, German settlers in the states of Ohio and Pennsylvania founded bilingual and German language schools with the support of public funding. Prior to the outbreak of the American Civil War (1861-1865), schools in Louisiana were bilingual in French and English. And in the years following the annexation of New Mexico to the United States in 1851, 33% of the schools were bilingual in Spanish and English (Del Valle 2003: 10-17). In point of fact, bilingualism and multilingualism were prevalent throughout the formation of the United States as such. Indeed, it was the abundance of minority languages that inspired the ideals of democracy that would be subsequently pursued by reaching out to ethnoracial communities in their respective native languages (Del Valle 2003: 9). Yet, the proliferation of languages in the United States has commonly been downplayed by asymmetries of power and prestige.

The case of Puerto Rico is noteworthy in this respect. Officially bilingual in Spanish and English,[14] the question of Puerto Rico has often appeared attached to the

---

[13] Two major instances of the increasing restrictions to Spanish-speaking minorities in the United States are the aftermath of the Treaty of Guadalupe-Hidalgo (1848), where the right to maintain the language and culture of the population of the acquired Mexican territories was ignored, and the passing of California's Propositions 187 (1994) and 227 (1998), which sought to prevent undocumented immigrants from receiving benefits and public services, as well as to eliminate bilingual education and instigate English-only instruction. See Ono and Sloop (2002).

interrogation of dominant articulations of national identity since it came under United States sovereignty it in the aftermath of the Spanish-American War (1898). Neither recognized as a colony of the United States nor assimilated as a state, Puerto Rico's transitional status has been historically shaped by the native population's strong allegiance to the Spanish language in connection with questions of hegemony, colonialism, and linguistic intolerance. Spanish language loyalty in Puerto Rico has not simply been interpreted as a sign of a distinct identity, but indeed as an obstacle to economic monopolization and militarization.[15]

In this context, "linguistic impurity" has become the dominant discourse through which English-only policies in Puerto Rico have been channeled. In the service of the so-called "Americanization" of the island, Puerto Rican Spanish has often times been portrayed as a *patois* of an allegedly pure Castilian Spanish. In turn, impurity has been utilized to legitimize the currency of English as the official language of the colony on the grounds that, as the President of the Insular Board of Education argued in 1899, "it will be nearly as easy to educate the people out of their patois into English as it will be to educate then [*sic*] into the elegant tongue of Castile" (Del Valle 2003: 19). However, the significance of Spanish in Puerto Rico as a symbol of nation and culture remains intact longer than a century after its colonization by the United States and will likely remain so

---

[14] Puerto Rico's bilingual status has been heatedly contested in the political arena, particularly in the early 1990s, when in April 1991 the Popular Democratic Party led a reform that replaced the Languages Act of 1902, which declared the island bilingual, with a law that recognized Spanish as the only official language. However, the Spanish-only initiative was rather short-lived. In January 1993, the New Progressive Party signed a law that restored Spanish and English as co-official languages in Puerto Rican territory.

[15] Although it is certainly true that living conditions in Puerto Rico under Spanish rule were more precarious than under U.S. rule (with the island being primarily used for military affairs) (Martínez-Vergne 1992), early-twentieth-century U.S. mercantilists did not show much interest in Puerto Rican native culture either, devoting most of their impetus to the production and exportation of sugar and tobacco.

throughout the twenty-first century. Although knowledge of English is increasingly becoming a "must have" not only in the Puerto Rican context but also because of the currency of global English, the degree of commitment to Spanish in Puerto Rico is symptomatic of the need to reconsider the attachment of language debates to questions of identity, citizenship, equality, and democracy.

Back into the context of the dominant ideological foundations of mainland United States, it is worth turning attention to the ultimate marginal construction of the nation-driven project, particularly in the current phase of transnationalism: the *barrio*. As minoritarian spaces that fall outside of the boundaries delimited by social superstructures, *barrios* embody the remainder that goes against the grain of national coherence. They are marginal places inhabited by non-English or, rather, not-only-English-speaking subjects that translate and challenge the one-for-one equation between the national language and the place where one belongs. By so doing, they develop a resistant voice that subverts the authority upon which national homogeneity rests. Conversely, in the view of those dwellers that inhabit borders as multidimensional frontiers, *barrios* symbolize both the physical and metaphorical peripheries against the hegemonic tendency to understand languages in opposition to each other.

In this chapter, I argue that in those intercultural faultlines translation acquires its full dimension as a locus of plurivocity and resistance. In order to do so, I first discuss the influence that dichotomous and neocolonialist language assumptions have exerted on contemporary translation studies. Then, I analyze the power of translation in the subversion of hegemonic conceptualizations of language by turning attention to Mexican

American border writing and, more specifically, to the work of Guillermo Gómez-Peña and its intersection with the linguistic, cultural, and political spectrum of national territories. In this way, I intend to trigger reflection about dominant presuppositions of language and translation, and their attachment to issues of difference, counterdiscursiveness, and multiple belonging.

Language contact in translation studies: Reinstating the organic mendacity

Throughout the history of the field, the biblical story of the Tower of Babel has hold sway in translation studies. Reaching its peak with the publication of George Steiner's *After Babel* (1975), periodizations of the history of mankind from the standpoint of languages and translation have not only delivered a pre-Babelian phase (where all humankind spoke a single originary language) and a Babelian phase (where a multiplicity of languages was scattered around the globe), but also, in light of recent mass movements of human capital, a post-Babelian phase (where a vast number of peoples uses an array of languages that, through multilingualism and translation, become mutually comprehensible) (Eoyang 1993).

However problematic the assumption that diasporic movements in late modernity have signaled the birth of multilingual societies is, the term "post-Babelian" certainly holds significance in conjunction with current processes of economic internationalization

and the globalization of culture.[16] Indeed, the transidentitarian experience illuminates the categorization of an inherently multilingual, translational phase that confronts the deceptively monistic equation lying at the heart of national projects. In this case, the question is whether post-Babelian becomes a euphemism for "neo-Babelianism by default" (Cronin 2003: 60-63). Differently put, does post-Babelian convey the plain juxtaposition of target languages ("target" of exclusion) that must perpetually translate themselves into the major language—very much along the lines of the corporate-liberal notions of multiculturalism that have reigned in North American institutions since the creation of the North Atlantic Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) in 1993—or, rather, the acknowledgment of the fundamentally dialogic relationship among languages?

In order to approach the current stage of post-Babelianism, I suggest that we consider first what is generally understood by *a* language. One of the main characteristics that define the one-for-one equation mentioned above lies in its focus on the locutionary sphere of language. From this perspective, language is categorized as a code that performs a series of ideal functions (such as informing, stating, and questioning) from which a series of grammatical rules can be deduced, and whose ultimate goal is the communication of information. This territorializing interpretation not only relegates language to a self-reliant concatenation of constants, but also attributes it to a homogenous community of ideal speakers who submit to social laws through the formation of grammatically-correct sentences (Deleuze and Guattari 2004). At the same time, such attribution involves and represses the existence of a remainder that, failing to

---

[16] The last quarter of the twentieth century saw an estimated migration of 40 million workers and 40-45 million refugees, most of them as a result of wars or famines (Bhabha 1994: xxi).

comply with grammaticality, comprises those illegitimate subjects that, by their own marginal position, defy the constant-driven use of language and exceed the limits of its dominant ideology.[17]

However, the realm of language and power in turn exceeds the limits of the locutionary. Both the extrinsic and intrinsic relations between words and the things that are done with them (Austin 1975) reveal that language does not denote, represent, or communicate a universal meaning, but rather intervenes in the production of sign-value. In addition, they expose that the unity of language (strongly linked to the power of constants) is fundamentally a political endeavor to territorialize, homogenize, and dominate language in its encounter with questions of signification and subjectification. By way of constant-extraction, a language both stems from and goes against the linguistic environment that surrounds it, becoming consequently borderized and imposed upon speakers. Along the lines of the questions of identity and citizenship mentioned above, speakers assume a congenital relationship to language—hence categorizations such as "half-breed," "bastard," and "mongrel".

In order to surpass the scientific model of language-as-a-system-of-constants and underscore alterity and difference, I propose to approach language as inherently transitional and heterogeneous. Situations of bilingualism provide us with a significant example when discussed from the paradigm of so-called "major" and "minor" languages. One of the contributions of postcolonial translation studies to the field of bilingualism

---

[17] It might be argued in the context of Western literary translation that what has been termed "smooth translation" (Venuti 1995: 21) is founded on the notion of language as communication, stressing transparency and intelligibility and, more importantly, eliding questions of cultural hegemony and ethnocentric violence.

and language contact has been the analysis of linguistic and cultural transference from the minor language (or the tongue of the colonized) into the major language (or the tongue of the colonizer) from the lenses of power and ideology, and the subsequent effects of multivalency and polysemy that take place in postcolonial literature (Tymoczko 2000). Because of its resistance to dichotomous thinking, hybridity in this respect challenges essentialist oppositions between major and minor, colonizer and colonized, and takes instead a horizontal approach that problematizes language as a national signifier.

Certainly, one may argue that being or, rather, becoming minor involves less a question of a relation to a standard or major language and more a latent quality of such major language subsumed by the power of constants (Deleuze and Guattari 2004: 111-122). Whereas the distinction between major and minor has generally been founded on sociolinguistic data and in connection with the linguistic environment, a feature that post-Babelian critics often fail to acknowledge is that, however seemingly homogenous, any major language is itself made up of internal minorities, unspoken remainders, and bastardized *barrios* of lingering voices from which constants themselves are drawn—"heteroglossia" in Bakhtin (1981) and "continuous variation" in Deleuze and Guattari (2004). Consequently, it is not only in their command of several languages and traditional translation strategies that the power of the post-Babelian subject is forged but, more importantly, in their potential to deviate from the model, to minoritize what is deemed major, to be multilingual in one language, or to speak in tongues in their own tongue.

Given that it is a process of becoming minor, translation emerges as a key component in the deterritorialization of the national language. Yet, scant attention has been paid to issues of becoming in translation studies (a discipline founded in Europe, also the birthplace of the one-for-one equation between language and nation) in view of their defiance of the practice of translation in a traditional sense. Certainly, given that throughout the centuries translation has been theorized as operating from source language A into target language B (that is, as interlingual), it must not be easy to turn sight to languages not just in synergetic interaction with each other, but also as multilingual *per se*. To put it another way, analyses of multilingual texts abound in translation studies, although drawn from Eurocentric assumptions of monolingualism as the "normal" state of affairs and of languages as self-contained entities, and based on the translation "problems" posed when rendering a source text that features several languages.[18] Leo Chan (2002), for instance, provides a compendium of scenarios where translators may find themselves rendering a multilingual literary text (from the incidental use of foreign words to the transposition of lexicons and syntactic structures into the author's native tongue) and a selection of solutions to facilitate a "translational mimesis" that reproduces its effects.

André Lefevere, on the other hand, introduces the word "postcolonial" into the discussion to denounce the existing gap in the discipline regarding multilingual texts that surface from postcolonial situations, where hybrid cultures produce texts written in a

---

[18] Interestingly, Kathryn Batchelor (2009: 232) argues that monolingualism has characterized postcolonial criticism since its very inception and points to the potential of translation studies to undermine the currency of monolingualism in postcolonial studies.

mixture of European languages with words and phrases from indigenous languages to add "local colour" (1995: 223). Lefevere proposes to go beyond the postcolonial paradigm to incorporate what he calls "the advent of multiculturalism in North America" (1995: 224)—yet, he remains silent about subsequent assimilationist policies.

While acknowledging the implications that current diasporic movements and globalizing politics may have for the theorization of translation, these approaches to multilingualism and translation remain uncritical of the ideological assumptions that haunt the discipline and present a product-oriented understanding of translational practice. Yet, questions arise that transcend the boundaries of language and reach out to the realms of ambiguity and difference. The aesthetics associated with cultural deterritorialization and multiple belonging, with its taste for code-switching, cultural syncretism, and identity performance, often conflicts with the widespread tendency to comply with dichotomous thinking and regard hybrid literature as a mere idiosyncrasy against the background of an apparent cultural normality. Such compliance permeates translation commentary to a large extent, as can be seen reflected in the status of multilingual, transidentitarian texts within the discipline, commonly characterized, and even pathologized, by an array of disdainful qualifiers such as "anomalous," "deviated," "illegitimate," and "treacherous" (McGuire 2002: 75).

One of the pioneers to translate Latin American "*transculturación*"[19] into Anglophone literary studies, Mary Louise Pratt in *Imperial Eyes: Travel Writing and*

---

[19] *Transculturación* is a term coined in 1940 by Cuban anthropologist Fernando Ortiz (2002) in response to the idea of "acculturation." Whereas acculturation focuses on the cultural consequences derived from the domination of indigenous and immigrant populations (that is, it is product-oriented), *transculturación* explores the modifications that cultural contact involves (that is, it is process-oriented). Although Mary

Transculturation (1992) introduces the notion of "contact zones" as intercultural spaces where asymmetrical relations of power among cultures establish ongoing relations. Borrowing the term "contact" from linguistics, Pratt coins "contact languages" to designate those improvised languages that, similar to pidgins, are developed among speakers of different tongues in the need to communicate. Indeed, a significant contribution of contact zones is the problematization of the cultural and political practices whereby a dominant group subjugates the colonized populations and, more significantly, the attachment of translation to the exercise of power. Nevertheless, the concept eventually reveals its indebtedness to the language-as-a-system-of-constants model.

Since, as previously discussed, deterritorializing a major language is a question of becoming, a deterritorialized language cannot be the result of an improvised intermingling of tongues. Rather, it happens to be multilingual by its own condition, yet made seemingly monolingual through the extraction of constants. At the same time, whereas the assumption that language-as-communication supports the desired coherence of national arrangements (hence the quest for monolingualism), the pragmatic sphere (that is, the things that are done or accomplished with words) not only defies the idea that language is meant for the communication of information, but also underlines its performative and transformative power. In presupposing the improvised, communicative qualities of language, "contact zones" sidesteps the continuous variation that underlies

---

Louise Pratt links *transculturación* to translation issues, the first translation "proper" of Ortiz's work into English was carried out by Harriet de Onís (Munday 2008: 70-71). For further reading on translation and transculturation, see Gentzler 2008: 174-179, Sales-Salvador 2004, and Tymoczko 2007: 120-127.

linguistic homogeneity, as well as the immanent relation between language use and performance, from which multilingual and transidentitarian hybridity emanates.

Similarly, in *The Scandals of Translation*, Lawrence Venuti (1998) coins the term "translingualism" to speak of the traces of indigenous languages in West Africa that "are visible in an English or French text through lexical and syntactical peculiarities, apart from the use of pidgins and the sheer embedding of indigenous words and phrases" (1998: 174). While translingualism makes a powerful argument against the homogenizing resistance to transcultural identities underlying national projects, I suggest that such articulation of linguistic deterritorialization attests to the permeability of constant-driven discourses on hybridity as idiosyncratic.

Along the lines of the scholarship discussed above, Venuti's lexical-and-syntactic-deviation approach reinstates prescriptive definitions of the ideal and unifying functions that language is meant to realize and expels its inherent variable state outside of the linguistic territory. Against the backdrop of the communicative dimension of language and the distinction between major/colonizer and minor/colonized, translingualism conveys a mere infiltration of (a)grammatical residue within an apparently hermetic symbolic system, leaving the realm of ambiguity out of the question. Moreover, by complying uncritically with the rhetoric of juxtaposition (that is, by describing hybrid literature as the "sheer embedding" of lexical and syntactic units into the major language), Venuti's approach reinstates the "melting pot" ideology that forces cultural concurrence under the patronage of the national language. On the whole,

"translingualism" reifies the neo-Babelianism by default that relegates linguistic minorities to simple peculiarities within the officially monolingual scenario.

The assumptions that have been built into contemporary translation studies speak in this respect to the observation made by Joshua Price (2000) that there exists a qualitative discrepancy between theory (traditionally drawn from languages as self-contained entities) and language use in current societies. More specifically, Price claims that the discipline has been suffering from an "organic mendacity": the belief that languages are dichotomous and, thus, mutually exclusive.[20] I suggest not only that the organic mendacity remains in the operating system of Western translation discourse (after all, it was founded upon oppositions such as domestic and foreign, source and target, fluency and accuracy, and author and translator), but also that its implications become particularly relevant in light of transnational movements of globalization and unprecedented migration flows to urban spaces, acquiring a renovated force vis-à-vis traditional ideas of homogenous melting pots, apparently unintelligible not-only-English-speaking *barrios*, and the cosmopolitan "menda-city."

---

[20] Price (2000: 45) borrows "organic mendacity" from the work of Richard Weissberg on Friedrich Nietzsche. I find the phrase useful for the discussion of the Western heritage of translation studies in relation to current redefinitions of translation as affected by globalizing scenarios (Cronin 2003; Tymoczko 2007; Gentzler 2008).

<u>Translation and linguistic nomadism: A border between languages or a border of languages?</u>

In order to contest the pervasiveness of the "organic menda-city"[21] in translation discourse, I propose to begin by questioning the mendacious fabric of the constant-based discourse on language. As I argued above, the contention that language is meant for communication underlies the quest for national, if not global, monolingualism. In other words, the nationalist struggle for monolingualism underlies the maxim that if (1) language is meant for communication and (2) languages are mutually exclusive, monolingualism is best for human communication. In turn, such maxim underlies the neo-Babelian utopia of a universal (English) language understood by all humankind or, as put by Michael Cronin, "a form of translation to end translation" (2003: 60): if the speakers of minor languages assimilated themselves into the major language, the need for translation would vanish.

The widespread characterization of the practice of translation as derivative and treacherous follows the line of thinking set by neo-Babelian discourse. Translation stands in the way of the neo-Babelian utopia, since it suggests a sense of ideological resistance and treachery to a desired political, economic, and cultural coherence. After all, (mis)translation has arguably stood behind a good deal of international conflicts and crises—for one, the dropping of the nuclear bomb during World War II (Santoyo 2006: 37-38). In contrast, language (perceived as a transparent system that verbalizes a reality

---

[21] In this chapter I use the term "organic menda-city" to refer to the assumption of languages as mutually exclusive in connection with diasporic movements and cultural configurations of vernacular cosmopolitanism.

lying "out there") provides a unitary framework to convey a universal meaning through a distinctive chain of signifiers, away from the distortion produced by the ulterior activity of decoding and re-encoding into another chain of signifiers—that is, translation. In short, the quest for monolingualism presupposes an essential distinction between language as the communication of a primary signification and translation as the metacommunication of such signification or, in other words, a one-to-one equation between reality and language and a choose-and-lose equation among languages and translation (Sommer 2003).

Suffice it to say that assumptions like those have long been refuted within poststructuralist approaches to language, although they keep permeating the way the relationship between language and translation is articulated—for instance, in the categorical distinction between original and translated literary works. Aware that all use of language is indirect in itself and that meaning is at once deceptive, fallible (therefore, open and malleable), and language-specific, multilingual writers trigger a reconsideration of the implications of post-Babelianism from the standpoint of "linguistic nomadism" (Macedo 2006): the ideological and identitarian implications of the polyglottism and plurivocity that circulate today in cultural configurations across the globe.

Although the claim that postcolonial writing is itself an act of translation has been heatedly debated in translation studies (Mehrez 1992; Tymoczko 2000), the engagement of translation with postcolonial literature exceeds the limits of its own conceptual boundaries, beyond semantic and syntactic effects of color-adding and foreign-word-embedding, and toward an elsewhere, a signifying *barrio*, where the functions of writer

35

and translator, as traditionally established in literary studies, stand in perpetual cross-invasion. If language is intrinsically unable to contain experience, one may argue, and if the linguistic paradigm is inevitably dislocative and translative, translation is not simply a form of writing, but it is also symptomatic of the mendacity of language itself: translation acknowledges an inherent treachery to its own practice, whereas language keeps articulating its own foundational mendacity by claiming to verbalize an assumed transcendental meaning. In other words, translation is but a reenactment of the failure of language to be primary since, as Gilles Deleuze and Felix Guattari (2004: 85) argue, language necessarily stems from a dynamics of "hearsay": it does not communicate from a first party who has seen to a second party who has heard, but instead it perpetuates itself as going from second to third parties that both hear and say.

The foundational mendacity of language, as well as the liberating role of translation, becomes particularly significant for multilingual writers. Confronted with the question of what language to choose, they opt for a strategy of self-translation, whereby the distinction between native language and foreign language that conventionally shapes identity translates into a process of becoming-across-languages. In this respect, one of the most popular tropes of translation has been that of the intersectional bridge connecting peoples from both shores. According to this model, translation stands as a means of communication and reciprocity against the threat of univocity and silence—hence the sense of displacement of multilingual writers, perpetually adrift between languages. Given that, by complying with such conceptualization, translation endorses the mendacity of the transparent use of language and dissociates translation from practices of political and cultural hegemony, postcolonial critics have distanced themselves from the image of

the bridge to represent the exercise of translation that takes place in multilingual narratives. Instead, they have been drawn to the conceptual threshold that defines language and translation, national and foreign, and author and translator in the first place: the border.

As the multidimensional articulation of the heteroglossic nature of language, border writing stems from a strategy of translation rather than representation, whereby the signification attributed to any given language is fragmented against its supposed unity and deterritorialized within its own established territory (Hicks 1991).[22] Consequently, this understanding of signification turns untenable the foundational distinction that the border itself traces, whether it is inside and outside, original and alien, or subject and object. In other words, border writing must be approached as a mode of operation that, similarly to translation, reveals the essentially displaced and inconclusive nature of language from experience, subverts the space of significance that has been built into linguistic conceptualizations based on systems of recognition, and, by so doing, decenters self-defining questions of writing in *a* language toward open-ended questions of languages *and* translation. The process no longer consists in impregnating the major language with the lexis and syntax of the minor(itized) language in a manifest fashion. Rather, it seeks to produce a subliminal level within that major language that obliterates its monolingual foundations, hence liberating the languages covered and smuggling the minor-becoming dimension of language across the borders that confine it.

---

[22] Another remarkable example of the interplay of borders with the Bakhtinian notion of heteroglossia is found in the late-nineteenth-century language revival movement in Ireland, albeit with significantly different implications. In this regard, Cronin (2003: 88-92) warns against an uncritical defense of heteroglossia by looking at the implications of a heteroglossic discourse of translation for language diversity.

Orders to (B)Orders: Guillermo Gómez-Peña's New World

As the representation of the dweller of the "hyperborder" that separates the United States and Mexico (Romero 2008), Chicana/o art has led the way in the Americas vis-à-vis contemporary problematizations and redefinitions of living *on* the border from the standpoint of language, translation, power, ideology, and identity. In this last section, I wish to draw attention to the work of Guillermo Gómez-Peña, a border artist who employs a multiple, self-defiant repertoire of identities that include a "*pachuco*" and a "*pocho*" in Mexico, a "wetback" in the United States,[23] a "*sudaca*" (derogative term addressed at people from Latin America) in Spain, a Turk in Germany, and, most commonly, a Mexican by birth in an ongoing process of "Chicanization."

In *The New World Border*, Gómez-Peña turns the dominantly Anglo-Protestant, monocultural New World Order upside down by envisioning an American cartography where, following the opening of the Berlin Wall, the U.S.-Mexico border has disappeared and a new map has been drawn against the "capricious hands of economic domination and political bravado" (Gómez-Peña 1996: 6). The official language of the resulting New Federation of U.S. Republics is Spanglish, a hybrid tongue resulting from the contact between Spanish and English and legitimated under the "Spanglish-Only Initiative."

Defined as "the linguistic juxtaposition of South and North" in the American continent (Stavans 2003: 3), the implications of Gómez-Peña's use of Spanglish, as well

---

[23] "Wetback" is a derogatory term used in the United States to refer to illegal Mexican immigrants. In connection with his professed goal of "'brownify[ing] virtual space," Guillermo Gómez-Peña (2000: 205) coins the neologism "webback" to tackle the often unwelcome presence of Mexicans and Latin Americans in the World Wide Web. For a discussion of the relation of Gómez-Peña's work with race, see Thornton (2007) and Foster (2002).

as other hybrids such as Franglé and Gringoñol, go beyond the simple rhetoric of juxtaposition. Indeed, they provide an insightful metacommentary on translation and identity. As Edwin Gentzler points out, for Gómez-Peña "there are only hybrid forms of language—Spanish, Gringoñol, colloquial French, and shifting indigenous languages—which he uses strategically to exclude traditional Western readers" (2008: 158). While it is certainly true that border writing emphasizes the violent experience of border crossers and requires a greater effort on the part of the reader to grasp the multiple discourses it underlies, I suggest that the often-underscored function of exclusion obscures the larger ideological implications of border writing.

In *Spanglish: The Making of a New American Language* (2003: 43), Ilán Stavans discusses the use of Spanglish as an "intra-ethnic vehicle of communication," that is, as a means to show empathy among the speakers of a given community. Yet, the repercussions derived from the use of Spanglish, or any language for that matter, do not come down to performing such ethnic-based functions, but they also work under the sphere of the extra-ethnic. In *The New World Border*, Gómez-Peña's use of Spanglish does not just "exclude" deliberately the monocultural reader (after all, his work has been extensively incorporated to predominantly-monolingual Anglophone cultural studies), but it is also part of a larger political strategy whereby monolinguals face the linguistic vertigo derived from an imposed system of monolingualism and lingua francas that do not coincide with their world experience. In so doing, they undergo an invisible metamorphosis whereby they become border crossers that face the trials of cultural, or rather transcultural, translation.

Certainly, the act of exclusion is an intrinsic component of the border experience. Physical and conceptual borders aim to create an outside and an inside upon which epistemological configurations are delineated, as I discussed in the introduction. A geopolitical border separates the officially English-speaking from the officially non-English-speaking Americas. A different border separates legitimate citizens from illegal-born aliens. However, the type of exclusion that monolingual audiences are subject to when wandering through *The New World Border* is not as one-dimensional as it may seem. Gómez-Peña's strategy does not simply seek to reverse the roles that dominant and subaltern communities play in post-NAFTA America—the "foreign in your own country" paradox that Price (2000: 36) points out—but to do so in a way that releases the intertextual and translational power of language and cross-cultural dynamics.

In *The New World Border*, the reader enters a multidimensional network of referential codes that shows the multiplicity of discourses surrounding any single language. Under its apparent fabric of neo-Babelian Spanglish-only policy, Gómez-Peña reveals the mendacious commensurability of the national signifier and the language it claims to signify, and creates a crisis of authority based on a system of linguistic recognition. Monolingual audiences are not only expected to experience a sense of exclusion but, more significantly, to feel interrogated and involved throughout the process of translation. They are prompted to experience the anxiety of representation derived from the border, to cross the border not from North to South or from English into Spanglish, but from a major to a minor-becoming language, from a state of constant relations to a state of continuous variation, and from a territorialized dimension to the deterritorialization of the signifying "whereness." In this context, the tensions that stem

from cross-cultural dynamics are not eventually resolved, but the process induces the reader to reconsider the mechanisms that define and homogenize language as it intersects with identity.

Consequently, I argue that, whereas most attention has been paid to the use of Spanglish and Gringoñol, Gómez-Peña's New World Border does not discard major languages in favor of hybrid tongues. Instead, he attempts to liberate the multilingual condition of language *per se* toward a state of continuous variation. In this way, Gómez-Peña undermines the assumption that hybrid languages are exclusively produced by a geopolitical situation of linguistic contact and reveals the inherent attachment of language to processes of hybridization and deterritorialization. In other words, I believe that one of the most significant contributions of Gómez-Peña's New World Border lies in his reconceptualization of languages, which extends beyond or, rather, *within* the constraints of language. By shifting the perspective from translating between languages to translating within languages, Gómez-Peña prompts a reconsideration of the ontological hierarchy and unity in which notions of major and minor languages are couched. Rather than a neo-Babelian erasure of difference by way of assimilation, the New World Border undermines the discourse that legitimizes the continued domination of major languages under the banner of equality and democracy. In this way, Gómez-Peña triggers the recognition of difference by pointing to the inherently displaced and heterogeneous core of what is deemed unified and homogeneous.

Indeed, when Gómez-Peña writes "I find myself in kinship with nonwhite English-speaking writers from India and the West Indies, Native Americans, and

41

Chicanos" (quoted in Fusco 1995: 157), he is not simply stating the obvious—that he finds himself in a peripheral position to traditional centers of power. Instead, he articulates the functioning of the multilingual body, whose multiple belonging makes the annihilation of the geopolitical realm of words possible (McGuire 2002).[24] In the New World Border languages do not signal linguistic belonging but the transitional zones from which identity emanates. In the case of Gómez-Peña, the use of Spanglish, English, pseudo-Nahuatl, Gringoñol, Spanish, and Caló in an inter-inclusive fashion underscores the multiple identities of language use on the border zone.

Far from championing a Spanglish-only scenario, *The New World Border* speaks to the neo-Babelian utopia of a monolingual global menda-city and problematizes the understanding of the notion of majority as merely facilitating cross-cultural communication. Quite to the contrary, so-called hybrid tongues function as points of access to ethnocentric assumptions in contemporary societies about assumptions of "pure" and "contaminated" languages as informed by national arrangements. Ultimately, languages and translation within the New World Border are embraced not as simple intra-ethnic vehicles of communication, but as axes of interaction that keep questioning and rethinking the borders that surround them.

---

[24] In this regard, one might claim that the notion of geographical dialects (for example, Indian English in relation to so-called standard, or British, English) already implies the eradication of the geopolitical realm of language without conveying a state of continuous variation. Indeed, dialects are not unaffected by the language-as-a-system-of-constants, since they are defined in relation to an officially standard variety. On the other hand, it is the state of continuous variation of that language that provides dialects with their own possibilities for variation by constricting the constants and expanding the variables. See Deleuze and Guattari (2004: 115).

Concluding remarks

In this chapter, I pointed out some of the ideological assumptions that permeate the linguistic environment of contemporary menda-cities as shaped by migration flows and globalizing politics, and their relation to the dichotomous thinking posited within the paradigm of the modern nation-state. Rather than opposing the constant-based approach to language to its inherent state of variation, I attempted to show that, similarly to distinctions between major and minor, both are not mutually exclusive, but they are instead two components of the same language put to different purposes.

I believe that the approaches to multilingual, transidentitarian hybridity in translation studies have been obscured by uncritical conceptualizations of the challenges it poses to interlingual translation, which have focused on idiosyncratic grammatical interferences instead of exploring the disjunctive act of self-translation that underlies this type of writing. In this regard, since translation should not perpetuate or expand borders in the purest globalizing fashion but explore their multiple dimensions, I suggest that the discipline reconsider its intersection with forms of ideological resistance and counterdiscursiveness that exceed the foundations of translation as previously laid. While it is certainly true that translation would self-destruct were it not for the existence of different languages (hence the necessity of borders), it is not sufficient to look at languages as underlying a single identity. Translation holds the power to reinforce the identity of the languages involved, but it also holds the power to question the dominant polarities of Western epistemology.

If, as Maria Tymoczko argues (2007: 7), the assumed neutrality of translators only facilitates the ascendancy of the values of the dominant powers, the discourse and practice of translation should question its involvement in neo-Babelian arrangements that place a systemic burden on those who do not speak the major language. Ultimately, translation should participate in the elaboration of a new cartography that departs from the organic menda-city into an organic multipli-city that, far from monocultural melting pot and happy multiculturalism ideologies, reveals and engages in the fluctuating boundaries of cross-cultural dynamics.

CHAPTER II
GLOBALIZATION AS TRANSLATION: FROM THE NEW WORLD (B)ORDER TO
THE NEW WORLD (DIS)ORDER

<u>Introduction: colonialism, globalization, the New Indian</u>

One of the main concerns that the advent of globalization, understood as a phenomenon of late modernity, has raised is the hegemony of English as the so-called "Esperanto of the twenty-first century" (Vidal 2007). Such hegemony implies the increasing minoritization of languages other than lingua francas. Indeed, if languages inherently underlie specific forms of understanding the world or, to put it differently, their own cosmologies, the currency of the English language and Anglo-American values in contemporary global settings threatens to dissolve not only those languages *ipso facto* relegated as minoritarian, but also the cosmologies they reflect. However, languages are not homogenous entities and, as I argue in the present chapter, they hold the capacity to interrogate dominant language ideologies in more than one way.

The anxiety derived from the spread of a hegemonic language as a lingua franca is not particular to the current stage of globalization. The legacies of European colonialism have been affecting indigenous languages for centuries before the paradigm of globalization as such began to permeate the imaginary of the contemporary world system. A case in point is that of Spanish in Peru as discussed by writer, anthropologist, and ethnologist José María Arguedas. One of the most influential Latin American intellectuals of the twentieth century, Arguedas problematized the imposition of Spanish

as the official language of Peru to signify the cosmologies of the indigenous Andean populations. Confronted with the demise of a millenarian indigenous language at the hands of a colonial language that, in some five centuries, had cultivated a prominent literary tradition in the Americas, Arguedas denounced the diglossic relationship between Quechua and Spanish that colonization had triggered and decolonization reinforced:[25]

> Any Indian who desires and struggles to integrate himself into the life of the nation, anyone from the *sierra* who hopes to improve himself and to progress, first must learn Spanish, because government, business, culture, education, everything happens in Spanish. For 500 years, with all these advantages, Spanish has opposed Quechua. (Quoted in Landreau 2002: 187)

Spanish colonial rule in the Americas turned Spanish, if not into the lingua franca of the world, at least into the lingua franca of the so-called New World at the expense of Amerindian languages such as Quechua, Aymara, and Mochica. Yet, contrary to what may seem, Arguedas did not regard Spanish as the driving force behind the linguistic homogenization that Peru had been undergoing for five centuries. In point of fact, he deemed Spanish a cultivated medium of expression whose incursion into the Andean *sierra* gave birth to the "*nuevo indio*" ("New Indian"), a *mestizo* who, in their command of Quechua and their increasing incorporation of Spanish to the Andean landscape, put dominant assumptions about national and regional languages to the test. The New Indian

---

[25] Martín Lienhard (1993) offers an insightful account of the linguistic homogenization that affected the use of Spanish in Peru during early colonial rule, as reflected in official documents written between 1550 and 1615.

not only problematized the association between language and territory that Quechua and Andean America or Spanish and Peru happened to symbolize, but also languages themselves as independent objects from cultural practices.

Far from creating fractures between languages in contact as typified by the concept of diglossia (for example, between Spanish as the language of high culture and Quechua as the language of the heathen barbarians, as the colonial apparatus sought to perpetuate), the New Indian produced fractures within languages themselves. Quechua was no longer viewed as an Andean language of yesteryear and Spanish, geographically and chronologically distant from Castilian landscapes, was increasingly permeated by the Amerindian cosmology. In this situation, a strategy of cross-fertilization emerged whereby, as Arguedas points out, the New Indian "will never cease to adapt it [Spanish] to their deep need to express themselves totally, that is, to translate each last call of their heart, in which the Indian is leader and root" (quoted in Landreau 2002: 189). Translation, then, stood at the heart of the New Indian, albeit not quite the type of translation posited in colonial designs.

In this respect, Homi Bhabha's problematization of the notion of "colonial mimicry" along the lines of hybridity turns illuminating. Understood as the construction of "a subject of a *difference* that is almost the same but not quite," (1994: 122; emphasis added), Bhabha discusses the paradox that underlies colonial mimicry and its effects on the authority of colonial discourse. On the one hand, colonial domination is contingent on the production and representation of difference (that is, a recognizable—though profoundly ambivalent—Other) and achieved by means of a formal "process of

disavowal" whereby the violent dislocation produced by the act of colonization becomes denied and the identification of "the cultural" (that is, the production of cultural differentiation as a sign of authority) becomes enacted (Bhabha 1994). Yet, on the other, if the authority of colonial discourse requires not the repression but the *repetition* of the self as something *different* (and, hence, it acquires its identity *via* the production and repetition of colonial difference), colonial discourse is inherently hybrid, for its power relies on its productivity as both an alleged signifier of origin and authority *and* an actual sign of repetition and difference.[26] Differently put, whereas, in order to preserve the recognition of its authority, colonial discourse relies on a unitary reference to a deceptively pure and original identity, the reference of discrimination is not based on the repression of the object of colonial discourse but on its repetition as "almost the same but not quite," that is, a hybrid.

The production of hybridity at the very heart of colonial discourse generates a significant change of perspective: colonial discourse is no longer interpreted as a symbol of authority but instead it is appropriated as the *sign* of colonial difference, hence reversing the process of disavowal whereby differential knowledges are articulated and creating a crisis of recognition that undermines the foundations of colonial authority itself. The double inscription of colonial mimicry—simultaneously a mode of appropriation and resistance—produces an effect of "estrangement" in the authority of colonial discourse and enables the native "interrogation" of the colonizing master's

---

[26] Drawing on the work of psychoanalyst Jacques Lacan, Bhabha links colonial mimicry to what he terms "the metonymy of presence" as a strategy of colonial discursive authority and its questioning. Although colonial mimicry is often taken to signal the complicity of the colonized subject with the colonizer, it also introduces disturbance into the colonizer's gaze by undermining essentialist constructions of the Other. See Bhabha (1994: 121-174).

narrative. As the offspring of hybridity, colonial mimicry (initially disturbing for the authority of colonial discourse because of its ambivalence) becomes a specific form of intervention in the reality constituted within colonial space.

If the concealed outcome of colonial power lies in the production of hybridity, what are the implications for the articulation of the New Indian from the standpoint of translation and identity? Primarily, the currency of Spanish as a signifier of colonial authority becomes untenable and the opposition in which Spanish and Quechua previously appeared couched is transformed into a site of native intervention and subversion. For if Spanish—once understood as a symbol of assimilation and compliance—becomes the locus of hybridity, a shift away from the ready opposition between Spanish and Quechua inscribed by "the cultural" and toward the power of translation to undermine hegemonic forms of narrative control occurs.

The arguments displayed by Arguedas are connected to Bhabha's articulation of colonial mimicry in this regard. Certainly, Arguedas was not condemning Spanish as part of the linguistic spectrum of Andean America. Instead, he was questioning the fundamental opposition that nation builders in Peru had championed between Spanish and Quechua, as well as the deceptive monolingualism that such opposition underlay. At the same time, Arguedas championed himself the establishment of Spanish as the official language of the national territory. Spanish, as he argues (1986: 36), presented a significant double bind: it informed the New Indian by infecting and expanding the Amerindian cosmology, while being simultaneously adapted to the Andean spirit, which shaped and was shaped by Quechua. Rather than reacting against the imposition of an

official national language, Arguedas interrogated the assumption that monolingualism is, like its own name indicates, monolingual. Quite to the contrary, even if Spanish was entering a one-to-one equation with the emerging Peruvian territory, Quechua remained the driving force behind the language imposed on the New Indian through a strategy of translation that, beyond paradigms of syntactic and semantic transference, was permeated by the Amerindian cosmology. In this way, Arguedas signaled the demise of Spanish as a "pure, untouched language" (quoted in Kokotovic 2005: 216) and embraced it as the offspring of Andean America.

I believe that the words of Arguedas are indicative of the effects of today's globalizing processes and that any discussion of globalization in the form of transnational corporatism should take into consideration the colonial legacies produced by European powers, as well as the resulting patterns of translation. As I noted in the previous chapter following Michael Cronin (2003: 60), the neo-Babelian utopia of a universal lingua franca paradoxically relies on translation, in the shape of language assimilation, to end translation. Translation, from this perspective, is complicit with the production of a monolingual global menda-city. However, in view of the considerations posed above, I find it relevant to incorporate Arguedas's New Indian as a paradigmatic figure in the problematization of the linguistic, cultural, and identitarian implications of current processes of globalization.

Whereas in the previous chapter I explored multilingual hybridity as a challenge to the ready equation between language and nation, in this chapter I wish to turn attention to globalization, understood as the transnationalization of social networks, as another

challenge to such equation. I argue that the role of translation in globalization should not be approached in an either/or fashion, but rather following a dialogic model that allows for a critical examination of the identitarian practices inscribed in globalizing processes. With that object in mind, first I analyze widespread approaches to globalization as either homogenization or diversification and their impact on translation studies. Then I turn to the concepts "global designs" and "local histories" (Mignolo 2000), and "globalization as translation" (Cronin 2003: 34) to discuss the process of translation of the global order into local circumstances. Finally, I draw attention to Guillermo Gómez-Peña's Five-Worlds Theory as a new space for translational forms that escape the binarisms of the dominant ideology.

Translation and globalization: Between the poles of homogenization and diversification

Approached as a contemporary phenomenon, the supranational order commonly referred to as globalization has been interpreted, as the adjective "supranational" indicates, from the paradigm of the nation-state (Nederveen-Pieterse 1995; Cronin 2003). Reduced to the movement and exchange of peoples, commodities, and ideas among nation-states, dominant conceptualizations of globalization have appeared territorialized, nationalized, and homogenized, leaving little—if any—room for the articulation of diasporic and transidentitarian subjectivities. From this perspective, the capital (be it human, economic, or cultural) is disseminated from the center to the periphery of the world system, with the attached processes of expansionism, hegemony, and "clonialism,"

or the spread of sameness (Cronin 2003: 127-130). Small wonder, then, that one of the main criticisms of globalization has circled around its homogenizing power, whereby the periphery is fashioned according to the dominant values of hegemonic nation-states—one of the principal instruments being language, in the shape of linguistic hegemony.

To the detriment of nationalist interpretations of globalization, it has often been argued (Fusco 1995: 25; de Toro 2006) that not only the decline of the Soviet Union but also the innovations in technology and the improvements in communication and transportation have rendered the concept of a homogenous nation-state illusory. Instead of a global clonialism emanating from the West, globalization—or, rather, globalizations, since, as Jan Nederveen-Pieterse argues (1995: 46), there are as many modes of globalization as globalizing agents—is conceptualized as a means of development of the sources of the self. From this perspective, the multiplication of simultaneous forms of cooperation and competition leads to cultural hybridization and multiple identities, which are constituted through social networks, rather than by means of national symbols.

In translation studies, the debate between the paradigms of globalization-as-homogenization and globalization-as-diversification has incorporated the role of translation in the present stage of globalization, albeit not always felicitously. In the otherwise excellent *Translation and Globalization*, Michael Cronin (2003: 142) proposes two major translation trends in the global village: "translation-as-assimilation" comprises the type of translation involved in neo-Babelianism by default (that is, the full assimilation of the major language at the expense of minor languages), whereas "translation-as-diversification" aims at invigorating minority languages by translating as much as possible from the more prestigious languages. In devising do-or-don't categories

52

to approach translation dynamics—whereby speakers of minority languages *either* fully assimilate into *or* resist the dominant language—I believe that Cronin complies with the dichotomous thinking that, as I argued in the previous chapter, permeates contemporary translation studies to a remarkable extent. In light of the questions raised in the introduction to this chapter through the figure of the New Indian as presented by Arguedas (1986), I propose a reconsideration of the consequences of globalization from the perspective of translation. In order to do so, I wish to begin by discussing the epistemological faults displayed in the work of Arguedas.

The Arguedan articulation of Quechua as the purest reflection of the Andean soul underlies the foundational mendacity that I problematized in the previous chapter: that of the one-to-one equation between reality and language that the quest for monolingualism presupposes. Such articulation obliterates the role of ideology in language and presumes to verbalize an objective reality that lies out there. At the same time, as I pointed out in the introduction to this chapter, although all use of language is indirect, one should not uncritically assume that all languages are identical or equivalent, since languages reflect particular cosmologies and, more significantly, are embedded in asymmetries of power and prestige—as illustrated, for example, by Spanish and Quechua in colonial Peru or English and Spanish in the contemporary United States.

Yet, it is in this regard that the reflections of Arguedas on language and translation acquire their full force. Although rooted in the understanding of language as the communication of a primary signification, the Arguedan conceptualization of the New Indian embodies the anxiety derived from the inner conflict between an identity shaped by an indigenous language and the imposition of a colonial language that does not

quite reflect the experience of the colonized subject. Moreover, it exemplifies the liberating power of translation to resist homogenizing processes of cultural domination and expand individual language cosmologies.

An additional fault that the Arguedan articulation of Quechua displays relates to what Walter Mignolo (2000) terms "the denial of coevalness," or the failure on the part of hegemonic powers to acknowledge the ways in which hegemonic and subaltern cultures interact with one another. More specifically, what I am referring to is the "antiquarian perspective" (Cronin 2003: 150) from which Arguedas himself portrays Quechua against Spanish: a picturesque, primitive language of the Andean mountains significantly lagging behind the colonial languages spread all over the Americas, as conveyed in the question, "How many centuries of evolution would it take for Quechua to achieve the broad horizons of Castilian Spanish, German, and French, which have spent centuries feeding the spirit in its yearning for beauty and research?" (Arguedas 1986: 36; my translation).

Indeed, it was in times of decolonization when colonial legacies became most tangible. As can be inferred from the words of Arguedas, colonial languages were regarded as the epitome of knowledge and civilization. In the case of the appointed Spanish Viceroyalty of Peru in 1543, the colonial apparatus made Spanish the language of politics, science, knowledge, and technology, and hence of so-called high culture. Given that it would only delay the progress of the emerging nation, Arguedas opposed Quechua as the only language of the Peruvian territory, revealing the conceptual shift that took place in the nineteenth century from a spatial to a chronological frontier or "chronopolitics" (Miyoshi 1993: 730), whereby the colonial dichotomy between the Old

World and the New World was reenacted in the opposition between the modern and the primitive (Mignolo 2000: 278-311).

In spite of the Eurocentric fabric that it displays, I believe that the Arguedan cosmology ultimately empowers minoritized language communities and that it should inform the conceptualization of the role of translation in situations of language hegemony problematized by Cronin (2003). The understanding of translation as facilitating either assimilation or diversification fails to shed any light on what translation actually does, as discussed in Arguedas (1986). If translation inevitably involved full assimilation into the dominant language, the spirit of the New Indian would have been subsumed by the act of assimilation into Spanish and Christian cosmology. Likewise, as long as the only way to resist language hegemony were not to translate oneself into the major language (a reversed neo-Babelianism by default, as it were), the New Indian would lack the component that makes the self new *per se*, that is, translation. Instead, translation becomes the *raison d'être* of emerging identities that fall through the cracks of dominant ideologies, a means to negotiate identities that lend themselves to a permanent process of translation.

From a certain perspective, Cronin's opposition between translation-as-assimilation and translation-as-diversification reproduces the essentialist opposition between Spanish and Quechua that pervaded colonial Peru for centuries and the colonial diglossia that established Spanish as the language of civilization and Quechua as the language of barbarism. Indeed, it is the lack of translation that makes speakers of minority languages either assimilate themselves into the dominant language or retreat into their native languages. Suffice it to say that I am not referring here to translation as a

unidirectional process whereby the mere act of translating implies a point of no return, as Cronin seems to convey. Rather, I am approaching translation as a multidimensional process of becoming that affects both translator and translated, hegemonic and subaltern, global and local, and that, as reflected in the New Indian, is fundamentally creative. From this perspective, translation is never conclusive, but rather contingent on its performative and transformative dimensions.

By confining the effects of translation to the poles of assimilation and diversification, Cronin obliterates the agency that underlies translational practice or, in other words, the multiple nature of translation. In this respect, Lawrence Venuti (1998: 159) provides a more thorough account of the functionality of translation as informed by the "modern/colonial world system" (Mignolo 2000),[27] which varies from confirming dominant ideologies and reinforcing ethnic stereotypes to critically revising both hegemonic and subaltern values in the creation and manipulation of domestic self-images. Yet, his conceptualization also seems caught in a binary switch. Driven by the asymmetries that structure international affairs, Venuti draws a distinction between translation within hegemonic countries (where translation facilitates the assimilation of domestic values) and translation within developing countries (where translation calls for resistance to language hegemonies). In other words, his description of contemporary translation dynamics reifies a fundamental division between so-called First and Third World nations.

---

[27] Mignolo (2000: ix) locates the emergence of the modern/colonial world system in the early sixteenth century, with the establishment of the Atlantic commercial circuit and the unfolding of capitalism.

I believe that the main shortcoming that both Cronin and Venuti present is ordering, instead of disrupting, translation in dichotomies. By so doing, they obliterate the interstitial passages of cross-cultural dynamics as affected by and affecting globalizing processes. In the following section, I incorporate the work of Walter Mignolo (2000) and, particularly, the imbrication of "local histories" and "global designs" to expand the guises of, so to speak, translating translation from global into local circumstances or, as I argue, from local into global into local circumstances.

<center>Local histories and global designs</center>

If the Arguedan articulation of languages in situations of contact reveals a manifest Eurocentric heritage, what does that convey about European local knowledge achieving global dimensions? And how does it relate to the global production of knowledge that the current stage of globalization seems to be championing? In order to address the first question, which underlies the relationship between colonialism and globalization, I suggest to draw attention to the concept "coloniality of power" (Quijano 1997), whereby, in the process of building the modern/colonial world system, knowledges and structures of power conflicted with one another, and whose main epistemological consequence was the subalternization of knowledges.

The coloniality of power begins with the colonial enterprise, fuelled by the configuration of the New World in the European imaginary and the constitution, exportation, and implementation of a Euro-centered global order. The coloniality of power resulted in the social classification of the planet population according to the European mind, or the objectification of "those whose brain and skin have been formed

<center>57</center>

by different memories, sensibilities, and belief" (Mignolo 2000: 146). In turn, this new order carried with it an institutional structure to articulate and endorse such classification. It also defined spaces according to the colonial difference (that is, the establishment of the external borders of the modern/colonial world system). Thirdly, it formed an epistemological perspective from which to channel the knowledges and structures of power derived from the new global order. In the case of colonial Peru, the Spanish "purity of blood" doctrine (Mignolo 2000: 27),[28] the colonial administrative district known as the Viceroyalty of Peru, the peripheral position—once geographical and then chronological, as I previously pointed out—of the colonial territory with regard to the Spanish crown and the imaginary of the modern/colonial world system, and the inscription of "the civilizing mission" (Mignolo 2000: 304) attest to the effects of the coloniality of power in Andean America.

For the purposes of this chapter, I wish to discuss the relationship of the notion of "coloniality of power" with the subsequent, yet illuminating, concept of "colonial difference" (Mignolo 2000). Certainly, coloniality of power verbalizes the mapping of the modern/colonial world system, which persists in today's globalizing processes. Nevertheless, whereas the coloniality of power suggests an established status quo, colonial difference conveys a process in the psyche of postcolonial subjects generated by

---

[28] According to Mignolo (2000: 31), the foundation of the modern/colonial world system resulted in the epistemological break from religious racism to genealogical racism (in other words, prior to Columbus' landfall in the Caribbean, European conceptions of race were driven by religious discourse, whereas the conquest of the Americas produced a shift in racist discourse based on the color of people's skin and, hence, on the purity of blood of the Aryan "race"). Yet, said break is dubious if one looks at the caste system in Spain and Portugal throughout the fifteenth century, where the "purity of blood" principle was already present in Christian texts such as Alonso de Cartagena's 1450 *Defensa de la unidad cristiana* (*Defense of Christian Unity*). Mariscal (1998) argues that pre-modern forms of racism were in fact transferred and adapted to the modern/colonial world system.

58

the coloniality of power. At the same time, given that colonial difference is itself far from being a univocal concept,[29] I concentrate on Mignolo's term as the place where local histories underlying global designs meet (Other) local histories.

Enmeshed in a dialectical relationship, Mignolo (2000) sees the modern/colonial world system as the result of imperial local histories that championed the implementation of global designs—from Christianity in Spain in the late fifteenth century to secular civilization in England and France in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, to modernization in the United States after 1945. The colonial difference results in the encounter of two different sets of local histories, one responding to the implementation of global designs and the other forced to accommodate such global designs. In other words, the colonial difference does not stem from the projection of local histories as global designs, but instead from the tension between two local histories, one *within* the internal borders of the modern/colonial world system and another *without*, whereby global designs are adopted, rejected, integrated, or ignored. In this respect, global designs are but a complement to the logic of universalism—that is, a Eurocentric world or universal history.

Dichotomous as it may seem at first, the duality "local histories" and "global designs" in point of fact defies dichotomies. Although Western epistemology becomes the inevitable point of departure, the implementation of global designs turns diverse because of the multiple confrontations of local histories that become enacted. As Mignolo

---

[29] Mignolo (2000: ix) provides four different albeit complementary conceptualizations of "colonial difference," as it intersects with the enactment of the coloniality of power, the emergence of subaltern knowledge and border thinking, the implementation of global designs, and the conflict between the coloniality of power and local histories.

argues, "Christian and Native American cosmologies, Christian and Amerindian cosmologies, Christian and Islamic cosmologies, and Christian and Confucian cosmologies among others only enact dichotomies when you look at them one at a time" (2000: ix). Indeed, a significant contribution of Quijano's coloniality of power and Mignolo's colonial difference lies in the agency they place on the new forms of subaltern knowledge that are articulated from the external borders of the modern/colonial world system. To put it differently, these concepts point to the emancipation of knowledge from its internal borders, while drawing a continuity between the modern/colonial world system and the current stage of globalization.

I believe that globalization, far from one-dimensional conceptualizations of the new global order, is not only the latest stage in the configuration of the coloniality of power. More significantly, it is fueling the conditions for subaltern communities to move beyond the dichotomous imaginary of the modern/colonial world system and form transidentitarian subjectivities that redefine the asymmetries inscribed in the colonial difference. Whereas translation within the internal borders of the modern/colonial world system has served the construction of the colonial subject and the articulation of the coloniality of power (Niranjana 1992), translation also holds the power to subvert and transform global designs from the so-called lower end of the colonial difference (Tymoczko 1999). By so doing, translation defies the hierarchical dichotomies of colonial discourse that continue to justify the operation of the coloniality of power.

Although the current stage of globalization and transnational corporatism is commonly interpreted as the reconfiguration of the modern/colonial world system, the scale of globalizing processes further complicates the effects of translation in the spread

of global designs. Differently put, however pervasive the perception that globalization is merely enacting the implementation of corporate global designs, the opposition between globalization-as-homogenization and globalization-as-diversification fails to account for the resulting interstitial formations, ignoring the role of subaltern local histories and translation as covered by Western epistemology.

In this regard, Cronin (2003: 34) proposes to focus not so much on "translation and globalization" as on "globalization as translation." Certainly, to approach "translation and globalization" in an inter-inclusive fashion would be to misconstrue translation as a one-directional process in the implementation of global designs without resistant subjects—the understanding of translation posited in neo-Babelian designs as informed by the coloniality of power. Caught in the monistic European mind, translation and globalization seems to establish a one-to-one equation between European local knowledge and its global projection. In other words, it articulates a single translation that obliterates the colonial difference as the space where global designs meet local histories that remain outside the borders of the modern/colonial world system and portrays a particular mode of globalization or "globalism" (Nederveen-Pieterse 1995: 46). Meanwhile, globalization as translation acknowledges that there is not a single mode of globalization but rather many translations of, so to speak, local-histories-subsuming-global-designs into local histories. In this way, translation is not simply an instrument of globalization. Instead, globalization processes are contingent on translations for the production, manipulation, and restitution of knowledge, including the passages of cultural difference.

The unsuspected possibilities of the New World (Dis)Order: Guillermo Gómez-Peña's Five-Worlds Theory

As I argued above, translation as affected by globalizing processes has been largely articulated in a dichotomous fashion—either invigorating minor languages or yielding to language assimilation and monolingualism—a conceptualization that, as I attempted to show by discussing Bhabha's notion of "colonial mimicry," becomes insufficient to account for translation dynamics from a postcolonial perspective. As a discipline that began to emerge in post-1945 Europe, translation studies absorbed the imaginary constructed after World War II, including the opposition between the First (or developed/consumer) and the Third (or developing/producer) Worlds. Today, the fall of the Berlin Wall and the unprecedented migration flows from Third to First World territories (the so-called "reverse migration") championed by globalizing processes[30] problematize the three-worlds model as laid out in the Western imaginary.[31] After all, what is the point of such spatial conceptualization when technological innovations and improvements in communication and transportation are increasingly disrupting geographical, linguistic, cultural, and political boundaries? In this last section, I explore Guillermo Gómez-Peña's Five-Worlds Theory to discuss globalization as translation and the incorporation of interstitial knowledge into the framework of globalization.

---

[30] Although migration toward accessible centers of power has constantly characterized the history of empires, the end of the Cold War elicited unprecedented international migration on account of the liberalization of regulations concerning international travel. Conversely, although since the fall of the Berlin Wall most human beings are legally free to leave their country of origin, the main driving force behind international migration has been the widening of socioeconomic disparities between developed countries and developing countries (Alonso-Rodríguez 2006).

[31] Shohat and Stam (1994: 25-27) argue that, rather than from developmental categories (such as "industrialized" and "non-industrialized"), the fundamental distinction underlying the three-worlds model stems from protracted structural domination. While categorized developing countries such as India, Egypt, Brazil, and Mexico happen to be highly industrialized, they still occupy a peripheral position that is subject to indirect European and North American hegemony.

An outstanding figure in academic and public debates about globalization, Guillermo Gómez-Peña incorporates questions of neo-colonialism, technology, and translation to the discussion of the new global order. A founding member of the Border Arts Workshop/*Taller de Arte Fronterizo* (a binational arts collective that from 1984 to 1990 explored the relations of Mexico and the United States), Gómez-Peña soon shifted from a site-specific concept of the border to a "global border consciousness" (Fox 1994: 62; Foster 2002: 49) after the collapse of the Soviet Union. He writes, "For me, the border is no longer located at any fixed geopolitical site. I carry the border with me, and I find new borders wherever I go" (1996: 5). In this regard, Gómez-Peña's conceptualization of the border acquiring global dimensions speaks to his involvement with the problematization of globalizing arrangements or, more specifically, of mainstream globalism.

Gómez-Peña envisions in his work a heterotopian cartography of Spanglish-speaking U.S. Republics that redefine the borders of hegemonic lingua francas and nation-states, as discussed in the previous chapter. In addition (and in compliance with his global border consciousness), this cartography stems from the new world disorder following the failure of the three-worlds model. In it, the dominant cartography of First and Third Worlds loses its power to reflect contemporary modes of individual and collective identity. More significantly, the scale of globalizing processes has opened the matrix of reality to "unsuspected possibilities" (1996: 6).

Inspired by the asymmetries perpetuated by mainstream globalism, the type of globalization that Gómez-Peña posits is far from the often-underscored corporatism that the current era of transnationalism seems to be championing. In his view, the task of the

artist is to reverse and redefine the topographies that have resulted from the coloniality of power. With this project in mind, Gómez-Peña departs from the three-worlds model to articulate a new paradigm that reflects those interstitial passages that fall out of dominant images of globalization: the Five-Worlds Theory. Beyond the now outdated First and Third Worlds, Gómez-Peña expands in *The New World Border* the mapping of the global social space by devising two new worlds: the Fourth and the Fifth.

From a conceptual rather than a spatial standpoint, Gómez-Peña's Fourth and Fifth Worlds reshape the notion of identity and citizenship. Differently put, they emerge as translations of global designs when travelling to the external borders of the modern/colonial world system and vice versa. Below, I attempt to show that they do not simply assimilate into or resist dominant globalism, but indeed they question, inform, and redefine the boundaries between the internal and the external borders of the modern/colonial world system and the dynamics under which colonial translation operates.

As Gómez-Peña writes, the Fourth World is "a conceptual place where the indigenous peoples meet with the diasporic communities" (1996: 7).[32] Inspired by the force of reverse migration and the decline of the nation-state vis-à-vis the increasing power of transnational corporations,[33] Gómez-Peña lumps together indigenous (in this case, Native Americans—not only in the U.S. but in the American continent as a whole) and diasporic groups (in this case, immigrant communities in the U.S.) as physically and

---

[32] The term "Fourth World" was not coined by Guillermo Gómez-Peña. It has been widely used since the 1970s to distinguish indigenous peoples around the globe from the Third World, where they often reside (Weaver 2000: 224-225).

[33] For a discussion of the crisis of the nation-state, see Held (1989), Anderson (1992), Miyoshi (1993), and Bartolovich (2000). For a discussion of the same topic in translation studies, see Cronin (2003: 42-75).

conceptually external to the three-worlds model. By so doing, he confronts the currency of the Western imaginary in the interaction of global designs and local histories. In the Fourth World, the word "indigenous" (traditionally bound to spatial conceptualizations of identity) exceeds the limits that have been established in the modern/colonial world system. To put it differently, the notion of indigeneity emancipates from the internal borders of the modern/colonial world system, embracing the diasporic populations, commonly dissociated from questions of indigenism[34]—after all, both indigenous and diasporic communities in the Americas have been displaced of their native lands by the coloniality of power.[35]

Even if the idea of deterritorialization—whereby the geographical location of cultures is eroding as a result of the international status of lingua francas and the spread of globalized consumerism (Cronin 2006: 49-50)—is deceptively challenging the "natural" relation of cultures to spatially-defined areas, Gómez-Peña does not engage with the notion of the Fourth World as the social space resulting from the collapse of the old colonial hierarchy of First World and Third World. Instead, the Fourth World becomes a conceptual space for the articulation of identities neither defined nor confined by the dominant notion of an inside and an outside, but operating *on* the border that legitimizes and exposes the fallacy of a single identitarian belonging. The interconnectivity of indigenous peoples and diasporic communities in the Fourth World contests the authority of the forces of transnational corporatism. It also problematizes

---

[34] The notion of "indigeneity" has been highly contested in postcolonial scholarship. For a summary of the main debates, see Weaver (2000).

[35] Moana Jackson characterizes indigenous peoples in the Anglocolonial world (namely Australia, Canada, India, New Zealand, and the United States) as a "culture of dispossession" that has been historically exploited under the pretext of the "gift of civilization" (quoted in Weaver 2000).

dominant notions of citizenship and the construction of individual and collective memory. Finally, it points to translation as a crucial agent for the articulation of multiple forms of identity and belonging.

Along the lines of Mignolo's articulation of the colonial difference as both a physical and a conceptual space, Gómez-Peña presents the Fourth World as the locus of the restitution of interstitial knowledge, as informed by the synergetic interactions that take place in contemporary societies. The Fourth World embodies a redefinition of globalizing spatial relations from the standpoint of transnationalism, syncretism, and polyglottism. Such redefinition underscores the role of translation in globalization or, as I argued above following Cronin (2000: 34), globalization as contingent on translation. If, as Bhabha (1994) points out, translation is not simply an adjunct to acculturation but a form of interaction, confrontation, and transmutation among historical subjects, the Fourth World is indeed a translation space.

Constituted by portions of all the previous worlds, the Fourth World brings to light translation as a means to transcend the hierarchies that underlie the colonial difference. More importantly, translation sheds light on the epistemological foundations upon which the coloniality of power was established and continues to operate. Instead of reenacting the colonial dichotomy underlying Western chronopolitics (that is, the modern and the primitive as represented, for example, by industrial and agrarian social forms), Gómez-Peña conceives the Fourth World as an abstract space *per se* that breaks away from dominant conceptions of territory towards the enactment of social networks that

make place for transidentitarian hybrid formations.[36] In this way, the Fourth World

counteracts the imaginary of the modern/colonial world system by translating from the

matrix whereby Western epistemology operates and beyond the antagonism of inside and

outside that commonly confines identity. In a nutshell, the Fourth World contests the

hegemonic mapping of space with a new politics of place, albeit one where the notion of

place itself, as constructed by historiographical and cultural narratives, is always

elsewhere, perennially flowing.

However innovative it may seem, Gómez-Peña's articulation of the Fourth World

turns problematic when approached from the perspective of postcolonialism. What do the

terms "indigenous" and "diasporic" mean in the Fourth World? What type of relationship

is Gómez-Peña drawing between both in the Fourth World from the standpoint of "the

postcolonial"? And does the formation a global border consciousness necessarily involve

the contemplation of all postcolonial experiences as equal? Indeed, the notions of

"indigeneity" and "diaspora" are not as transparent as conveyed by Gómez-Peña.

Although he draws on the case of settler colonies (namely in the Americas) to formulate

the Fourth World, he seems to disregard the existence of "invaded colonies" (Weaver

2000: 223) or colonies of intervention and exploitation (such as those in Africa and Asia),

where the notion of displacement acquires distinctive connotations on account of the

alleged coexistence of pre-colonial cultures within the framework of imperial domination

and where colonialism takes a significantly different form. In this way, Gómez-Peña's

exclusion of invaded colonies in his articulation of the Fourth World neglects the

---

[36] Gómez-Peña's characterization of the Fourth World has not been absent from criticism. Following Henri Lefevbre's argument that the abstract space of flows is part of the internal logic of the capital, Foster (2002: 63) contests the capacity of Gómez-Peña's Fourth World to provide a basis for resistance.

complexity of the modern/colonial world system in its various manifestations and partly obscures an intricate understanding of the notions of indigeneity and diaspora.

The spatial abstraction of the Fourth World is complemented by the virtual reality of the Fifth World, which Gómez-Peña describes as "Virtual space, mass media, the U.S. suburbs, art schools, malls, Disneyland, the White House & La Chingada" (1996: 245). Surprising as it may seem, Gómez-Peña does not oppose the Fourth to the Fifth World, or the first three worlds to the Fourth and the Fifth for that matter. Instead, he intervenes in the binary switch where contemporary discussions of globalization seem to be caught by setting the conceptual relation between both in motion. Neither are they identical nor clearly distinct—a relationship reminiscent of Bhabha's colonial mimicry—but, rather, the Fourth and the Fifth World appear couched in what Iain Chambers, following Walter Benjamin and Rey Chow, terms "reciprocal translation" (2002: 26). Despite hegemonic interpretations of globalization as the proliferation of free-market capitalism, translation (an intrinsic activity of human interaction, all the more with the production of an increasingly transnational and cosmopolitan public sphere) not only serves the hegemonic domestication and exploitation of the objects of the world in the direction of a Western global order. Translation also affects the translating culture, introducing disturbance and alterity into what is deemed to be uniform and unified.

If, even when governed by asymmetries of power and prestige, translation modifies both translator and translated, globalization necessarily involves more than the global spread of corporate transnationalism and technological mobility. Certainly, the deterritorialized transnationalism and displaced mobility of diasporic communities and economic migrants facilitate the contestation and transformation of dominant

68

conceptualizations of the New World Order while exposing the increasing interconnectivity and constant transformation of identity. Such transformation stands opposite to the deceptive ontological fixity of identity, a condition that is not simply dependent on translation but indeed relies on translation as a fundamental component. Gómez-Peña's Fifth World (and its relation to the Fourth World) is indicative of the significance of translation for the articulation and performance of multiple identities in contemporary societies.

The deceptive epitome of the multinational entertainment site produced by transnational corporatism, Gómez-Peña juxtaposes in the Fifth World the so-called "media state," characterized by the proliferation of corporate global networks, with an iconic translator of the modern/colonial world system (von Flotow 1997: 74-75; Gentzler 2008: 154-155): La Malinche or "*La Chingada*" ("The Fucked," an epithet of La Malinche). Traditionally regarded as the mother of "*mestizaje*" in Mesoamerica (albeit in a misogynist, patronizing fashion that highlights the illegitimate origins of Mexican national identity), the figure of La Malinche has become a staple of contemporary debates on modern notions of race and gender in the Americas. Because of Gómez-Peña's resistance to dominant identity politics in Mexico and the "happy multiculturalism" ideology of the media state, the inclusion of *La Chingada* in the Fifth World may be interpreted as a critique of the generalization of specific experiences of dislocation. In other words, the presence of La Malinche stands as a powerful challenge to the idealization of migration and diaspora produced under the discourse of mobility and cosmopolitanism, and the role of dominant media networks in producing and legitimizing images of the Other (Foster 2002: 48).

Certainly, the reclamation of La Malinche as *the* representative of a condition (be it the Native American, the Amerindian, the *mestizo*, the Mexican, or the postmodern) threatens to overlook the mediated discursive background of such reclamation. The violent and misogynist conditions under which La Malinche has been appropriated often become obliterated in the name of a purported celebration of *mestizaje* and hybridity. Gómez-Peña's placement of *La Chingada* in the Fifth World in this respect speaks to the instrumentality of translation to imagine and perpetuate dominant representations of "colonial subjects" (Niranjana 1992) that seek to fix their identity.

However, the presence of Gómez-Peña's *La Chingada* in the Fifth World does not merely convey the role of translation in the projection of global designs. Quite to the contrary, Gómez-Peña problematizes the Fifth World as a site of co-optation and the Fourth World as a site of resistance, and translation lies at the heart of their relationality. *La Chingada* points to the commodification of knowledge and the discursive practices of the media state, while raising questions of *mestizaje*, ethnicity, gender, technology, and agency in translation. While it is too often assumed that media environments and, particularly, cyberculture are erasing the role of race in cyberspace (with the underlying assumption that so-called "netizens" are becoming increasingly white), *La Chingada* restores the role of race and gender in contemporary virtualizations of identity and becomes an agent of intervention and appropriation of the media state and its regime of representation. Such appropriation can only be carried out if La Malinche is translated as *La Chingada* (an illegitimate figure of origin) or, differently put, if the hegemonic domestication that operates in colonial translation is realized. After all, as Chambers' articulation of reciprocal translation suggests, translation invites us to consider that which

70

lies beyond the "translated subject" and the silent effects it produces on the "translating subject" (2002).

In addition to the dominant representation of dislocation and mobility, Gómez-Peña's Fifth World problematizes the notion of "here" and "there" in Western epistemology and the formation of location and identity, a fundamental instrument of colonial translation. In a medium where virtual anonymity frequently elicits consumption rather than transformation, *La Chingada*—the discursive mother of *mestizaje* in the Americas—reinstates racial histories into the cosmopolitan public sphere. More specifically, *La Chingada* brings race into a virtual space that prompts a commodified "identity tourism" (Nakamura 1995) against a landscape of dominant whiteness.

Translating La Malinche not only allows for the corporate colonization of identity or the implementation of global designs from Western local histories. More importantly, *La Chingada* fuels the appropriation of global designs from the perspective of multiple local histories and cultural formations. Rather than denounce the identity play and identity redefinition enabled in cyberspace as an instance of colonial translation, Gómez-Peña's inclusion of *La Chingada* in the Fifth World seeks to question the production and domestication of identity and collectivity by the media state vis-à-vis emerging forms of identity performance. Indeed, the performance of racial identities in online environments as a form of border crossing poses significant implications for the conception of translation and identity, and the negotiation of power relations in contemporary globalized societies. Far from advocating either assimilation or resistance, translation in the Fifth World operates as a means of confrontation, negotiation, and redefinition—one that points to emerging media as potential sites for the emancipation of knowledge from

the internal borders of the modern/colonial world system, where identities are constantly formed, reformed, and performed.

In this way, Gómez-Peña's Fourth and Fifth Worlds confront the construction of dominant categorizations of the New World Order. They establish new relations of interdependence between the internal and external borders of the modern/colonial world system, where the colonial difference is enacted and, as I attempted to illustrate, reassessed. Given the repercussions of identity performance in cyberspace, the imbrication of the Fourth World (where new forms of citizenship are being articulated) and the Fifth World (where the borders of personal experience and power relations are significantly shifting) play a critical role in the interrogation of dominant globalism and the transformation of physical spaces.

Concluding remarks

In this chapter, I pointed out the deceptively dichotomous background of contemporary discussions of globalization in translation studies. From the New Indian to La Malinche, I attempted to show that, rather than a process of *either* assimilation *or* diversification as posited by Cronin, translation in a globalized context takes as many shapes as modes of globalization are simultaneously being enacted. In this respect, rather than *the* New Indian or *La* Malinche, the interdependence of globalization and translation calls for an epistemological shift that accounts for the numerous New Indians and Malinches that, instead of championing translational praxis as a unidirectional process, rely on the performative powers of translation. By so doing, these subjects problematize dominant assumptions about language and identity.

As Chambers points out, "Not only is modernity multiple, it is also translatable" (2002: 30). Hence, new theoretical models must be developed to approach the intersection of translation with histories, cultures, and trajectories that challenge the notion of historical time and space. Indeed, the role of translation in situations of language hegemony is far from merely benefitting homogenization or resistance. Although certainly fruitful for the discussion of translation as a site of representation, I believe that the models that have been offered in translation studies to problematize translation and globalization have paid an excessive attention to what translation is (as illustrated by the hegemony of English as a lingua franca) to the detriment of what translation does (as reflected in the manifold confrontations of local histories that are inscribed in globalizing processes). More importantly, they fail to account for the multiple dimensions of translation—in other words, they obliterate the unsuspected possibilities of translational practice (as exemplified in Guillermo Gómez-Peña's Five-Worlds Theory) that can only be released through the development of epistemological models that explore the multiple strategies of translation resulting from the coloniality of power.

CHAPTER III
IDENTITIES IN TRANSLATION: HYBRIDIZATION, TRANSLATABILITY, AND BORDER WRITING

Introduction: A target-oriented translation of Europe or a source-oriented mistranslation of Latin America?

If, particularly since the publication of Octavio Paz's *El laberinto de la soledad* (1950), the conceptualization of Mexicans as "*los hijos de La Malinche*" ("the children of La Malinche") has been gaining currency in the interpretation and discussion of Latin American identity, what does that say about the translational foundation of what is known today as Latin America? Likewise, if the articulation of the New Indian as illustrated in the previous chapter through the work of José María Arguedas signals a departure from Manichean thought that, rather than pointing to a unidirectional process whereby indigenous cosmologies are entirely subsumed under colonial designs, seeks to rethink the outcomes of the modern/colonial world system from a multidimensional standpoint, what are the consequences for the performance of Latin American identities? Furthermore, given the position of the American continent in the European imaginary from the sixteenth to the nineteenth centuries, as well as the more recent establishment of a barbed-wire fence that separates the so-called two Americas (Anglo and Latin America), how has postcolonialism shaped Latin American cultural history? [37]

---

[37] Here I am not using "postcolonialism" to indicate a rupture in relation to colonialism, as Shohat and Stam (1994: 40) argue in their discussion of the term, but rather to signal the (trans)formation of identity in colonized areas ever since the emergence of the modern/colonial world system.

The role that translation has played in Latin American subjectivity comprises more than meets the eye. More specifically, translation and identity in Latin America comprise more than Western translation scholarship has been willing to articulate, often showing a strong dependence upon canonical literary forms and ideas, as pointed out by scholars such as Else Vieira (1998) and Edwin Gentzler (2008). Whereas, as discussed in the previous chapter, European rule in the Americas elicited a neo-Babelian order whereby indigenous populations were eventually forced to translate themselves into colonial languages, little attention has been paid to translational processes that, beyond the practice of translation in the traditional sense, have affected and continue to affect identitarian and discursive practices in the New World.

Aware of the type of translation involved in the imposition of the colonizer's "culture"—itself an instrumental concept of colonial discourse, as Walter Mignolo argues (2000: 15)—as well as the attached strategies of resistance to colonial domination, Susan Bassnett characterizes Latin America as a target-oriented translation, that is, "not a copy but a continuation through renaissance" (1992: 63). Unlike those who have interpreted the emergence of the modern/colonial world system as the triumph of the universalizing European mind, Bassnett points to Latin America as a site of indigenous revision, adjustment, and, ultimately, empowerment. Certainly, when she characterizes the Latin American condition as translational, Bassnett is not only referring to the functional force of translation or the relocation of imperial languages triggered by colonialism. She is also acknowledging the involvement of translation in the production and manipulation of identitarian itineraries.

In this respect, Bassnett adds an intersubjective dimension whereby translation in Latin America does not simply transpose and enact the meanings that operate in the modern/colonial world system, but also subjects them to translational norms that appropriate, question, and rewrite the colonial imaginary in which they appear embedded —very much along the lines of Fernando Ortiz's notion of "*transculturación*." In other words, Bassnett highlights the performative powers of translation. By so doing, she challenges dominant projections of translation as the rendition of the values of the source text, while revealing the imbrication of postcolonial translation with local histories, rather than with a single local history underlying global designs.

In spite of this, Bassnett's characterization of Latin America is not exempt from a good deal of Eurocentrism. Although in point of fact the name "Latin America" happens to be a nineteenth-century French coinage,[38] the articulation of the subcontinent as a translation of Europe—be it target-oriented or source-oriented, dynamic or formal, or domesticating or foreignizing—complies with the colonial view of the Americas as the result of the so-called "Age of Discovery." Differently put, it draws from a spatial reconfiguration or "continuation," as Bassnett writes, of European history. Yet, the conquest of the Americas should be regarded, if any, as the continuation of Europe's crusades against the Other, fuelled by the spread of Christian demonology and the so-called *Reconquista* of the Iberian peninsula from the eighth to the fifteenth centuries by means of the expulsion of three million Muslims and 300,000 Sephardic Jews (Shohat

---

[38] One of the most outstanding literary figures in the discussion of the power of name-giving in colonial contexts and its intersection with Latin American identity is Caliban in William Shakespeare's *The Tempest*. See Fernández-Retamar 2004 and Gentzler 2008: 171-174.

and Stam 1994: 59-60). Bassnett's metaphorization seems caught in the mendacity of the *a*historicity of indigenous peoples before 1492 and remains oblivious to the fact that, prior to colonialism, hundreds of languages were spoken in the Americas and interlingual translation was already a widespread activity.

In this respect, rather than a translation, Latin America may be regarded as a Eurocentric misnomer or, as Gentzler argues, a mistranslation (2008: 5). Indeed, colonialism in the Americas brought about a series of (mis)translation patterns derived from prevailing forms of ideological othering as a means to legitimize the violence that was perpetuated against the native populations. For example, Shohat and Stam (1994: 60) recount how Amerigo Vespucci's narrative of the indigenous peoples had uncanny similarities with the Jewish stereotypes that reigned in Christian Europe at the start of the conquest.[39] Both enemies of Christianity were characterized, among others, as "savage," "blood drinkers," and "cannibals."[40] In the case of Latin America, not only were the indigenous peoples mistranslated following the colonial ideological and discursive system, but they were integrated into another instance of Eurocentric mistranslation (Latin America) that underscored their submission to the European mind as reflected in the Latin languages that were imposed on the natives of the subcontinent, namely Spanish, Portuguese, and French. In addition, the imposition of such languages carried

---

[39] The prominence of anti-Semitic discourse in the characterization of Native Americans by Spanish conquistadors is one of the arguments posed by Mariscal (1998) to point to the pre-modern foundations of modern racial formations.

[40] Following Fernández-Retamar, Gentzler (2008: 172, 173) discusses the word "cannibal" as a mistranslation of the name of the tribes that the Spanish encountered upon arriving in the West Indies (the *Carib* Indians).

along further mistranslations, such as the illiterateness of native American cultures, a good deal of which were primarily oral or, in other words, non-literate.[41]

In this chapter, I follow up on Gentzler's view of the phrase "Latin America" as a colonial mistranslation and I argue that what is known today as Latin America is actually what is lost in translation. Differently put, my contention is that translation in Latin America expands beyond any single language to incorporate what is generally taken to be lost in translation. With that argument in mind, I allude to different types of translation, namely three. By "colonial translation" I refer to the practices of reproduction and reinforcement of the ontological order in the colonization of the Americas that followed the creation of the West as an entity, where translation served the needs of imperial designs by transforming native populations into legible and controllable subjects. By "translation proper" I allude to interlingual translation as defined by Russian formalist Roman Jakobson but, more importantly, as stemming from an assumption of languages as dichotomous and mutually exclusive—the organic mendacity, as previously discussed in chapter one. By "translation as hybridization" I seek to underscore the power of translation to challenge and negotiate dominant polarities of Western reason, along the lines of Homi Bhabha (1994) and Néstor García-Canclini (1995). In addition, I focus on two major and interrelated themes in the discussion of contemporary Latin American identity: hybridity and the border. First, I trace the history of hybridity and *mestizaje* as discursive mechanisms in the construction of racial categories and national identity.

---

[41] Sixteenth-century Spanish missionaries in the Americas regarded the use of alphabetic writing as one of the most distinctive features of "human" civilization. Mignolo (2000: 3) sees literateness as a major component in the configuration of the colonial difference and the Atlantic imaginary. However, not all pre-Columbian cultures were non-literate. For example, the Algonquians and the Mayans had a system of writing. See Brotherston (2002: 165-179).

Then, I apply the concept of "multitemporal heterogeneity" (García-Canclini 1995) to the analysis of the dynamics of modernization in Latin America and its relationship to hybridity and translation. Finally, I draw upon Guillermo Gómez-Peña's reconceptualization of the border and I discuss translation as a site to rethink the dynamics of modernity.

From biology to culture: Hybridity, mestizaje, syncretism

If there were one major topic of study of the Latin American condition that has been heatedly debated in postcolonial scholarship, that would be hybridity. Initially a biological and botanical term referring to the offspring of different species, in the nineteenth century it came to indicate the crossing of different races. Yet, as Robert Young points out (1995: 6), it was not until the period between 1843 and 1861 that the term was preceded by the adjective "human,"[42] albeit with significant restrictions. Providing alleged examples from Central and South America, zoologist Robert Knox wrote in his 1850 treatise *The Races of Men* that the different peoples of the world could be and had indeed been crossed, but "like all exotics, have degenerated" (quoted in Young 1995: 6). Knox's thesis met with the criticism of fellow scientists. For example, Charles Darwin argued in 1859 in *The Origin of Species* that the rule of the infertility of human hybrids could never be absolute, whereas Pierre Paul Broca's 1860 *On the*

---

[42] The refusal to speak of human hybridity was mainly influenced by the monogenetic thesis, developed by ethnologist J. C. Prichard in *Natural History of Man* (1843), whereby the perceived differences of race in humans are in fact mere varieties within a single species. See Young (1995: 10-11).

Phenomena of Hybridity in the Genus Homo introduced the dichotomy between "proximate" and "distant" races to support the argument that "the hybrid of remote species is unfruitful, whilst the offspring of naturally affiliated may prove fruitful and self-supporting to all time" (quoted in Young 1995: 16).

One of the most—if not the most—visible targets for the epistemology of blood mixture that resulted from the coloniality of power, Latin America was commonly cited in nineteenth-century European racialist writing as the epitome of the degenerative (and degenerate) consequences of miscegenation. Knox himself blamed racial mixture in the New World on the incessant revolutions that had taken place on American soil since the Age of Discovery. In this respect, the 128 Spanish terms of combinations of races that lexicographer Manuel Alvar cites in *Léxico del mestizaje en Hispanoamérica* (1987)—not to mention those that were coined in the French and Portuguese colonies, let alone those that did not make it to Alvar's compilation—provide us with a hint of the degree of mixture that situated Latin America at the center of the axis of aversion and desire developed by European racialist theory (Young 1995: 19, 175, 177). Among those terms, at a time of independence struggles and nation building, *mestizaje* was embraced across the subcontinent as Latin America's foundational theme: racial amalgamation not as an accident, as contended in European scholarship, but as the essence of a newly-forged hybrid identity (Fernández-Retamar 2004: 84).

The adoption in Latin America of *mestizaje* as a conciliating synthesis of races against the backdrop of nineteenth-century theories of miscegenation performed a back-translation of the double burden that the modern/colonial world system had imposed on

the so-called "Children of the Americas." Not only had they been brutally conquered and mistranslated as "savages," "infidels," and "sexual omnivores" (Shohat and Stam 1994: 60) but, once their connection with Europe began to be acknowledged, polygenist scholarship portrayed them as distant racial degenerates. *Mestizaje* (which, in spite of having the same etymology as the English "miscegenation,"[43] developed considerably more positive connotations) was appropriated by Latin Americans and, particularly, by the dominant social strata (the so-called "*criollos*," or American-born descendants of Europeans) as a discursive device to legitimize the mixture of differentially-constructed racial categories while channeling the formation of national identities in the wake of decolonization. Instead of the simple refutation of the racial hierarchy laid out in positivist Europe, nineteenth-century Latin American *mestizaje* became a political appropriation of hegemonic racial discourse as a means to challenge the alleged degeneration of the New World and facilitate the configuration of a racially-mixed identity. *Mestizaje*, in other words, served as a framework for the spread of the philosophy of "Unity in Diversity" by means of the exaltation of the Indian as a paradigmatic figure of the Latin American condition against Eurocentric ideologies of racial purity.

As far as the imbrication of race and the consolidation of the emerging nations were concerned, Mexico led the way of the discourse on Latin American *mestizaje* well into the twentieth century. One needs only to visualize the most notorious Latin

---

[43] From the Latin "*miscere*" (to mix). However, "miscegenation" also features the lexeme "*genus*" (race), which is absent in the Spanish "*mestizaje*" (Compact Oxford English Dictionary: online; Diccionario de la Real Academia Española: online).

American icon to realize the extent to which *mestizaje* exceeded racial discourse to become a central component of the formation of national identity: the Virgin of Guadalupe. A syncretic figure from the time when Mexico's war of independence from Spain (1810-1821) was declared, the Virgin of Guadalupe became the leading symbol of a redefined ideal of Mexicanness. The instrumentalization and institutionalization of the Virgin did not simply rely on the translation of Christian iconography into local circumstances—a domestication, one might argue. Indeed, it went farther, appropriating the many translations from which what eventually came to be known as *the* Virgin of Guadalupe sprang. Among them, we find the Serpent goddess Coatlicue and her sinister doubles Tlazolteotl and Cihuacóatl, as well as her benevolent double Tonantsi, who, in the early days of the Spanish invasion, protected the indigenous populations from the anger of the Christian god.

Under the banner of *mestizaje*, Guadalupe became a major symbol of the redefinition of the relationship among the iconographies that became articulated throughout the centuries in Mesoamerica at a time of configuration of the major nation-states of the modern era. Since then, as the *Himno guadalupano* (Guadalupano Hymn) goes, "for the Mexican, to be a *Guadalupano* is something essential" (Anzaldúa 2007: 51). Certainly, the image of the Virgin of Guadalupe has accompanied all major social justice movements in Mexico and the U.S. Southwest, from the Mexican Revolution

(1910-1920) to the strikes of Chicano farmworkers in Delano, California (1965), to the Zapatista uprising (1994).[44]

If the Virgin of Guadalupe became the visible head of syncretism in Mexico, one of the leading intellectuals behind the discourse of *mestizaje* as it intersected with the consolidation of the postrevolutionary Mexican nation was writer, philosopher, and politician José Vasconcelos. By the time Vasconcelos published his most celebrated treatises, *La raza cósmica* (1925) and the lesser known *Indología* (1926), the trope of *mestizaje* as a means of national integration had already been utilized by other Latin American revolutionary leaders (such as Venezuelan Simón Bolívar, Cuban José Martí, and Uruguayan José Enrique Rodó) and Mexican intellectuals (such as Andrés Molina-Enríquez and Manuel Gamio).[45] Yet, Vasconcelos's conceptualization of a hybrid Cosmic Race provided significant insights for the way that Latin American *mestizaje* came to be problematized throughout the twentieth century―such as the return to hybridity, a term long disregarded in favor of the ubiquitous *mestizaje*.

Whereas *mestizaje* had commonly served the *criollo* cause to legitimize and regulate the continued domination over the conquered populations, hybridity appeared to convey a reversal of the structures of power constructed in the past and a dialectical articulation of racial and cultural differences in the present to account for the form of

---

[44] Conversely, the Virgin of Los Remedios―also called "*La virgen gachupina*"―was appropriated during the late colonial and early republican periods by the Mexican royalist army to assist the royalist cause. The significance of the Virgin of Los Remedios in Mexico can be seen reflected in the ancient pyramid of Cholula, located in the city of Puebla and the largest pyramid in the world today, which is topped by an image of the Virgin.

[45] In 1916, Gamio criticized the widespread association of *mestizaje* with hybridity by associating the former with authenticity and nationalism and the latter with artificiality and foreignness (Lund 2006: xiii).

syncretism that had come to represent postcolonial Mexico. In this context, the racial foundations of *mestizaje* were integrated into the identitarian potential of hybridity, as a more comprehensive signifier for the Latin American condition.

Even if almost a century had passed since the publication of the major European racialist works by the time the treatises of Vasconcelos were published, assumptions of racial degeneration lingered into the first decades of the twentieth century, reaching their apex in the 1930s with the Nazi ideology of Aryan supremacy. In Mexico, the dictatorship of Porfirio Díaz (1876-1910), largely founded on notions of progress that had been imported from positivist Europe, generated an increasing disparity of wealth that eventually incited the revolution (Burke 2002: 54). According to Vasconcelos, the international spread of continental philosophy had made Latin Americans "come to believe in the inferiority of the mestizo, in the unredemption of the Indian, in the damnation and the irreparable decadence of the Black" (1997: 34). Against the backdrop of natural apartheid theories and state-sponsored positivism, Vasconcelos envisioned a hybrid race that, rather than eliminate the weaker species, would incorporate the four basic races devised in and by the coloniality of power: the White, the Black, the Mongol, and the Indian.

Certainly, by addressing the construction of racial hierarchies in the modern/colonial world system, Vasconcelos was not only rebelling against European forms of discursive othering, but also pointing towards the emergence of a new geopolitics of knowledge strongly influenced by the shift of the United States from a subaltern community in the nineteenth century to an imperial power in the twentieth

century (Mignolo 2000: 127, 128). Whereas in the recent past the growing association of

the United States with materialism and utilitarianism had motivated a great deal of debate

in Latin America—particularly after the signing of the Treaty of Guadalupe-Hidalgo

(1848), which fuelled the opposition between the so-called Yankee and Latin races,[46] and

the Spanish-American War (1898)—the work of Vasconcelos switched the focus of

debate from racial purity and materialist uniformity to the formation of aesthetic and

cultural identity.[47]

Given the significant advances in technology and communication and the

emergent international leadership of the United States, Vasconcelos regarded the

prevailing racial paradigms in Latin America insufficient to account not only for the

spread of what he called "the Anglo-Saxon cause" (1997: 17), but also for the racial and,

thus, spiritual reconfigurations that remained ahead of his time. Contrary to the overt

condemnation of racial amalgamation in European scholarship, his primary thesis was

that, since *mestizaje* had been fruitfully increasing as the relations among the four basic

races became intensified, a new perfected race made up of selections of those races

would eventually rise and become "the first truly universal, truly cosmic culture" (1997:

39). However, such a race would not simply be the offspring of an intensified *mestizaje*.

Vasconcelos locates the emergence of the Cosmic Race at the third stage of the evolution

---

[46] Such opposition was also sparkled by U.S. military aggressions in Central America and the Republic of
New Granada (later renamed Colombia) in 1856. The aggression, nineteenth-century intellectual Justo
Arosemena writes, upset the "equilibrium of nations and races" and followed the coinage of the term "Latin
America" (quoted in McGuinness 2003: 101).

[47] For a paradigmatic discussion of the growing association of the United States with the ideals of
materialism and utilitarianism at the turn of the century, see José Enrique Rodó's 1900 essay *Ariel*, where
he derives the symbolism from William Shakespeare's *The Tempest* to tackle identity formation in Latin
America.

of human relations—the first one being characterized by violent miscegenation (or colonialism); the second by scientific discourses aiming to regulate and, accordingly, limit racial mixing in the name of reason (or European positivism); and the last by an "aesthetic pathos" whereby *mestizaje* is inspired by joy, love, and creativity, as opposed to submission to the race with the most power (Vasconcelos 1997: 29).

Interestingly, the articulation of the Cosmic Race, strongly influenced by Hegelian concrete universalism, emerged as a framework to expand and transcend the racial commitment of *mestizaje* towards the redefinition of the emerging Mexican and Latin American identities. By enlarging the conceptual spectrum of *mestizaje*—too often bound to racial politics—and embracing questions of aestheticism, spirituality, art, and culture, Vasconcelos also enlarged the mestizo population of Latin America, which came to incorporate the indigenous and Afro-descendant populations—commonly excluded by the Euro-descendant elite (Kraidy 2005: 52). These populations were incorporated into a cultural narrative of Mexico, whose integrative heterogeneity, for lack of a better phrase, became commemorated in the *Plaza de las Tres Culturas* (Square of the Three Cultures) in Mexico City.

In spite of its narrative of a racial democracy, the Vasconcelan prophecy proves deceptive. Notwithstanding its apparently egalitarian foundations, the Eurocentric heritage of the Cosmic Race floats to the surface in several respects. Indeed, when the author writes, "Only the Iberian part of the continent possesses the spiritual factors, the race, and the territory necessary for the great enterprise of initiating the new universal era of Humanity" (1997: 38), not only is he justifying the operation of the modern/colonial

world system,[48] but he is also complying with the racial hierarchies constructed by colonial discourse—the same hierarchies that the Cosmic Race is meant to overcome. Correspondingly, in spite of the integrative dimension of the Cosmic Race, the indigenous peoples and the peoples of African descent stand at the bottom of the racial scale, only to be absorbed by those races that feature a greater aesthetic quality: "In a few decades of aesthetic eugenics, the Black may disappear, together with the types that a free instinct of beauty may go on signaling as fundamentally recessive and undeserving, for that reason, of perpetuation" (Vasconcelos 1997: 32).

Although Vasconcelos does not make any specific reference to translation, it becomes clear that his unified vision of the Cosmic Race underlies the deceptive inversion of the values traditionally assigned to "original" and "copy" or "source" and "target," and, more significantly, the appropriation of the positivist discourse on race and nation—the Cosmic Race as the superior species of a unified nation. Similarly to the underlying discourse of identity performance in cyberspace that I discussed in the previous chapter, Vasconcelos relied on the racial miscegenation that had been taking place in physical spaces for five centuries in the Americas to produce a covertly Eurocentric aesthetic and spiritual identity. Rather than utilizing the mixture of races, cosmologies, histories, cultures, and languages present in *mestizaje* to challenge the identity that had been imposed on Latin America, Vasconcelan *mestizaje* reproduced the

---

[48] In *La raza cósmica* (*The Cosmic Race*), Vasconcelos places a strong emphasis on the "spiritual mission" of the Spanish conquistadors and the "civilizing mission" of Christianity in the Americas. Strikingly enough, he even characterizes the historical relationship of Spanish conquistadors with the native and Afro-descendant populations as one of love (1997: 13).

dominant oppression and assimilation that colonial translation exerted on the native populations to perpetuate an identity shaped by the discourse of European eugenics.

The aesthetic pathos of Vasconcelos bears a remarkable resemblance to Robert Knox's reversion theory, whereby the children of interracial unions revert after a few generations to one or other of the species from which they sprang (Young 1995: 15). Yet, rather than reverting to one of the species, the children of the Cosmic Race become dependent on the assimilation of the several species, which strive to conquer the synthesis. As Vasconcelos writes, the key to a successful synthesis lies on education: "Inferior races, upon being educated, would become less prolific, and the better specimens would go on ascending a scale of ethnic improvement" (1997: 32). As much as he openly formulates his criticism of the Darwinian notion of natural selection, the underlying differences between the ideology of "the survival of the fittest," as Herbert Spencer puts it (Burke 2002: 54), and the Vasconcelan defense of racial aesthetics become rather blurred.

Vasconcelos places an emphasis on racial hybridity against the trope of racial domination. This is certainly indicative of a narrative shift in the articulation of Latin American identitarian discourse—from an orientation founded on scientific reason and progress to another inspired by aestheticism and spiritual reflection. However, the fixation of Vasconcelos on transcending the attachment of such discourse to the politics of materialism and utilitarianism (the second stage of the evolution of human relations, in his own conceptualization) eventually results in the downplaying of the asymmetries of power under which *mestizaje* operates—that is, the axis of aversion and desire described

by Young (1995). At the same time, the racial scale from which his articulation of the Cosmic Race draws not only complies with such asymmetries, but it also perpetuates the racial hierarchies historically constructed by structures of power and control. These include the spiritual and the civilizing mission, both subject to colonial translation to articulate and disseminate their logic.

Vasconcelos's Cosmic Race sheds light on the development of the philosophy of "Unity in Diversity" in Latin America. The significance of the Cosmic Race can be seen reflected in the focus on unity that the politics of national integration produced in the aftermath of decolonization and the wake of U.S. imperialism to the detriment of diversity and the ways in which such diversity was both contingent on and prevented by dominant constructions of race. Yet, Vasconcelan thought also signaled the cultural turn that hybridity and *mestizaje* would take in the twentieth century towards a redefinition of Latin American postcolonial identity and cultural production. This new approach incorporated translation as an inherent component both in the "proper" sense and as a discursive practice embedded in the formation and representation of culture.[49]

The New Hybridity: Hybridization, translatability

In the opening section of this chapter, I addressed a series of questions related to the transformations that the debate on hybridity, race, culture, and identity in Latin America underwent throughout the twentieth century. Namely, I focused on issues such

---

[49] For an account of translation "proper" in translation studies, see Gentzler (2001): 1-4.

as the reconsideration of the Latin American condition as represented by iconic figures such as La Malinche and the Virgin of Guadalupe within the framework of Chicana/o cultural studies, the questioning of the organized Manichean thought enacted by the spiritual and civilizing missions, and the configuration of the border as a fundamental component of contemporary Latin American experiences.

Certainly, each of those issues is present to a greater or lesser degree in the theories and debates that were discussed in the previous section. Yet, far from the historical preoccupation with national integration that they display, the so-called "New Hybridity" (Lund 2006) or the return to hybridity to the detriment of *mestizaje*, particularly in the late twentieth century, has sought to underscore postnational fragmentation or, as Homi Bhabha (1994) puts it, an incommensurability lying at the heart of national projects. Hybridity or, more precisely, hybridization problematizes the understanding of identity as a set of essential characteristics based on and justified by hierarchically-constructed notions such as race, class, culture, and nation, revealing the multiplicity of mixtures involved in the process of identity formation in an increasingly cross-cultural and transnational world.

One of the main contributions of the discussion of hybridization in the twentieth century is the problematization of time. Traditionally, the conceptualization of modernity in Latin America (whereby modernization involves the demise of traditional cultures) has been guided by the opposition between "tradition" and "modernity," antithetical creators of allegedly pure objects—the former producing nations and the latter generating progress. In this respect, Néstor García-Canclini provides a fruitful approach to hybridity

as a conceptual tool in order to account for the non-synchronous temporality (in other words, the temporal incommensurability) of national cultures. According to García-Canclini, those cultures appear characterized by the interaction of dynamic links among multiple logics of development rather than by historical linearity.

Emphasizing the inadequacy of the theories that have come to describe the Latin American condition, García-Canclini notes that, "Neither the 'paradigm' of imitation, nor that of originality, nor the 'theory' that attributes everything to dependency, nor the one that lazily wants to explain us by the 'marvelous real' or a Latin American surrealism, are able to account for our hybrid cultures" (1995: 6). As I argued in the previous chapter, the colonial dichotomies derived from Western chronopolitics have permeated the debates on social dynamics to a large extent, all the more so with the implementation of the Monroe Doctrine (1823), the emergence of the United States as a world power, and North American interventionism in Latin American territories throughout the twentieth century. For García-Canclini, the modern very rarely displaced the traditional in Latin America. Rather, the temporal dynamics that operate among the different historical periods (whereby indigenous, colonial, and postcolonial sediments continue to hold sway in an epoch) produced what he terms a "multitemporal heterogeneity" (1995: 47). This new conception of time underlies the complex juncture of traditions and modernities as triggered by the ambivalent splitting of colonial discourse—a notion paralleled in Bhabha's "time-lag": an ambivalence at the point of enunciation itself (1994: 265).

García-Canclini's conception of multitemporal heterogeneity presents significant implications for the conceptualization of translation in Latin America as I problematized

91

it in the introduction to this chapter. If multitemporal heterogeneity overcomes the dominant strategies of binary opposition rooted in the ontological narratives of Western scientific reason (such as tradition versus modernity) and generates forms of translation-as-hybridization that undermine the very means of recognition of cultural differences and narrative timeframes, what are the consequences for dominant notions of translation "proper"?

Certainly, García-Canclini's account of the failure of dominant paradigms to understand the dynamics of hybridization in the modern era holds uncanny similarities with traditional representations of translation. The claim of the degeneration of an allegedly pure origin that nineteenth-century racialist scholarship made against hybrids might be compared to eighteenth-century pronouncements of German Romantics about languages after Babel having degenerated from a pure primordial language and translation being a perennial reminder of the failure to restore linguistic purity.[50] Likewise, the characterization of those of mixed race as the most beautiful human beings of all (Young 1995: 16) is reminiscent of the prevailing metaphor in eighteenth-century France of "*Les belles infidèles*," whereby the more unfaithful translations are, the more beautiful they turn out to be. This model reveals the underlying ideology of (male) translators having to "rape the text" (Chamberlain 1992) and the involvement of translation in the axis of attraction/repulsion and domination/servitude characteristic of colonial reproduction.

---

[50] For a compilation of German Romantic texts on translation, see Robinson (1997).

92

Although Western conceptualizations of translation have been founded upon analogous dichotomies to those used in racialist discourse, the relation between hybridization and translation extends beyond the pervasiveness of tropes embedded in dominant ideologies, acquiring a transformational value of agency and empowerment. As I discussed in chapter one, if hybridization is but a continuous negotiation of multidimensional, non-synchronous systems of signification (or, as García-Canclini puts it, a process of entering and exiting modernity), translation becomes a site away from the politics of polarity and towards the contestation of the colonial univocity and the reconsideration of the social dynamics that drive the formation of cultural identity.

In this regard, my contention that Latin America incorporates what is taken to be lost in translation draws from García-Canclini's multitemporal heterogeneity and the amalgamation of indigenous, colonial, and postcolonial sediments in contemporary societies of the subcontinent. Along similar lines to the metaphorization of Latin America as a target-oriented translation of Europe discussed above, cultural modernism in Latin America has been frequently interpreted as a translation of European modernism or, as formulated by historian Perry Anderson, a "belated and deficient echo of the countries of the center" (quoted in García-Canclini 1995: 44). Here, Latin American cultural expressions are conceived as a distorted reverberation of the dominant cultural order. Indeed, colonial translation stands behind the Eurocentric articulation of Latin American modernism.

As it has been argued in postcolonial translation scholarship (Bassnett and Trivedi 1998; Tymoczko 1999), translation becomes a central component in the construction of

the dichotomy Self/Other and the perpetuation of asymmetrical relationships among languages and cultures. Likewise, hybridity as a category stems from the assumption of difference between "pure" components (or at least one of them being "pure") that go into the mixture and reinforces the separation of supposedly authentic identities. Such is the type of hybridity posited in neo-Babelian designs, whereby—borrowing Anderson's metaphor—minority cultures become mere echoes of dominant ideologies by means of an unreserved submission to colonial translation. From this perspective, hybridity is but a terminological shift for the reenactment of the dominant order in the era of cosmopolitanism.[51]

In this regard, I propose yet another terminological shift for the discussion of hybridity and translation in the modern era, which fundamentally involves the substitution of those two terms for "hybridization" and "translatability." The election of the former may seem obvious if approached as a simple grammatical question—hybridity indicates a quality, whereas hybridization suggests a process. Certainly, hybridity has been traditionally tied to racial debates focused on "the who" and "the what" rather than "the how," so to speak. The conceptualization of hybridity in nineteenth-century European racialist discourse served the construction of a racial category—the *mestizo*. Hybridity also functioned as the signifier of a cultural identity and a social hierarchy based on the epistemology of blood mixture and skin color devised by the coloniality of power (Mignolo 2000: 15). Racial, cultural, and social hierarchical organization

---

[51] Jan Nederveen-Pieterse (1995: 45) associates this type of hybridity with what he terms the "CocaColonization" and "McDonaldization" of market relations, which have resulted from the global spread of consumerism and the dominance of the United States as a world power rather than from a genuine cultural openness in international relations.

legitimized the subordination and discrimination of those categorized as hybrid and, thus, as racial degenerates detrimental to social development.

Whereas hybridity fails to account for the complexity of the structures and practices resulting from multitemporal heterogeneity by drawing from an essentialist conception of race and identity, I believe that hybridization contributes to a deeper understanding of the ongoing fecund processes of sociocultural reconfiguration. Hybridization is therefore embedded in the asymmetries of power that determine, but do not delimit, intercultural dynamics. Departing from Eurocentric categories of purity and authenticity, hybridization underscores the multiplicity of confrontations and transactions resulting from cross-cultural and transnational contact. In addition, it calls into question dominant constructions of identity as self-contained and ahistorical, as well as of minority cultures as mere echoes of the dominant order, situating contemporary cultural relations amid specific sociohistorical conditions.

Given that identity is not solely determined by biology or heredity but also by discourse, hybridization (as well as resistance to hybridization) provides a reconceptualization of collective and individual patterns of subjectification. More significantly, hybridization moves the enactment of difference away from the homogenizing logic of "fusion without contradiction" (García-Canclini 1995: xxiv) and toward the construction of a creative multicultural reality that accounts for the tensions derived from the intersection of multiple historical temporalities in Latin America.

On the other hand, by focusing on translatability rather than translation "proper," I am certainly not proposing to resort to a purportedly neutral in-betweenness of cultural

egalitarianism. Quite to the contrary, one of the goals of the terminological shift I am suggesting is to underscore the asymmetries where relations of power are couched. I also seek to pay attention to the discontinuities incorporated in multitemporal heterogeneity that hybridization and translatability expose.

Characterized by Walter Benjamin as "an essential quality of certain works, which is not to say that it is essential that they be translated; it means rather that a specific significance inherent in the original manifests itself in its translatability" (2000: 16), translatability reflects the tension arising between the necessity for translation and the possibility of translation. The former involves the recognition of alterity that is inherent to the act of translation itself—the assumption of difference that Cronin (2003: 169) points at as the foundational theme of translation and the introduction of alterity argued by Chambers (2002)—whereas the latter relies on the universal correspondence between words and things or "pure naming" (Hanssen and Benjamin 2002). The very absence of universality is what creates the necessity to translate, but translation relies on a certain universal quality in language—otherwise translation *per se* would be unthinkable on account of the lack of instruments of thought to conceptualize it. While they may seem contradictory, I consider the relationship between translation's necessity and translation's possibility rather paradoxical, engaging in a dialogical encounter that helps redefine language and translation.

As argued by Beatrice Hanssen and Andrew Benjamin, the conception of universality contained in translation "proper" features two main characteristics (2002: 110-11). First, it does not cause or subsume particulars and, hence, it does not play a

constituting role in the formation of their identity. Second, and more importantly, the absence of a causal relation whereby the universal gives particulars their quality does not imply the absence of universality. In other words, the relation of universality and particularity is creative and productive. Consequently, necessity precedes the possibility of translation, conditioning the articulation of difference that underlies translational activity and revealing the interaction between the particular and the universal inherent in language.

While arising from the impossibility of pure naming, translation works *through* the universality that remains present in the plurality of languages. In other words, translatability works by recalling that which went *with* the proliferation of languages after Babel: the fragments of the broken vessel, as put by Walter Benjamin (2000: 21). In this respect, translatability becomes helpful to expose the hybridized nature of language as the conceptual site where the two preconditions of translation are set against each other dialogically and to account for the multiple transactions involved in cross-cultural contact without obliterating the specificity of the elements involved.

The interdependence of hybridization and translatability speaks to my claim that translation (as hybridization) in Latin America incorporates what is taken to be lost in translation (proper). Indeed, traditional interpretations of translation have been driven by a partial treatment of translatability as determined by the "possibility" of translation from a canonical standpoint. According to that logic, translation has been commonly represented as the failure of language to render an original correspondence between

97

words and things, or the failure of pure naming—a position rooted in the history of Bible translation that became discredited in the twentieth century.

The inclusion of translatability and hybridization provides us with a different account of the involvement of translation in the production, reproduction, and redefinition of social and discursive structures that determine the notion of identity. Rather than eliciting a neo-Babelian order whereby languages become fragments of the epistemological configuration devised by structures of power and control, translatability and hybridization question the very idea of cultural homogenization by challenging the social hierarchy where identities appear embedded. In addition, they underscore the interaction among multiple, non-synchronous dynamics of development that characterize multitemporal heterogeneity. Translation, in this regard, goes beyond the logic of possibility to embrace the untranslatable, the "element in a translation that does not lend itself to translation" (Benjamin 2000: 16). In so doing, translation produces an ambivalent splitting that modifies the process of identity formation toward the generation of multiple fertile alliances away from, while closely connected to, the politics of national belonging, transnational capitalism, and cultural homogenization.

Living *on* the border: Deterritorialization, tangentiality

In the case of contemporary Latin America, I believe that a third component must be added to the discussion of multitemporal heterogeneity in its intersection with hybridity and translation: the border. Similar to hybridity and *mestizaje*, the border has

become a regular component of the conceptual network used in cultural studies to approach identity in Latin America. In this regard, the case of Mexico provides a significant (if not the quintessential) example. Mexican intellectuals have significantly contributed to the discussion of hybridity, inspired in part by the geographical position of the border with the United States. As writer Carlos Fuentes points out, "We're conscious in Mexico that Latin America begins with the border—not only Mexico, but the whole Latin America" (quoted in Burke 2002: 59). Certainly, the Mexico-U.S. border has commonly defined and represented the sociohistorical confrontations between dominantly Anglophone and Hispanophone, Lusophone, and Francophone cultures, as represented for example in the Haitian independence (1804)—which remained unrecognized by the U.S. government until 1862—and the Mexican-American War (1848)—where the U.S. acquired the territories subsequently known as the states of California, Arizona, Nevada, Utah, New Mexico, and Colorado.

The border I am referring to in the present section is not the spatial frontier that separates North from South, the First World from the Third World, English from non-English languages, materialism from spiritualism,[52] or the melting pot from *mestizaje* in the American continent. This conception of spatial boundaries certainly motivated and informed my understanding of the border. Yet, my approach follows the turn taken in Chicana/o scholarship from a site-specific conception of the border (that is, the Mexico-

---

[52] Again, the theme of "Arielism" as developed by Uruguayan José Enrique Rodó is paradigmatic of the growing association of Latin America with spirituality and the United States with materialism. In *Ariel*, Rodó praises the moral and spiritual superiority of Latin America over the United States, which he characterizes as "utilitarian and vulgar" (1988: 63).

U.S. border) to a trope of deterritorialization as a means to address issues of identity politics, cultural imperialism, and global border consciousness (Fox 1994).

The notion of deterritorialization underlies many contemporary redefinitions of the border and its relation to multitemporal heterogeneity, although the significance of their imbrication remains to be fully investigated. In the first chapter, I analyzed deterritorialization in relation to language and nation building. In order to do that, I followed the conceptualization of "minor literature" proposed by Deleuze and Guattari (2004), whereby one of the characteristics of minor literature is the deterritorialization of language toward a state of continuous variation. I believe that the deterritorialization carried out in the framework of border culture and Chicana/o scholarship shares a strong relationship with Deleuze and Guattari's articulation of minor literature. However, such articulation, largely based on European literary models, fails to include the border narratives that have stemmed from the Americas. For this reason, I propose a conceptual expansion of the notion of deterritorialization to incorporate the categories derived from cultural practices as developed in Chicana/o studies.

In this respect, the work of D. Emily Hicks sheds light on the functions of deterritorialization. According to Hicks, one of the characteristics of border writing is the deterritorialization of time and space by means of non-synchronous memory (1991: 4). As an example, Hicks cites the opening lines of Gabriel García-Marquez's *Cien años de soledad*,[53] where the reader is told, from a perspective in which the future is already past,

---

[53] "*Muchos años después, frente al pelotón de fusilamiento, el coronel Aureliano Buendía había de recordar aquella tarde remota en que su padre le llevó a conocer el hielo.*" ("Many years later, as he faced the firing squad, Colonel Aureliano Buendía was to remember that distant afternoon when his father took him to discover ice.") (Hicks 1991: 4)

what Colonel Aureliano Buendía will do in the future.[54] Border narratives evade a single ordering of reality, undermining the binarized logic of synchronicity while transporting the reader not backward and forward in time as if crossing perennially from one side of the border to the other, but rather through the line where both sides of the border meet—the same line that sets them against each other. Just as the border is assumed to separate different temporalities (as conveyed by the nineteenth-century colonial dichotomy between the modern and the primitive), border writing underscores their very permeability by fusing the discrete historical temporalities that underlie the modern/colonial world system and generating further temporalities that refract the contradictions stemming from both sides of the border.

Along the lines of García-Canclini's articulation of multitemporal heterogeneity, the non-synchronicity of border narratives exposes the sedimentation, juxtaposition, and interweaving of different historical periods in contemporary cultural configurations. The notion of temporality in border narratives operates not by the substitution of tradition for modernity or through the articulation of a collective culture of memory, but instead by a multiple sequencing of the temporal order whereby the present is linked to the past in terms of the possibilities of the future. Similarly, the articulation of space displayed in border writing counteracts the type of deterritorialization championed by economic globalization—typified by the growing presence of U.S.-owned assembly plants or "*maquiladoras*" along the Mexican side of the border, especially after the signing of

---

[54] Hicks's notion of border writing does not only stem from the literature of the so-called Latin American Boom. In fact, it appears strongly linked to European modernist writing, as characterized by writers such as Franz Kafka, James Joyce, and Marina Tsvetayeva. However, Hicks points to the narrative transcension of the writer's own marginal position in terms of political content as a significant point of departure of border writing vis-à-vis the modernist tradition (1991: 40-67).

NAFTA. Rather than by a cohesive familiar space, border narratives are populated by a multiplicity of disjunctive landscapes marked by cognitive experiences of movement and connection that emerge from several languages and cultures through what might be termed "landscapes of memory." Such landscapes are the result of the construction of social networks binding the spaces that the border is assumed to separate and the translation of non-linear spatial forms in the process of cultural production.[55]

Indeed, the process of reterritorialization follows the very process of deterritorialization from the time when space becomes a cognitive representation triggered by the interference and interaction of both sides of the border. Deterritorialization appears determined by the absence of objects from the past (Hicks 1991: xxxi) and the experience of border crossing. In this way, the deterritorialization and reterritorialization of time and space in border writing expose the need for a conceptual expansion of Deleuze and Guattari's articulation of minor literature that incorporates the combination of non-synchronous memory and multidimensional perception that characterizes cultural production in border narratives. In this regard, translation—an ongoing process of reconfiguration of historical processes and regimes of power—stands at the core of such production as a source of hybridization.

---

[55] The idea of "landscapes of memory" connects with Henri Lefebvre's interpretation of social space as an unlimited set of social spaces intertwined by virtue of clusters of relationships and, hence, of an understanding of space as a series of overlapping and interconnected spaces. See Lefebvre (1991).

The border as a both physical and conceptual site of confrontation and transaction acquires a new significance in Guillermo Gómez-Peña's "tangential"[56] approach (Bartra 1993). Rather than a demarcation that places two nationalized cultures in direct opposition to each other, the border for Gómez-Peña becomes a space to live *on*, both in the sense of reconciling two seemingly conflicting histories and in the Derridean sense of the survival and continuation of the sediments of such histories.[57] Gómez-Peña's appropriation of the border provides a redefinition of the dynamics that guide border crossing: the border ceases to be a line crossed transversally to go from one side to another. Rather, border crossing becomes a tangential move that allows border crossers to glimpse the angles that remained hidden before, covered up by dominant narratives.

Gómez-Peña's tangentiality reveals an image of the American continent whereby, in contrast to Fuentes' contention, Latin America does not begin with the border, but the border is rather constitutive of the Americas and its inhabitants. For Gómez-Peña, the Americas as a border continent are made of "our Alaskan hair/ our Canadian head/ our U.S. torso/ our Mexican genitalia/ our Central American cojones/ our Caribbean sperm/ our South American legs/ our Patagonian feet/ our Antarctic nails" (Gómez-Peña 1996: 2-3). No longer seen as the locus of delineation of two conflicting but complementary histories, Gómez-Peña criticizes the instrumentalization of the border as a mechanism of ideological control and identitarian determinism: "By homogenizing all Mexicans and

---

[56] Anthropologist Roger Bartra (1993) uses the adjective "tangential" as a literal translation of the Spanish phrase "*irse por la tangente*" (to evade or escape trouble cleverly), in contrast to the negative connotations that the adjective presents in English, where it is synonymous with "irrelevant."

[57] See Derrida (1979). For a discussion of the connection of Derrida's text with translation and borders, see Gentzler 2008: 168-171.

saying that, for example, Mexicans have a hard time entering into modernity, the Mexican state can offer itself as a redemptor [*sic*] of Mexicans, and the one who is going to guide them by the hand into modernity" (quoted in Kearney 2004: 268). The homogenization of identity exposes the major role that dominant conceptualizations of hybridity have played in the constitution of *a* Latin American identity. If predecessors such as José Vasconcelos and Octavio Paz reacted against the geopolitical border constructed by the United States, Gómez-Peña reacts against the borders of Mexicanness that, complying with Western chronopolitics, aim to drive their subjects into a particular conception of modernity driven by the negation of sociocultural hybridity. In this way, Gómez-Peña's articulation of a border continent questions the dynamic interplay of the traditional and the modern underscored by multitemporal heterogeneity and the myth of an omnipresent homogeneous identity.

Gómez-Peña's tangential approach provides a model of post-national subjectivity whereby the border, commonly criminalized as a source of contamination of national identity, becomes a permanent process of confrontation, negotiation, and creation in the performance of what the author terms "*gringostroika*": the balkanization of the Americas into a transnational multiplicity of times and places of enunciation—such as Nuyo Rico, Cuba York, and Afroamerica.[58] *Gringostroika* elicits a redefinition of the concept of the border as the liminal space where the multitemporal heterogeneity of modern culture becomes enacted. For Gómez-Peña, living on the border implies translating on the

---

[58] Although ideologies of multiculturalism and the "melting pot" have stood as a major theme in the United States for longer than a century, Gómez-Peña's *Gringostroika* incorporates questions of identity performance, post-national citizenship, and vernacular cosmopolitanism vis-à-vis mainstream globalism.

border. In this context, translation does not simply imply switching back and forth among Spanish, English, and Spanglish, but emancipating, transporting, negotiating, and renovating concepts, histories, and "revolutionary needs" (Mignolo and Schiwy 2002: 262) from one context into another, from a site-specific understanding of translation (from language A to language B) to a multiplicity of sites of enunciation, and from a logocentric model of translation to a translational model of representation. As a consequence, the border between original and copy, national and foreign, and tradition and modernity becomes blurred.

A reflection of the non-synchronicity and multidimensionality of writing on the border in connection with hybridization and translatability, translation moves beyond the dominant sphere of colonial univocity and the centrality of *logos* that has traditionally permeated translation discourse. In Latin America, translation has not only served the maintenance of asymmetrical relationships among languages and cultures but, more significantly, it has also revealed the discontinuities underlying the formation of closed conceptual categories. By focusing on the border instead of on the two individual spaces that it separates, border writing has come to signal the emergence of a "translational identity" (Gentzler 2008) that, far from preserving the status quo, opens up new possibilities for confronting the epistemology constructed by structures of power and control and redefining the contradictions stemming from the borders of the modern/colonial world system.

Concluding remarks

In the present chapter I pointed out the necessity to distance oneself from canonical logocentric notions of translation "proper" to approach the formation of Latin American identity. I propose that translation scholars embrace conceptualizations that expand beyond any single language to incorporate what is generally taken to be lost in translation. Rather than as the sole consequence of the colonial imposition of Romance languages, I approached translation in Latin America as an inherent sociocultural process of creation, reproduction, and reorganization of discrete hierarchical structures of meaning and knowledge, and I explored its relationship with discursive practices embedded in the construction and representation of culture and identity, namely *mestizaje*, hybridity, and the border.

In this respect, I suggested that the interplay of translatability and hybridization in Latin America has been guided by neo-Babelian models of fusion without contradiction. Indeed, the phrase "Latin America" has uncritically been taken to signify the translation of native populations into Latin languages and their submission to European paradigms that, in turn, mistranslated those populations following Eurocentric ideological and discursive systems. Inspired by the interdependence of hybridization and translatability as ongoing fertile processes that affect human cultures from within, I proposed a conceptual shift that problematizes the dominant articulation of temporal dynamics in Latin America. Such articulation operates under the coloniality of power, while the shift I proposed underscores the network of conflicts, negotiations, and alliances that underlie multitemporal heterogeneity.

By so doing, I did not intend to reaffirm or celebrate hybridization regardless of the asymmetries in which it appears embedded—let alone negate resistance to hybridization. Rather, I attempted to detach the analysis of identity formation from the binarized logic of essentialist discourse and favor an improved understanding of the hermeneutical capacity of hybridization to account for the complex and multiple interactions of historical temporalities in the configuration of what is known today as Latin America. In this regard, I sought to underscore the power of translation not merely to echo the forces of the center and hence foster cultural inequality, but to generate a polyphonic epistemology that diversifies and redefines prevailing structures of meaning and knowledge.

CONCLUSION
NEW AVENUES FOR TRANSLATION IN THE ERA OF COSMOPOLITANISM

In this thesis, I began with a discussion of translation and language contact, I problematized the relationship of translation and mainstream globalism, and I explored new ways to look at the role of translation in the formation of racial and cultural identity. Given the macrostructural organization of the thesis into three chapters, those topics were initially approached with a certain degree of independence from one another. Yet, my ultimate goal was to underscore the existing intersections among them and point to further avenues of approaching translation as a cluster concept—as proposed by Maria Tymoczko (2007)—in order to expand translation theory beyond dominant Western paradigms.

A significant component of this thesis was based on the critique of a number of contemporary approaches to translation that fail to account for the heterogeneity and multidimensionality in which translations are commonly embedded and that reinforce those same assumptions from which they attempt to distance themselves. Rather than reinstating widespread binarisms by offering definite categorizations of what translation is or should be, I suggest that a comprehensive theory of translation should focus on the concrete sociocultural conditions where translations develop and the interaction among hegemonic forces and specific multicultural arrangements that characterize the configuration of contemporary societies. That does not mean that I am championing a descriptive translation studies methodology to analyze the types of translation discussed above—although my approach is certainly informed by descriptive translation studies and

the post-Toury scholarship. Rather, I am proposing that translation studies embrace sociocultural practices that do not necessarily match the definitions of translation that have traditionally been laid out in Western translation discourse. Differently put, I am pointing to new categories of translation that depart from the understanding of translation as the decoding and re-encoding of an original core of meaning. In this way, I attempt to trigger the analysis of discursive processes that involve not only a simple juxtaposition of languages but the incorporation, manipulation, and negotiation of languages as they intersect with the formation, imposition, and confrontation of cultural values, ideologies, and systems of belief.

Along the lines of the problematization of the Manichean base-superstructure dichotomy posed by the transnationalization of social networks (García-Canclini 2001), I argued that the concept of translation discussed in this thesis reveals the inapplicability or, rather, the non-universal applicability of Western models of translation to the sociocultural practices that characterize local histories. In this regard, even if the models on which I focused are informed by the asymmetries inscribed in languages and cultures, I believe that their main shortcoming is twofold. First, they point to the construction of deceptively primary categories in order to provide as comprehensive a conceptualization of translation as possible. Second, they are founded on seemingly homogeneous categories such as languages, cultures, and nations to provide a fixed description of translation. In other words, in their quest to define a theory that accounts for the general dynamics that guide the practice of translation, theoretical approaches have often remained uncritical of the epistemological foundations upon which Western notions of translation have been established, hence confining themselves to the conceptual poles

they attempted to challenge in the first place. While aiming at disrupting the borders that have traditionally defined Western translation discourse, contemporary translation theory has often extended them by remaining oblivious of the interplay of hegemonic forces and multiple local histories that characterizes the modern/colonial world system and the epistemic potential emerging from the numerous intersections between those poles.

However, it would be a mistake to assume that the main limitation of the approaches I critiqued lies in their claim for universality. Those approaches are conceptually different to overtly universalist theories of translation (such as Eugene Nida's "science" of translation) in that they depart from idealized assumptions about human nature and the speaking subject, and focus instead on the process of translation. As I sought to argue, my critique is not directed toward the general or universalist character of those approaches. Quite to the contrary, any comprehensive theory of translation must inevitably attempt to be as general as possible if it aims to raise awareness of the phenomena upon which it seeks to shed light. Yet, that does not imply that it will positively achieve any complete description of such phenomena. I believe that the approaches discussed in the present thesis are not comprehensive on account of the scant attention they devote to types of translation that fall outside the boundaries of traditional Western conceptualizations and their rather uncritical stance toward dominant presuppositions about translation practice.

One of the main goals of this thesis has been to problematize and rethink such presuppositions, one of them being the perception of monolingualism as not only normal but also highly desirable and of translation as a linguistic transaction from one particular

language to another. Certainly, issues of so-called "cultural coherence" have had critical effects not just on the linguistic spectrum of national communities—where vehicular languages or lingua francas have been adopted for the seemingly egalitarian purposes of communication and reciprocity—but also on the understanding of language itself within such communities as a self-contained, primarily communicative entity. In turn, the discourse of cultural coherence has permeated translation studies, where multilingualism has often been portrayed as a mere stroke of local color against a homogeneous monolingual landscape. Instead, I pointed to multilingualism as a means to question the asymmetries where languages are embedded and the attachment of languages to translation and hybridization.

In this respect, the growing interconnectedness and "cosmopolitanization" triggered by neo-liberal globalizing politics and migration flows provide an interesting "territory" or "site" to rethink translation. The diversification of the linguistic spectrum of urban spaces and the ever-increasing need for human interaction across languages stands as a major challenge to dominant ideologies of language and translation. One of the main categories that I have been using throughout this thesis is hybridity (or, as I proposed in chapter three, hybridization), although with significantly different nuances in each chapter. As a category, I approached hybridity on the basis of the assumption of difference. In other words, rather than considering hybridity the result of an underlying difference among the elements that go into the mixture, I focused on hybridity as a consequence of the construction, articulation, and assumption of a purportedly essential difference among such elements that seeks to legitimize the production of cultural

differentiation as signs of authority—along the lines of Bhabha's articulation of "colonial mimicry."

From a certain perspective, it becomes clear that hybridity is contingent on translation since, similarly to hybridity, translation operates under the assumption of difference. Yet, from another perspective, translation works by its very definition against hybridity on account of the adaptation of the source text not simply to the target language, but also to the dynamics that guide the translation process for the target audience—hence the illusionistic effect of transparency inherent in translation "proper." In the chapters above, I aimed to problematize the understanding of hybridity as either one or the other (after all, one of the main goals of this thesis has been to question the pervasiveness of dichotomous thinking) but, more importantly, I attempted to discuss the relation of translation as a performative and transformative activity with hybridity.

In this regard, the question of so-called "post-Babelianism" is significant. Even if the apparent monolingualism of modern nation-states has traditionally rested upon a multilingual fabric or, as Edwin Gentzler argues (2008: 8-39), even if monolingualism inevitably implies multilingualism, migratory movements in late modernity have made multilingualism, or at least languages other than contemporary lingua francas, more visible. Still, interaction among speakers of different languages is mostly carried out in only a handful of languages, predominantly English. As a consequence, translation features as a salient characteristic of post-Babelianism, albeit the kind of translation that leads to what Michael Cronin (2003) terms "neo-Babelianism." While I certainly agree with Cronin, I aimed to suggest that the consequences of dominant neo-Babelianism are

112

more than the apparently perpetual translation from so-called minor languages into lingua francas. I also argued that hybridity may certainly shed light on cross-cultural dynamics on account of both its participation in and resistance to dichotomous thinking. After all, hybridity works under assumption of difference while it may simultaneously be interpreted as an affirmation of similarity.

My approach in that respect departed from the widespread perception of hybridity as a simple idiosyncrasy and pointed to translation as the locus of plurivocity and resistance whereby hybridity comes to challenge neo-Babelian designs. Rather than a means to facilitate the uncritical assimilation of the dominant values, I believe that, regardless of the focus on transparency and fluency championed by socio-economic forces, translation preserves the power to challenge the homogenizing foundations of national and cultural arrangements, and of language itself. The pervasiveness of the discourse on the locutionary sphere of language and its communicative function ultimately obscures the existing asymmetries of power among the languages that constitute the linguistic spectrum of any given community. More importantly, the dominant ideology produces and legitimizes a homogeneous community of ideal speakers whose linguistic behavior is ruled by such communicative function. Along with the prominence of the communicative function, the mutual exclusivity of languages (whereby languages in contact juxtapose but do not intermingle) abides by the intended notion of modern languages as homogeneous, self-contained entities driven strictly by communication.

Translation provides a different account of language and ideology. Indeed, translation is never definite but rather contingent on a series of variables and, hence, translation *per se* does not necessarily interrogate power structures. Yet, the types of translation that I discussed in this thesis (as illustrated primarily through the work of Guillermo Gómez-Peña) challenge what I termed the "constant-based discourse on language" by drawing attention to the multilingualism contained in monolingualism or the multiplicity of languages within any single language. Far from perpetuating the assumed illusionistic effect of translation, the narratives that I explored question instead the illusion of a transparent use of language and a universal meaning conveyed through language. In addition, they point to translation as a means to confront and redefine dominant conceptualizations of languages as mutually exclusive and indeed of monolingualism as inherently monolingual. If, as Gentzler points out following Jacques Derrida, monolingualism hides a "silent but always ongoing process of translation that occurs beneath the surface" (2008: 10), it becomes clear that translation stands as fundamental, albeit covert, component of monolingualism. At the same time, translation holds the power to undermine the deceptively homogeneous foundations of monolingualism and expose the continuous variation that underlies the articulation of language as a system of constants.

In this regard, the relation of the understanding of hybridity that I exposed in this thesis with translation turns problematic. If monolingualism inevitably builds upon a translational fabric, translation indeed becomes an agent of hybridity, albeit the kind of hybridity that prompts fusion without contradiction, as I attempted to illustrate by way of the "melting pot" and "happy multiculturalism" ideologies in the contemporary United

States, as well as of José Vasconcelos's conceptualization of a Cosmic Race. Such hybridity can be seen reflected in contemporary hegemonic discourses on cosmopolitanism, where heterogeneity and difference are both assimilated and repressed by the official monoculture without giving any weight to contradiction and resistance—in other words, what Gómez-Peña names "culti-multuralism," that is, "an esperantic Disneyworldview in which all cultures, races and sexes live happily together" (1996: 241). Certainly, to approach hybridity uncritically as the harmonization of cross-cultural interaction would be to misconstrue the asymmetrical conditions where hybridity emerges and the hegemonic forces that guide the dynamics of interaction.

To problematize and counteract the homogenizing drive of hybridity was a significant component of this thesis. Drawing primarily on the work of Walter Mignolo and Néstor García-Canclini, I attempted to discuss the various subject positions from which contemporary hybridity emanates and the role of translation in the performance and redefinition of those subject positions. While it is commonly assumed that the potential of hybridity as a source of diversification is being jeopardized by Anglo-American socio-economic and cultural dominance, I suggest that globalization is rather making the belief in "pure" or "authentic" identities even more untenable. Evidently, the fact that cross-cultural contact is being intensified does not mean that the asymmetries of power have disappeared altogether—paradoxically, as Anglo-American culture is all the more commoditized across the globe, the United States borders are becoming increasingly controlled and militarized. Yet, confining the effects of globalization and translation to the poles of homogenization and diversification fails to account for the

115

multiplicity of ongoing processes of cross-cultural contact that take place within the modern/colonial world system.

The confrontations among local knowledges incorporated in Mignolo's articulation of "local histories" and "global designs," and Cronin's conceptualization of "globalization as translation" were indeed illuminating in order to rethink globalization and, more specifically, mainstream globalism. Whereas translation has commonly been explored as a major tool for the spread of the logic of universalism underlying global designs (as represented by colonial translation), the multiplication of local histories taking the place of universalism and the differentiated experiences of globalization among those local histories provide a hint of the many roles translation plays at the current phase of globalization. More significantly, they reflect the power of translation not only to perpetuate but also to confront, negotiate, and modify the asymmetries where languages and cultures are couched. In this case, translation challenges the neo-Babelian discourse of fusion without contradiction and points toward the construction of a politics of recognition that goes beyond "forms of identification that are not simply projections or assimilations" (Cronin 2003: 35)—that is, forms of hybridity that resist the dominant instrumentalization of hybridity.

In that respect, I suggested that the interpretation of translation from the lenses of García-Canclini's articulation of "multitemporal heterogeneity" proves fruitful both to detach translation from its logocentric foundations and to facilitate the production of a politics of recognition of difference, ambivalence, and contradiction. By approaching modernity as the intersection of an array of historical temporalities, it becomes possible

to dissociate translation from monoglot diffusionism and underscore existing dynamic links among multiple paths of development that defy the dichotomous imaginary of contemporary globalism. If identity is constructed from an interweaving of temporal sediments that are translated into local circumstances, the conception of a transcendental origin and the linearity of the Western mapping of modernity become interrogated. Translation no longer remains an echo of the dominant order. Instead, it releases identity from a purportedly transcendental point of origin and becomes an effective practice for the configuration of local networks and the contestation of hegemonic globalism. The continued existence of such local networks is both the consequence and the condition *sine qua non* of the notion of translation I discussed in this thesis, for translation allows them to negotiate the economy (understood as site for political debate and cultural difference) into particular circumstances while, at the same time, without them the need for translation would cease to exist.

On account of the theoretical questions raised above, I believe that the analysis of the work of Guillermo Gómez-Peña and, particularly, his articulation of the New World Border provided significant insights for the reconsideration of translation that I proposed in this thesis. Translation is not a unidirectional activity whereby one is perennially translated or resists being translated, but rather a performative process that is often contingent on socioeconomic and cultural forces and reveals the inherently hybrid and fluid character of identity. Evidently, Gómez-Peña's reflections on translation are influenced by the nature of his work (performance art), which makes translation an intrinsic component of his performance pieces.

117

The work of Gómez-Peña does not confine itself to Western conceptualizations of translation, but rather problematizes them, as I attempted to show. Beginning from what is commonly taken to be the fundamental component for translation (that is, languages), the New World Border does not conform to dominant monoglossic conceptions of language. In it, translation operates from and into single languages (namely Spanglish), albeit one that takes as many forms as there are translations. Far from championing a Spanglish neo-Babelianism, Gómez-Peña's use of Spanglish underlies the attachment of language to power relations and, consequently, points to translation as a means to reverse the power asymmetries by translating seemingly homogeneous languages into hybrid Spanglish. Yet, I suggested that, rather than simply excluding the monolingual audience, Gómez-Peña aims to trigger an invisible process of translation, indeed one that does not operate from and into languages but instead *within* languages. After all, Gómez-Peña's Spanglish itself is constantly undergoing a process of retranslation, depending on the intended audience of his performance pieces. By triggering a crisis of authority within lingua francas, Spanglish seeks to articulate the continuous variation of language, the repressed multilingualism underlying monolingualism, and the inherent commitment of languages to translation—hence Gómez-Peña's emphasis on the performative dimensions of translation.

If translation, in its intersection with identity formation, is articulated as a performative process or, differently put, if translation does not merely reproduce identity but becomes a fundamental component for the redefinition of identities, the attachment of globalization not *with* translation but instead *as* translation acquires a compelling force. In this regard, the translation of globalization can be seen reflected in Gómez-Peña's

Five-Worlds Theory, where, instead of extending the asymmetries of the three-worlds model, globalization is enacting new sociocultural configurations. Here, translation engages with the articulation and transformation of multiple perspectives beyond the borders historically established by dominant discourses—such as those of among regions, nations, blocks, or even hemispheres. Gómez-Peña's Five-Worlds Theory not only problematizes the commonly held view of translation as homogenization and/or resistance, but it also relies on translation as a process of diversification whereby subjectivity becomes decentered and the multiple identities of the self surface. The hegemonic vision of globalization is replaced by a translational interdependence of local projects and social networks where translation no longer remains an agent of homogenization. Instead, translation becomes an integral instrument for the production of a multiplicity of alliances involved in the process of identity formation.

In the New World Border, translation does not follow an original text or operate from and into languages. Rather, it is guided by a tangential dynamics where an interweaving—or a "counterpointing," as Fernando Ortiz put it (2002)—of source and target, domestic and foreign, and traditional and modern is achieved in translation. Translation is but a necessary condition for the configuration of subjectivity, whereas the lack thereof is what makes subjects fall prey to the universalism of mainstream globalism and the politics of fusion without contradiction.

In this thesis, I discussed translation and hybridism as illustrated in the work of Gómez-Peña and I pointed to a reconsideration of the notion of translation as it relates to issues of language, globalization, and identity formation. Given the emphasis that I

placed in the performative dimension of translation, I believe that translation studies may gain new insights from the fields of pragmatics and performance theory. I suggest that the reconceptualization of translation will not only generate an improved understanding of the configuration of local knowledges, but also of cross-cultural interaction among such local knowledges.

In *Translation and Globalization*, Michael Cronin proposes a new "translation ecology" that empowers speakers and translators of minority languages, and notes that "in any meaningful translation ecology, translation cannot be unidirectional, however noble the intentions" (2003: 169). I hope that this thesis contributes to the emergence of a new translation ecology where individuals are not only empowered on account of their condition as speakers of "minority" languages but, more significantly, by way of their condition as human translators who engage in the confrontation and transformation of dominant conceptualizations of translation.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Alarcón, Norma (1989) 'Traddutora, Traditora: A Paradigmatic Figure of Chicana Feminism', *Cultural Critique*, 13: 57-87.

Alonso-Rodríguez, José Antonio (2006) 'Globalización, pobreza y gobernabilidad internacional', in Mario Cabrera-González (ed) *Geografías del desorden. Migración, alteridad y nueva esfera social*, València: Universitat de València, 37-47.

Alvar, Manuel (1987) *Léxico del mestizaje en Hispanoamérica*, Madrid: Instituto de Cooperación Iberoamericana.

Álvarez, Rodolfo (1973) 'The Psycho-Historical and Socioeconomic Development of the Chicano Community in the United States', *Social Science Quarterly*, 53(4): 920-942.

Anderson, Benedict (1992) 'The New World Disorder', *New Left Review*, 193: 3-13.

Anzaldúa, Gloria (2007) *Borderlands/La frontera: The New Mestiza*, San Francisco: Spinsters/Aunt Lute.

Arguedas, José María (1986) 'El Wayno y el problema del idioma en el mestizo', *Nosotros los maestros*, Lima, Perú: Editorial Horizonte, 35-38.

Austin, J. L. (1975) *How to Do Things with Words*, Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Bakhtin, Mikhail M. (1981) *The Dialogic Imagination. Four Essays*, Austin/London: University of Texas Press.

Balibar, Etienne (1991) 'Citizen Subject', in Eduardo Cadava, Peter Connor, and Jean-Luc Nancy (eds) *Who Comes after the Subject?*, London/New York: Routledge, 33-57.

Bartolovich, Crystal (2000) 'Global Capital and Transnationalism', in Henry Schwarz and Sangeeta Ray (eds) *A Companion to Postcolonial Studies*, Malden, MA/Oxford: Blackwell Publishers, 126-161.

Bartra, Roger (1993) 'Introduction', in Guillermo Gómez-Peña (author) *Warrior for Gringostroika: Essays, Performance Texts, and Poetry*, St. Paul, MN: Graywolf Press, 11-12.

Bassnett, Susan (1982) 'Writing in No Man's Land: Questions of Gender and Translation', in Malcolm Coulthard (ed) *Ilha do Desterro*, 28, special issue: 63-73.

Bassnett, Susan and Harish Trivedi (1998) *Postcolonial Translation. Theory and Practice*, London/New York: Routledge.

Batchelor, Kathryn (2009) *Decolonizing Translation. Francophone African Novels in English Translation*, Manchester: St. Jerome Publishing.

Benito, Jesús and Ana María Manzanas (2002) 'Border(Lands) and Border Writing: Introductory Essay', in Jesús Benito and María Manzanas (eds) *Literature and Ethnicity in the Cultural Borderlands*, New York: Rodopi.

Benjamin, Walter (2000) 'The Task of the Translator', in Lawrence Venuti (ed) *The Translation Studies Reader*, London/New York: Routledge, 15-22.

Bhabha, Homi (1994) *The Location of Culture*, London/New York: Routledge.

Brisset, Annie (2003) 'Alterity in Translation: An Overview of Theories and Practices', in Susan Petrilli (ed) *Translation Translation*, New York: Rodopi, 101-132.

Brotherston, Gordon (2002) 'Tlaloc Roars: Native America, the West and Literary Translation', in Theo Hermans (ed) *Crosscultural Transgressions. Research Models in Translation Studies II: Historical and Ideological Issues*, Manchester: St. Jerome Publishing.

Burke, John Francis (2002) 'Mestizaje as Holistic Engagement of Multiple Cultures', in *Mestizo Democracy: The Politics of Crossing Borders*, College Station: Texas A&M University Press, 52-82.

Chamberlain, Lori (1992) 'Gender and the Metaphorics of Translation', in Lawrence Venuti (ed) *Rethinking Translation. Discourse, Subjectivity, Ideology*, London/New York: Routledge, 57-74.

Chambers, Iain (2002) 'Citizenship, Language, and Modernity', *PMLA* 117(1), special topic: Mobile Citizens, Media States: 24-31.

Chan, Leo Tak-hung (2002) 'Translating Bilinguality: Theorizing Translation in the Post-Babelian Era', *The Translator* 8(1): 49-72.

Cronin, Michael (2006) *Translation and Identity*, London/New York: Routledge.

_____ (2003) *Translation and Globalization*, London/New York: Routledge.

Daniel, G. Reginald (2006) *Race and Multiraciality in Brazil and the United States: Converging Paths?*, University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State University Press.

Daroqui, María Julia (1998) *(Dis)locaciones: narrativas híbridas del Caribe hispano*, València: Tirant lo Blanch, Universitat de València.

Dasenbrock, Reed Way (1987) 'Intelligibility and Meaningfulness in Multicultural Literature in English', *PMLA*, 102: 10-19.

de Toro, Alfonso (2006) 'Globalization - New Hybridities - Transidentities - Transnations: Recognition - Difference', in Frank Heidemann and Alfonso de Toro (ed) *New Hybridities: Societies and Cultures in Transition*, Hildesheim: Olms, 19-37.

Del Valle, Sandra (2003) *Language Rights and the Law in the United States*, Clevedon, UK/Buffalo: Multilingual Matters.

Deleuze, Gilles and Felix Guattari (1980) '20 novembre 1923. Postulats de la linguistique', in *Mille plateaux: Capitalisme et schizophrénie*, Paris: Editions de minuit, 95-139; trans. by Brian Massoumi (2004 [1987]) as 'November 20, 1923: Postulates of Linguistics', in *A Thousand Plateaus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia*, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 83-122.

124

Derrida, Jacques (1977) 'Survivre', *Parages*, Paris: Galilée, 117-219 ; trans. by James Hulbert (1979) as 'Living On/Border Lines', in Harold Bloom, Paul de Man, Jacques Derrida, Geoffrey Hartman, and J. Hillis Miller (eds), *Deconstruction and Criticism*, New York: Seabury Press, 75-176.

Eoyang, Eugene (1993) *The Transparent Eye: Reflections on Translation, Chinese Literature, and Comparative Poetics*, Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.

Fernández-Retamar, Roberto (2004) 'Caliban: Notes Toward a Discussion of Culture in Our America', in Ana del Sarto, Alicia Ríos, and Abril Trigo (eds) *The Latin American Cultural Studies Reader*, Durham: Duke University Press, 83-99.

Foster, Thomas (2002) 'Cyber-Aztecs and Cholo-Punks: Guillermo Gómez-Peña's Five-Worlds Theory', *PMLA* 117(1): 43-67.

Fox, Claire F. (1994) 'The Portable Border. Site-Specificity, Art, and the U.S.-Mexico Frontier', *Social Text*, 41(Winter): 61-82.

Franco, Javier (webmaster) (2002-2010) *Bibliography of Interpreting and Translation (BITRA)*. Available online at [http://cv1.cpd.ua.es/tra_int/usu/buscar.asp?idioma=en] (accessed January 10, 2010).

Fusco, Coco (1995) *English is Broken Here: Notes on Cultural Fusion in the Americas*, New York City: New Press.

García-Canclini, Néstor (2001) *Consumers and Citizens: Globalization and Multicultural Conflicts*, Minneapolis/London: University of Minnesota Press.

_____ (1992) *Culturas híbridas. Estrategias para entrar y salir de la modernidad*, Buenos Aires: Editorial Sudamericana.

Gentzler, Edwin (2008) *Translation and Identity in the Americas. New Directions in Translation Theory*, London/New York: Routledge.

_____ (2006): 'Translation Theory: Monolingual, Bilingual or Multilingual?', *Journal of Translation Studies*, 9(1): 105-123.

_____ (2001 [1993]) *Contemporary Translation Theories*, Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Godayol i Nogué, Pilar (1999) 'Escriure (a) la frontera: autores bilingües, traductores culturals', *Quaderns. Revista de traducció*, 3: 29-37.

Gómez-Pena, Guillermo (2000) *Dangerous Border Crossers: The Artist Talks Back*, London/New York: Routledge.

_____ (1993) *Warrior for Gringostroika: Essays, Performance Texts, and Poetry*, St. Paul, MN: Graywolf Press.

_____ (1996) *Friendly Cannibals*, San Francisco: Artspace Books.

_____ (1996): *The New World Border*, San Francisco: City Lights Books.

Hanssen, Beatrice and Andrew E. Benjamin (2002) 'The Absolute as Translatability: Working through Walter Benjamin on Language', *Walter Benjamin and Romanticism*, New York: Continuum, 109-122.

Held, David (1989) 'The Decline of the Nation State', in Stuart Hall and Martin Jacques, (eds) *New Times: The Changing Face of Politics in the 1990s*, London/New York: Verso, 191-205.

Hernández-Sacristán, Carlos (1999) *Culturas y acción comunicativa: introducción a la pragmática intercultural*, Barcelona: Octaedro.

Hicks, D. Emily (1988) 'What is Border Semiotics?', in Jeff Kelley (ed) *The Border Art Workshop (BAW/TAF) 1984-1989: A Documentation of Five Years of Interdisciplinary Art Projects Dealing with U.S.-Mexico Border Issues*, San Diego: BAW/TAF, 48-55.

Hicks, D. Emily (1991) *Border Writing. The Multidimensional Text*, Minneapolis/Oxford: University of Minnesota Press.

Human Relations Area Files (HRAF) *eHRAF World Cultures*. Available online at [http://ehrafworldcultures.yale.edu/ehrafe] (accessed January 10, 2010).

Kearney, Michael (2004) 'Borders and Boundaries', in *Changing Fields of Anthropology: From Local to Global*, Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield, 251-273.

Kokotovic, Misha (2005) *The Colonial Divide in Peruvian Narrative. Social Conflict and Transculturation*, Brighton/Portland, OR: Sussex Academic Press.

Kraidi, Marwan (2005) 'The Trails and Tails of Hybridity', in *Hybridity, or the Cultural Logic of Globalization*, Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 45-71.

Kuhn, Josh D. (1999) 'Multiculturalism without People of Color: An Interview with Guillermo Gómez-Peña', *Aztlán: A Journal of Chicano Studies*, 24(1): 187-199.

Kuhnheim, Jill S. (1998) 'The Economy of Performance: Gómez-Peña's New World Border', *Modern Fiction Studies*, 44(1): 24-35.

Landreau, John C. (2002) 'José María Arguedas: Peruvian Spanish as Subversive Assimilation', in José del Valle and Luis Gabriel-Shteeman (eds) *The Battle over Spanish between 1800 and 2000. Language Ideologies and Hispanic Intellectuals*, London/New York: Routledge, 167-191.

Leal, Luis (1979) 'Mexican American Literature: A Historical Perspective', in Joseph Sommers and Tomás Ybarra-Frausto (eds) *Modern Chicano Writers*, Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 18-30.

Lefebvre, Henri (1991) *The Production of Space*, Oxford/Cambridge: Blackwell.

Lefevere, André (1995) 'The Word in Two Languages: on Translating Hybrid Texts', in Henri Bloemen, Erik Hertog, and Winnibert Segers (eds) *Letterlijkheid, Wooderlijkheid. Literality Verbality*, Antwerpen/Harmelen: Fantom, 223-233.

Lienhard, Martín (1993) 'La diglosia y su negación. Escrituras disidentes en el Perú colonial', in Elvezio Canónica de Rochemonteix and Ernst Rudin (eds) *Literatura y bilingüismo. Homenaje a Pere Ramírez*, Kassel: Edition Reichenberger, 307-322.

Lund, Joshua (2006) 'Theorizing Hybridity Today', in *The Impure Imagination: Toward a Critical Hybridity in Latin American Writing*, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 11-64.

Macedo, Ana Gabriela (2006) 'Identity and Cultural Translation: An Introduction', in Ana Gabriela Macedo and Margarida Esteves-Pereira (eds) *Identity and Culture: Writing across the Borders of Englishness*, Bern: Peter Lang, 11-18.

Mariscal, George (1998) 'The Role of Spain in Contemporary Race Theory', *Arizona Journal of Contemporary Hispanic Studies*, 2: 7-22.

Martínez-Vergne, Teresita (1992) 'The Setting. Puerto Rico in the Nineteenth Century', in *Capitalism in Colonial Puerto Rico: Central San Vicente in the Nineteenth Century*, Gainesville, FL: University Press of Florida, 1-10.

Martin-Márquez, Susan (2008) *Disorientations: Spanish Colonialism in Africa and the Performance of Identity*, New Haven: Yale University Press.

Martín-Rodríguez, Manuel (2007) 'Mapping the Trans/Hispanic Atlantic: Nuyol, Miami, Tenerife, Tangier', in Ana María Manzanas (ed) *Border Transits. Literature and Culture across the Line*, Amsterdam/New York: Rodopi B.V.

Martín-Ruano, María Rosario (2003) 'Bringing the other back home: the translation of (un)familiar hybridity', *Linguistica Antverpiensia, New Series*, 2: 191-204.

Mateos-Aparicio, Ángel (2007) 'Trespassers of Body Boundaries: The Cyborg and the Construction of a Postgendered Posthuman Identity', in Ana María Manzanas (ed) *Border Transits. Literature and Culture across the Line*, Amsterdam/New York: Rodopi B.V.

McClennen, Sophia A. (2004) 'Lost in Space: The Geography of Exile', *The Dialectics of Exile: Nation, Time, Language, and Space in Hispanic Literatures*. West Lafayette: Purdue University Press, 163-206.

McGuinness, Aims (2003) 'Searching for "Latin America": Race and Sovereignty in the Americas in the 1850s', in Nancy P. Appelbaum, Anne S. Macpherson, Karin Alejandra Rosemblatt, and Peter Wade (eds) *Race and Nation in Modern Latin America*, Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 87-107.

McGuire, James (2002) 'Forked Tongues, Marginal Bodies: Writing as Translation in Khatibi', in Paula J. Olúbùnmi Smith and Daniel P. Kunene (eds) *Tongue and Mother Tongue*, Trenton, NJ: Africa World Press.

Mehrez, Samia (1992) 'Translation and the Postcolonial Experience: The Francophone North African Text', in Lawrence Venuti (ed) *Rethinking Translation: Discourse, Subjectivity, Ideology*. London/New York: Routledge.

Mignolo, Walter D. (2000) *Local Histories/Global Designs. Coloniality, Subaltern Knowledges, and Border Thinking*, Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Mignolo, Walter D. and Freya Schiwy (2002) 'Translation/Transculturation and the Colonial Difference', in M. Elisabeth Mudimbe-boyi (ed) *Beyond Dichotomies: Histories, Identities, Cultures, and the Challenge of Globalization*, Albany: State University of New York Press, 251-286.

Miyoshi, Masao (1993) 'A Borderless World? From Colonialism to Transnationalism and the Decline of the Nation-State', *Critical Inquiry* 19 (Summer), 726-751.

Morales, Rebecca (1998) 'Dependence or Interdependence: Issues and Policy Choices Facing Latin Americans and Latinos', in Frank Bonilla, Edwin Meléndez, Rebecca Morales, and María de los Ángeles Torres (eds) *Borderless Borders: U.S. Latinos, Latin Americans, and the Paradox of Interdependence*, Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1-13.

Munday, Jeremy (2008) *Style and Ideology in Translation. Latin American Writing in English*, London/New York: Routledge.

Nakamura, Lisa (1995) 'Race in/for Cyberspace: Identity Tourism and Racial Passing on the Internet', *Works and Days*, 13(1-2): 181-193.

Nederveen-Pieterse, Jan (1995) 'Globalization as Hybridization', in Mike Featherstone, Scott Lash, and Roland Robertson (eds) *Global Modernities*, London/Thousand Oaks, California: Sage Publications, 45-68.

Niranjana, Tejaswini (1992) *Siting Translation: History, Post-Structuralism, and the Colonial Context*, Berkeley: University of California Press.

Ono, Kent A. and John M. Sloop (2002) *Shifting Borders: Rhetoric, Migration, and California's Proposition 187*, Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Ortiz, Fernando (2002) *Contrapunteo cubano del tabaco y el azúcar: advertencia de sus contrastes agrarios, económicos, históricos y sociales, su etnografía y su transculturación*, Madrid: Cátedra.

Paz, Octavio (1950) *El laberinto de la soledad*, México D.F.: Cuadernos Americanos.

Prasad, G. J. V. (1999) 'Writing Translation: The Strange Case of the Indian English Novel', in Susan Bassnett-McGuire and Harish Trivedi (eds) *Post-colonial Translation: Theory and Practice*, London/New York: Routledge, 41-57.

Pratt, Mary Louise (1992) *Imperial Eyes: Travel Writing and Transculturation*, London: Routledge.

Price, Joshua (2000) 'Hybrid Languages, Translation, and Post-Colonial Challenges', *Translation Perspectives* XI(Spring): 23-47.

Quijano, Aníbal and Michael Ennis (2000) 'Coloniality of Power, Eurocentrism, and Latin America', *Views from the South* 1(3): 533-580.

Robinson, Douglas (1997) *Western Translation Theory from Herodotus to Nietzsche*, Manchester: St. Jerome Publishing.

Rodó, José Enrique (1900) *Ariel*. València: Prometeo; trans. by Margaret Sayers Peden (1988) as *Ariel*, Austin: University of Texas Press.

Rodowick, D. N. (2002) 'Introduction: Mobile Citizens, Media States', *PMLA* 117(1), special topic: Mobile Citizens, Media States: 13-23.

Romero, Fernando (2008) *Hyperborder: The Contemporary U.S.-Mexico Border and its Future*, New York: Princeton Architectural Press.

Saldívar, José David (1995) 'The Limits of Cultural Studies', in Gordon Hutner (ed) *The American Literary History Reader*, New York: Oxford University Press, 188-203.

Sales-Salvador, Dora (2003): '"I translate, therefore I am": la ficción transcultural entendida como literatura traducida en el polisistema poscolonial', *Linguistica Antverpiensia, New Series*, 2: 47-60.

Sales-Salvador, Dora (2004) *Puentes sobre el mundo. Cultura, traducción y forma literaria en las narrativas de transculturación de José María Arguedas y Vikram Chandra*, Bern: Peter Lang.

Santoyo, Julio César (2006) 'Blank Spaces in the History of Translation', in Georges L. Bastin and Paul F. Bandia (eds) *Charting the Future of Translation History*, Ottawa: University of Ottawa Press, 11-43.

Shohat, Ella and Robert Stam (1994) 'From Eurocentrism to Polycentrism', in *Unthinking Eurocentrism: Multiculturalism and the Media*, London/New York: Routledge, 13-54.

Simon, Sherry (1998) 'Translating and Interlingual Creation in the Contact Zone. Border Writing in Quebec', in Susan Bassnett-McGuire and Harish Trivedi (eds), *Post-colonial Translation: Theory and Practice*: 58-74.

Sommer, Doris (2003) *Bilingual Games*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Sommers, Joseph and Tomás Ybarra-Frausto (eds) (1979): *Modern Chicano Writers: A Collection of Critical Essays*, Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall.

Spener, David (2005) *Mexican Migration to the United States, 1882-1992: A Long Twentieth Century of Coyotaje*. Available online at [http://www.ccis-ucsd.org/publications/wrkg124.pdf] (accessed January 10, 2010)

Stavans, Ilán (2003) *Spanglish: The Making of a New American Language*, New York: Rayo.

_____ (1996) 'Translation and Identity', in *Art and Anger*, Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 187-203.

Steiner, George (1975) *After Babel: Aspects of Language and Translation*, New York: Oxford University Press.

Subirats, Eduardo (ed.) (2003) *Américo Castro y la revisión de la memoria (El Islam en España)*, Madrid: Libertarias.

Thornton, Niamh (2007) 'Body, Nation, and Identity: Guillermo Gómez-Peña's Performances on the Web', in Claire Taylor and Thea Pitman (eds) *Latin American Cyberculture and Cyberliterature*, Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 111-122.

Tobar, Héctor (2005) *Translation Nation. Defining a New American Identity in the Spanish-Speaking United States*, New York: Riverhead Books.

Torres, Luis A. (1994) 'Bilingualism as Satire in Nineteenth-Century Chicano Poetry', in *An Other Tongue: Nation and Ethnicity in the Linguistic Borderlands*, Durham: Duke University Press, 247-262.

Toury, Gideon (1980) *In Search of a Theory of Translation*, Tel Aviv: The Porter Institute for Poetics and Semiotics.

Tymoczko, Maria (2007) *Enlarging Translation, Empowering Translators*, Manchester: St. Jerome Publishing.

_____ (2003) 'Ideology and the Position of the Translator. In What Sense is a Translator 'In Between'?', in María Calzada-Pérez (ed) *Apropos of Ideology*, Manchester, UK/Northampton, MA: St. Jerome Publishing, 181-201.

_____ (2000) 'Translations of Themselves: The Contours of Postcolonial Fiction', in Sherry Simon and Paul St-Pierre (eds) *Changing the Terms: Translation in the Postcolonial Era*, Ottawa: University of Ottawa Press.

_____ (1999) *Translation in a Postcolonial Context. Early Irish Literature in English*, Manchester: St. Jerome Publishing.

United States Census Bureau (2006) *American Community Survey*. Available online at [http://www.census.gov/acs/www/index.html] (accessed January 10, 2010).

Vasconcelos, José (1948) *La raza cósmica*, México D.F.: Espasa Calpe; trans by Didier T. Jaén (1997) as *The Cosmic Race/La raza cósmica: A Bilingual Edition*, Baltimore: The John Hopkins University Press.

_____ (1927) *Indología: Una interpretación de la cultura íbero-americana*, Barcelona: Agencia Mundial de Librería.

Venuti, Lawrence (1998) 'Globalization', in *The Scandals of Translation. Towards an Ethics of Difference*, New York: Routledge, 158-189.

_____ (1995) *The Translator's Invisibility*, London: Routledge.

Vidal, África (2007) 'Resisting through Hyphenation: The Ethics of Translating (Im)Pure Texts', in Ana María Manzanas (ed) *Border Transits. Literature and Culture across the Line*, Amsterdam/New York: Rodopi B.V.

Vieira, Else Ribeiro Pires (1998) 'New Registers for Translation in Latin America', in Peter Bush and Kirsten Malmkjaer (eds) *Rimbaud's Rainbow. Literary Translation in Higher Education*, Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

von Flotow, Luise (1997) *Translation and Gender. Translating in the 'Era of Feminism'*, Manchester/Ottawa: St. Jerome Publishing and University of Ottawa Press.

Weaver, Jace (2000) 'Indigenousness and Indigeneity', in Henry Schwarz and Sangeeta Ray (eds) *A Companion to Postcolonial Studies*, Malden, MA/Oxford: Blackwell Publishers, 221-235.

Williams, Jenny and Andrew Chesterman (2002) *The Map: A Beginner's Guide to Doing Research in Translation Studies*, Manchester: St. Jerome Publishing.

Williamson, Arthur (1999) 'Patterns of British Identity: 'Britain' and its Rivals in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries', in Glenn Burgess (ed) *The New British History: Founding a Modern State 1603-1715*, London/New York: I.B. Tauris, 138-173.

Young, Robert J. C. (1995) 'Hybridity and Diaspora', in *Colonial Desire: Hybridity in Theory, Culture and Race*, London/New York: Routledge, 1-28.