

Diasporic Writing and the Reconstruction of Chinese National and Cultural Identity or Identities in a Global Postcolonial Context

Wang Ning

In the contemporary era, the phenomenon of diaspora and diasporic writing has more and more attracted the attention of literary and cultural studies scholars in postcolonial studies, becoming one of the most cutting-edge theoretical topics in the post-theoretical era, both in the English-speaking world and in China.¹ Well-known critics such as Edward Said, Gayatri Spivak and Homi Bhabha, either out of their own diasporic experience or through analyses of other diasporic writers' works, offered their observations and studies of this phenomenon. Upon entering the age of globalization, along with the increasing blurring of the boundary of nation-states and peoples' national and cultural identity, the study of the large-scale immigration that characterized the past two decades has become more and more attractive to both literature and cultural studies scholars. Although the phenomenon of diaspora and diasporic writing is by no means a contemporary event, it is highlighted in current studies of globalization and in the reconstruction of national and cultural identity or identities. This article will start from this angle to explore diasporic writing in a global postcolonial context.

I. Diaspora as a Consequence of Globalization

I have already largely discussed about the issue of globalization and culture on several other occasions ("Confronting Globalization"; "Comparative Literature"), but before dealing with the phenomenon of diaspora, I will first sum up my own theoretical reconstruction of globalization by chiefly referring to its "glocalized" practice in the Chinese context. In my view, we can reconstruct globalization in the following six aspects: (1) Globalization as a way of global economic operation and development; (2) Globalization as a historical process;

(3) Globalization as a critical concept; (4) Globalization as a narrative category; (5) Globalization as a cultural construction; (6) Globalization as a theoretical discourse (Wang "Marxism" 36–39).² However, along with the deepening investigation of cultural globalization, and along with the presence of diaspora becoming increasingly conspicuous in a global postcolonial context, we may well add two more elements to our studies: the appearance of the immigration trend and the rise of diasporic writing.³ Although diaspora and diasporic writing are not just contemporary events, in this part, I will confine my discussion to the diaspora and diasporic writing in the age of globalization.

Tracing the appearance of modern diaspora means taking into consideration the intensification of the circulation of world population in globalization. In this sense, we should say that large-scale immigration started in the late nineteenth century and culminated in the late twentieth century as Marx and Engels took the initiative to describe the capitalist expansion and its consequent new division of international labour: "The bourgeoisie has through its exploitation of the world market given a cosmopolitan character to production and consumption in every country.... All old-established national industries have been destroyed or are daily being destroyed" (68). That is, on the one hand, these capitalists should expand their capitalization, so that they had to move from their own empire (centre) to other parts of the world (periphery). On the other hand, along with capitalist expansion, the people who developed and manipulated the operation and circulation of capital, as well as those seeking work, would certainly move from all parts of the world (periphery) to the world economic and financial centre to find opportunities to develop their business and personal careers: the Euro-American sphere. They settled down there and even established their communities and culture. For the purpose of developing business, they scattered in all parts of the world thereby blurring the artificial demarcation between centre and periphery. They move here and there thus always in a state of fluidity. So from its very beginning, the immigration trend has been developing in two directions: both from centre to periphery and from periphery to centre, in the process of which the sense of centre is deconstructed.

People often think these immigrants privileged, but actually they feel quite displaced or “homeless.” As Edward Said sums up from his own experience,

Necessarily, then, I speak of exile not as a privilege, but as an alternative to the mass institutions that dominate modern life. Exile is not, after all, a matter of choice: you are born into it, or it happens to you. But, provided that the exile refuses to sit on the sidelines nursing a wound, there are things to be learned: he or she must cultivate a scrupulous (not indulgent or sulky) subjectivity. (184)

Capitalism requires large numbers of cheap labour, and the migration of labour has certainly promoted capitalist reproduction, paving the way for a new division of international labour. Furthermore, since capitalism is not satisfied with local production, it expands production overseas so as to open up new possibilities and new markets. In cultural and intellectual migration, those immigrants from periphery to centre usually have some “cultural capital” which is significant and influential in their original countries. But at the imperial centre, they may feel rootless and homeless in an alien space. Here, on the one hand, they promote their products as well as their culture and values through their agency; on the other hand, they, in localizing their products and values, try to create something “glocal” between centre and periphery. This is actually a two-directional migration in the age of globalization. If we do not see this doubleness, we cannot grasp the essence of contemporary diaspora in a comprehensive way.

Since movement and fluidity characterizes diasporic populations, their identity undergoes a sort of splitting: from single identity to multiple identities. As Kwame Anthony Appiah and Henry Louis Gates comment, “Ethnic and national identities operate in the lives of individuals by connecting them with some people, dividing them from others. Such identities are often deeply integral to a person’s sense of self, defining an ‘I’ by placing it against a background ‘we’” (3). In discussing the issue of national and cultural identity in the age of globalization, we cannot but touch upon the phenomenon of diasporic populations and

diasporic writing. For it is the state of diaspora, among others, that enables people to have more than one national and cultural identity. Since ethnic Chinese populations are to be found in many parts of the world, diaspora studies has recently become more and more attractive to scholars of literary and cultural studies within China. In the past, diasporic writing was translated into Chinese as “liuwang wenxue,” that is, “those who write on the theme have moved abroad due to either political persecution or economic difficulty.” So they are also regarded as writers in exile. It is true to some extent, but diasporic writing has far more meanings than that. In today’s global context, we usually translate the term diaspora into Chinese as “lisan” or “liusan” or “liulishisuo.” And diasporic writers are thus translated into Chinese as “lisan zuojia” or “liusan zuojia.” I myself would prefer the second translation: “liusan,” for it not only refers to those who move out of the original countries due to certain political persecution or economic difficulty, but also refers to those who voluntarily and freely move out of their original countries. That is, the diaspora are always homeless, having a cosmopolitan sense, or seeking a sort of “consciousness of global citizenship” (Tu, “Duoyuan”), and moving from here to there without a fixed location or national identity. These diasporic experiences certainly enable them to write from different perspectives: they might rethink of the life in their original countries from the outside or critique the social realities of their new countries of residence as outsiders. In this sense, they usually have double perspectives moving between two cultures and creating a sort of “third space”. And they have multiple cultural identities because they write between different cultures.

As we all know, the word diaspora was first used by in the West to describe in a pejorative way Jews living in different parts of the world outside a national homeland. Later, it was used in the present sense, especially in the contemporary era. Take, for example, the Chinese diaspora. Many Chinese emigrants first prioritize involvement in local communities and their new culture. As a result, many of them do not write in Chinese, and some even change their names into foreign ones in an attempt to identify themselves with local people. In this way, we cannot say that they are still Chinese judging merely by their faces. On the

other hand, many of the Chinese diaspora choose to write in English, especially those settling down in North America and Australia, on their Chinese experiences, thereby disseminating Chinese culture world wide. So at present, the word diaspora becomes more and more neutral, more and more pointing to the “diasporic” state of these immigrants.

Although contemporary studies of diaspora and diasporic writing started in the early 1990s, first in postcolonial studies, actually, it did not become a cutting edge topic for Chinese scholars until we entered the age of globalization, in which large-scale immigration has intensified. Consequently, a large number of writers in other countries have conscientiously used literature to express their homeless feeling and diasporic experience. And their writing has formed a unique vision in contemporary world literature, filled both with homeless people’s longing for their motherland and vivid descriptions of exotic landscapes in other countries. Said describes the experience of exile in this way:

Exile is strangely compelling to think about but terrible to experience. It is the unhealable rift forced between a human being and a native place, between the self and its true home: its essential sadness can never be surmounted. And while it is true that literature and history contain heroic, romantic, glorious, even triumphant episodes in an exile’s life, these are no more than efforts meant to overcome the crippling sorrow of estrangement. The achievements of exile are permanently undermined by the loss of something left behind forever. (173)

Here, for Said, the experience of exile or diaspora is both a privilege and bitter suffering: you are enabled to rethink the social realities of a country of origin from the outside, but you do not have a fixed national and cultural identity. As the diasporic writers or intellectuals write in between two or more than two national cultures, their national and cultural identity cannot be singular. Namely, they could carry on dialogue with both people of their original countries as foreigners, and at the same time, involving themselves with their “alien” faces in the local communities. Undoubtedly, within this cross-cultural framework, diasporic writing represents a unique literary phenomenon. Then, one

may raise the question: did diaspora or diasporic writing spontaneously emerge in the contemporary era or has it had a long and unique tradition in literary and cultural history? Let us trace briefly its origin in literary history before dealing with the issue of identity.

Literary diaspora, in my view, may well refer to two aspects: the diasporic state of the writer, as we have already discussed above; and the diasporic style of the writer, which finds particular embodiment in such English and American novelists as Daniel Defoe, Henry Fielding, Mark Twain, and Saul Bellow. These writers do not necessarily have a diasporic experience, but write in a diasporic or picaresque style. Although the latter do not have much significance to the word diaspora in today's sense, they do anticipate more or less contemporary diasporic writing in style. Other writers, such as Henrik Ibsen, James Joyce, Ezra Pound and V.S. Naipaul, experienced diasporic life and wrote their best works in the periods of their exile. Since these writers are very much relevant to the issue of identity which I will discuss in detail I will now focus on the issue of Chinese identity or identities in the following section.

II. Toward a Transnational (Re) Construction of Chinese Identit(ies)

It is true that in the past ten years the process of globalization that has been sweeping the whole world has had a profoundly direct influence on China's politics, economy, society and culture. If we recognize that globalization has impacted studies of individual national literatures, then it has in addition promoted new studies of comparative literature and world literature. As we all know, the early stage of comparative literature is world literature. After over one hundred years, in the current age of globalization, comparative literature is progressing closer and closer to a new sort of world literature with a cosmopolitan sensibility. The boundaries of nations are transgressed, so are those of disciplines or fields of representation. No doubt, in current Western literary and cultural studies circles, quite a few scholars are doing both literary and cultural studies and have made remarkable achievements in the two fields. To these scholars, literary phenomena and cultural factors are interconnected. From cultural and literary perspectives in general, diasporic writing is a research object of cultural studies scholars as well as comparatavists,

which has actually bridged the two disciplines. Even within literary studies, diasporic writing attracts the attention of all the three types of scholars: those of national literature, such as those engaged in Chinese-American literature studies; those of comparative literature, such as those engaged in two or more than two literatures crossing the linguistic and disciplinary boundaries; those of world literature since the diaspora have a cosmopolitan sense with no fixed cultural location or national and cultural identity. The multiple identities or ways these identities are represented are common points of study for all of these scholars, regardless of disciplinary boundaries. With this in mind, the question then becomes, what kind of identity or identities do Chinese diasporic writers want to represent in their writing? Obviously it should not be traditional nationalism, which has become more and more problematic in the contemporary era.

In dealing with nationalism, Said points out,

We come to nationalism and its essential association with exile. Nationalism is an assertion of belonging in and to a place, a people, a heritage. It affirms the home created by a community of language, culture, and customs; and, by so doing, it fends off exile, fights to prevent its ravages. Indeed, the interplay between nationalism and exile is like Hegel's dialectic of servant and master, opposites informing and constituting each other. All nationalisms in their early stages develop from a condition of estrangement. (176)

As we know, one's national and cultural identity is both natural born and constructible afterwards. It could not be always pure. The magnificent spectacle of the opening ceremony of the Beijing Olympic Games in 2008 actually displays such a transnational spirit: on the one hand, there is the unprecedented highlight of Confucian ideas which are certainly national and local, but on the other hand, all these are realized by means of postmodern high technologies of sound, light and electricity which were introduced from the West and thus global. Here, both globalization and nationalism are in play, and globalization is realized by highlighting a sort of nationalism, and in turn an essential part of national culture

(Confucianism) is globalized, thus creating a plane of transnationalism. The process suggests that globalization cannot be realized unless it is located in a certain cultural soil or localized. The artificial demarcation between different identities has thus been deconstructed, and traditional nationalism has been transcended by a sort of transnationalism, or a new type of cosmopolitanism.

Let us return to the issue of globalization and its impact on China. Dialectically speaking, globalization has brought about two aspects of influence to China's literary and cultural studies. Its positive aspect lies in bringing cultural and intellectual production closer to the governance of market economy rather than the past socialist planned economy. On the other hand, globalization makes elite cultural production more and more difficult, thus expanding the gap between elite culture and popular culture. In the current era, the old formalistic literary theory has been replaced by a more inclusive cultural theory or just critical theory, offering Chinese theorists rare opportunities to change our status from a "theory consuming country" into a "theory producing country." For any theory produced in the Western context, if it intends to become universal, should be appropriate to interpret non-Western literary and cultural phenomena, otherwise, it cannot be regarded as being "universal." Similarly, any theory produced in a non-Western context, if it really intends to move from "periphery" to "centre" must be first of all "discovered" by Western academia, or it will always remain "marginal" or "regional." A "regional" theory may gradually develop into a "global" or "universal" theory through the agency of Western academia or English. The prevalence of postcolonial theory initiated by those from a Third World background serves as an example. Similarly, the rise of diasporic writing has concretized the study of national and cultural identity and deconstructed a singular identity, thereby paving the way for the appearance of multiple identities.

In describing the indeterminacy of nations, Homi Bhabha points out,

Nations, like narratives, lose their origins in the myths of time and only fully realize their horizons in the mind's eye. Such an image of the nation—or narration—might seem impossibly

romantic and excessively metaphorical, but it is from those traditions of political thought and literary language that the nation emerges as a powerful historical idea in the west. (1)

The problematic of nation in the age of globalization has become more and more conspicuous along with the blurring of the boundary of nation-states. Globalization, like an invisible empire, severely challenges the power of national sovereignty. To promote nationalism enthusiastically in such an age of globalization seems indeed out of place.

Confronted with the impact of globalization, I would propose one cultural strategy for Chinese intellectuals, that is, we should first of all realize that we are now in an age of globalization that is beyond any expectation or resistance. On the other hand, we cannot be dragged by these strong waves without distinction or critique. So, the correct attitude might be outlined in this way: we may make full use of globalization to develop Chinese culture without having its cultural tradition colonized in an attempt to popularize Chinese language and culture world wide. In this sense, sticking to the old-fashioned nationalism will prevent us from giving full play to our cultural and literary imagination.⁴ We could draw some lessons in this respect from the history of modern Chinese culture and literature. As a matter of fact, resisting or transcending the old-fashioned nationalism has, at least in the Chinese context, a long history, even before the May 4th period which is the most open period in the twentieth century, and in which there appeared quite a few literary masters of transnational consciousness and international reputation.

In the past century, Chinese literature, largely under the Western influence, has been moving toward the world, farther and farther away from its own tradition. In this way, the May 4th Movement started the process of Chinese modernity, in which Western cultural trends and academic thoughts flooded into China, challenging China's long-standing nationalism. What is even worse to many people is that the Chinese language was also largely "Europeanized" or "Westernized." Many of the major May 4th writers, such as Lu Xun, Hu Shi, Guo Moruo, Yu Dafu, and Ba Jin had diasporic experiences. Their minds were occupied with

cosmopolitanism or transnationalism, rather than a narrow-minded nationalism. But to my mind, this turning away from nationalism is undoubtedly a direct consequence of Chinese modernity, which is different from the Western modernity. It is an alternative modernity, which has not only deconstructed the myth of a “singular modernity,” but is also able to carry on equal dialogues with both traditional Chinese culture and literature with modern Western culture and literature. The appearance of Chinese modernity as an alternative modernity has also added a new page in the history of international or global modernity or modernities. One of the conspicuous phenomena is that numerous foreign literary works and theoretic works were translated into Chinese, thus strongly stimulating Chinese writers’ creative imaginations. In deconstructing a narrow-minded nationalism, some writers would rather admit being influenced by foreign literature than by traditional Chinese literature. Even Lu Xun, a pioneering figure of modern Chinese culture and literature, in talking about his literary inspiration, rather frankly admitted:

But when I began to write stories, I did not realize that I had the talent of writing fiction. For at the time, I was staying in a guest house in Beijing, where I could not write research papers as I did not have any references, nor could I do translation as I did not even have the original texts at hand. In this way, what I could do is to write something like fiction. Hence *The Diary of a Mad Man* came out. When I wrote this piece, I only depended on some hundred foreign literary works I had read and some knowledge of medicine I had obtained. As for other preparations, there were no more. (Lu Xun 512; my translation)

Although, as we all know, Lu Xun made profound Chinese cultural and literary achievements and even wrote a short history of Chinese fiction, he still tried to deny his being influenced by traditional Chinese literature largely due to his strong motivation of modernizing Chinese literature and culture. Actually, to Lu Xun, a man of letters with a profound knowledge of both Chinese and Western learning, proposing an overall “Westernization” is nothing but a cultural and intellectual strat-

egy. He does not want to destroy traditional Chinese nationalist spirit, but rather, he wants to highlight a sort of transnational cultural spirit in an attempt to reconstruct Chinese national and cultural identity in a broader context of global culture and world literature. When living in exile in Japan, he wanted to study medicine to save the country from the “sick” state. But later, he realized that literature might waken the oppressed people to rise up against the imperialist colonization. So he chose to study literature and started to write literary works. His short stories, such as “The True Story of Ah Q,” express his sharp critique of this sort of narrow-minded national character embodied in the protagonist Ah Q, symbolic of poor and backward Chinese peasants in the old society. Other May 4th writers, such as Hu Shi and Guo Moruo, have also forcefully deconstructed traditional Chinese literary discourse by calling for the translation of as many Western literary works into Chinese as possible: the former not only took pains to introduce Western cultural trends and literary works in China, but also published in English internationally; the latter, in destroying the old tradition, even identified himself as China’s Whitman. Ba Jin, inspired by the then prevailing anarchism, was once interested in Esperanto to express his cosmopolitan consciousness. As a result of such large-scale translation, there appeared a modern Chinese literary canon, with modern Chinese literature moving closer to world literature and becoming an inseparable part of world literature. In the process of building up a new Chinese national and cultural identity or identities, translation has played a very important role, but this sort of translation is on the level of cultural interpretation and representation rather than merely linguistic rendition. In writing a modern Chinese literary history, translated literature should be regarded as having played an important role, and thus is an inseparable part of modern Chinese literature. It is through such large-scale literary and cultural translation that a new literary canon was born which has helped to construct a new transnationalism.

Although the May 4th Movement took place about ninety years ago, it is still the subject of various criticisms and controversies. Obviously, if we re-examine the positive and negative consequences of the May 4th Movement from today’s point of view, we may well reach such a conclu-

sion: in bringing various Western cultural trends and theories in China, the May 4th writers and intellectuals neglected to attempt to introduce Chinese culture and literature to the outside world. What is even worse is that in destroying Confucian temples, they also got rid of some of the positive aspects of Confucianism, thereby anticipating the “crisis of belief” in contemporary China. In severely criticizing nationalism, they unintentionally led China into a pit of cultural colonialism. Fortunately, in the current age of globalization, China has become one of the very few countries to have benefited greatly from globalization, not only economically and politically but also culturally and intellectually. The recent practice of cultural globalization in the Chinese context will by no means colonize Chinese culture, but instead, it will help to promote Chinese culture and literature worldwide. So in this aspect, highlighting “transnationalism” rather than traditional nationalism, which is similar to a new cosmopolitanism, might be a goal for scholars of comparative literature and cultural studies.

It is true that whether we do literary studies or cultural studies, we cannot do it well without the intermediary of language. To a large extent, the influence of globalization on culture also finds particular embodiment in the remapping of a world language system: the originally popular languages becoming more and more popular, and the originally less popular languages disappearing or becoming weaker. In this aspect, English and Chinese are two of the major world languages that have benefited most from the globalization of culture. Due to the comprehensive power of the United States and the long-standing colonial heritage of the British Empire, the popularization and influence of English still ranks the first among all the major world languages. But on the other hand, English has been undergoing a sort of splitting: from the so-called formal “Queen’s English” dividing into “world englishes” or “global englishes,” with strong indigenous pronunciations and grammatical rules. Then, what is the consequence of globalization on Chinese, the most popular language next to English? Obviously, as we have noticed, Chinese is also undergoing a sort of movement: from a national language to a regional language and finally to one of the major world languages. So the popularization of Chinese

worldwide has undoubtedly changed the established framework of world culture. But on the other hand, in promoting Chinese across the globe and making it one of the major world languages, we should also notice that it might well lose its established identity as a national language in a manner similar to English. In my view, if Chinese could really become the second major world language next to English, it will more or less complement the latter. In this new framework of world language and culture, the transnationality of Chinese language and culture will become more and more conspicuous. Since Chinese diasporic writers work between languages and cultures, they will certainly contribute a great deal to building up such a transnational consciousness.

III. Farewell to Postcoloniality?

Shenghuo (Life), a very popular but "classy" Chinese magazine published monthly, has recently put out a special issue on "Farewell to Postcoloniality,"⁵ which has undoubtedly aroused some critical interests among China's postcolonial scholars, although this special issue is chiefly devoted to artistic works. One might raise the questions: why should we say good-bye to postcoloniality now? Was China really a colonial country in the past or is China largely colonized in culture now? I would say neither. If not, why should we say farewell to postcoloniality? I think it a rather complicated issue that deserves to be discussed.

As we all know, China was once called the "central empire" (*zhongyang diguo*), viewing all other countries, be they West or East, as "savage aliens" (*man yi*). But it was not long before Europe quickly developed during the Industrial Revolution and the founding of the United States. China was degraded to a second-class country with the largest population, but of minor importance in international politics and economy. What is even worse is that Chinese people were for a long time called "sick East Asians" (*dongya bingfu*). The recent successful Beijing Olympic Games, especially the grand opening ceremony, has undoubtedly showed that China is no longer a developing country belonging to the Third World. It is undergoing a "depovertizing" and "de-third-worldizing" process, as a result of which, its position as a political and economic power has been

established. Even physically, China has become a force in international sports. But culturally and intellectually speaking, we cannot say that China is a cultural and intellectual power equal to its current political and economic position: Chinese literature and culture are little known to the outside world except to some sinologists and those interested in China, and Chinese humanities scholars have a very weak voice in international scholarship although we do not necessarily suffer from “aphasia.” (Would this concept of *aphasia* work to nuance or address my comment above?)

Tu Weiming, one of the eminent and ambitious Neo-Confucianists in the contemporary era, in promoting the Neo-Confucian doctrines worldwide in the past decades, once put forward his grand discourse of “cultural China” which has been recently revised. According to his new description, “cultural China” includes the following three forces: (1) the Chinese in mainland China, Hong Kong, Macao and Taiwan; (2) the Chinese diaspora all over the world; and (3) the foreigners who study Chinese culture (Tu “Multiculturalism”). In the current era, the last two forces are becoming more and more forceful in promoting Chinese culture across the globe along with an increasing interest in China: the Chinese diaspora are paying more attention to expressing their “homeless,” but cosmopolitan sentiments both in words and in deeds; and more and more foreigners are interested in Chinese culture as well as in learning the Chinese language. In this sense, the project of “cultural China” will become materialized in the years to come. But at the moment, in international academic exchange and communication, we cannot require our Western colleagues to speak and write in Chinese, but if we do not speak English, we will not enable our international colleagues to understand us. Or we will be self-marginalized always remaining at the periphery and speaking in a weak voice. Since English is still the most powerful and popular *lingua franca* in the contemporary world, any national literature or local theory cannot become global or universal without being translated into English. Or, any writers or literary scholars cannot become internationally renowned without the intermediary of the United States since America actually functions as the centre of world cultural and literary

studies. In this way, we have more or less been in a state similar to that of postcoloniality.

Furthermore, many of the Chinese writers have long had a sort of “Nobel complex” (Nuobeier qingjie), hoping that some day one of them will be awarded the Nobel Prize for Literature. And many humanities scholars hope that our works could be translated into other major international languages, especially English, so that our works could be read and our voices might be heard by our international colleagues. Thus, there is a kind of postcolonial consciousness thinking that we are not equal to our Western colleagues in international communication and dialogues. In my opinion, such a (post) colonial consciousness is unnecessary. The answer is to have a normal state of mind, to treat other people and ourselves in an equal manner. In this way, we will be able to change China from a “theory consuming country” into a “theory producing country.” China was never totally colonized, let alone a postcolonial state. If indeed some of us have a postcolonial consciousness, we should now give up such postcoloniality and engage in East-West cultural and academic dialogue so that we can contribute to world culture and academia.

Notes

- 1 The first time I came across the term “diaspora” was in 1994, when I was invited to organize a workshop with Steven Tötösy on postcolonialism and diasporic writing at the 14th Triennial Congress of the International Comparative Literature Association (Edmonton, August 1994). The term soon traveled to China, and since 1999, at every triennial congress of the Chinese Comparative Literature Association, there is always a panel or parallel session on this topic with more emphasis on Chinese diasporic writing.
- 2 See Wang Ning (“Marxism”). When I read part of this paper at the International Conference on Confucianism in the Postmodern Era (Beijing, October 2006), Cheng Chung-ying reminded me that I should also view globalization as a philosophical discourse. I quite agree with him, but since Fredric Jameson has already developed this idea, I do not want to repeat it.
- 3 Here I would note that, apart from large-scale emigration of Chinese people abroad, there has also been a trend of large-scale immigration to China, especially from such countries or regions as South Korea, Singapore and Taiwan, and occasionally from some Euro-American countries along with China’s economic

and political role in the process of globalization. All these overseas “diaspora” try to find some opportunities to develop their career or business in China.

- 4 For the relationship between nationalism and literary imagination, see Spivak. On the basis of this article, she gave a public lecture on March 7, 2006 at Tsinghua University at my invitation.

- 5 See Zhang and the entire issue of *Shenghuo* [Life] 9.

Works Cited

- Appadurai, Arjun. *Modernity at Large: Cultural Dimensions of Globalization*. Minneapolis: U of Minnesota P, 1996.
- Appiah, Kwame Anthony, and Henry Louis Gates, Jr., eds. *Identities*. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1995.
- Bhabha, Homi, ed. *Nation and Narration*. London: Routledge, 1990.
- Cheng, Chung-ying. “Preface to the Special Issue on Democracy and Chinese Philosophy: The Inner and the Outer for Democracy and Confucian Tradition.” *J of Chinese Philosophy* 34.2 (June 2007): 151–54.
- Jameson, Fredric. “Notes on Globalization as a Philosophical Issue.” In Jameson and Masao Miyoshi. 54–77.
- , and Masao Miyoshi, eds. *The Cultures of Globalization*. Durham, NC: Duke UP, 1998.
- Lu Xun. *Lu Xun quanji* [Collected Works of Lu Xun] Vol. 4. Beijing: People’s Literature P, 1989.
- Marx, Karl and Frederick Engels. *The Communist Manifesto*. Ed. and Intro. John E. Toews. Boston: Bedford/St. Martin’s, 1999.
- Robertson, Roland. *Globalization: Social Theory and Global Culture*. London: Sage, 1992.
- Said, Edward. *Reflections on Exile and Other Essays*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 2000.
- San Juan Jr., E. *After Postcolonialism: Remapping Philippines-United States Confrontations*. Lanham: Rowman and Littlefield Publishers, 2000.
- Spivak, Gayatri. “Nationalism and Imagination.” *AUT* 329 (2006): 65–90.
- Tu Wei-ming. “Preface” *Way, Learning, and Politics: Essays on the Confucian Intellectual*. Albany: State U of New York P, 1993. ix–x.
- . “Duoyuan wenhua yu wenming duihua” [Multiculturalism and Dialogue among Civilizations], keynote speech at the 9th Triennial Congress of Chinese Comparative Literature Association, 12 October 2008, Beijing.
- Wang Gungwu. *China and the Chinese Overseas*. Singapore: Eastern UP, 2003.
- Wang Ning. “Confronting Globalization: Cultural Studies versus Comparative Literature Studies?” *Neohelicon* 28.1 (2001): 55–66.
- . “Makesizhuyi he quanqihua lilun jiangou” [Marxism and the Theoretical Construction of Globalization]. In *Makesizhuyi yu xianshi* [Marxism and Reality] 1 (2003): 85–91.

- . “Comparative Literature and Globalism: A Chinese Cultural and Literary Strategy.” *Comparative Literature Studies* 41.4 (2004): 584–602.
- . “Toward ‘Glocalized’ Orientations: Current Literary and Cultural Studies in China.” *Neohelicon* 34.2 (2007): 35–48.
- Zhang Kuan. “Wang Ning: ling shicha duihua” [An interview with Wang Ning]. *Shenghuo* [Life] 9 (2008): 12–17.