

MARKETING AND MANAGING THE OTHER

Dorothy Figueira

University of Georgia, Athens

179

In the age of unmasking essentialisms, theory has become the greatest of master narratives. Dissident voices have charted the politics and projects of theory. As the recent volume, *Theory's Empire* (2005), by Daphne Patai and Will H. Corral has shown, the critique of theory's ideological postures and its displacement of literature has a long pedigree and sustained argument. In the following discussion, I will focus on recent trends in the study of alterity. I will begin by discussing the various theories of the Other that have developed in American academe. I will then examine the pedagogies that have put these theories of alterity into practice. I will question how models of assimilation engendered by these theories and pedagogies reflect racial issues in the American context. I will also investigate how literary criticism has colonized the study of alterity, a field that has been traditionally treated by the social sciences, without the introspection that social scientists have brought to their constructions of the Other. In conclusion, I will touch upon the institutional advantages of this appropriation.

The institutionalization of multiculturalism in the United States is a bureaucratic structure purporting to foster minority rights. An outgrowth of the movement in the 80's on American campuses to revamp the canon, multiculturalism claims to open the canon up to subalterns, exiles, and others. Its call to reinvision the world from a decolonizing and anti-racist perspective has triggered reactions on both the Right and the Left. On the Right, multiculturalism is seen as an attack on Euro-American culture. On the Left, it represents not an assault on Euro-Americans, but on Eurocentrism, the discourse that "embeds, takes for granted and normalizes... the hierarchical power relations generated by colonialism and imperialism" (Shohat and Stam 7). One of multiculturalism's underlying assumptions is that people can

only comprehend people like themselves, rather than translate difference (Gitlin 208-09). Or, as a Stanford University student put it, when asked during that university's debates over canon revision about studying important non-Western trends such as Japanese capitalism or Islamic fundamentalism: "Who gives a damn about those things? I want to study myself" (San Juan 1995, 230-01). The sad truth is that some multiculturalists, although they view themselves as "border-crossers" (Giroux 23) and cultural workers (Giroux 21), define alterity in very self-referential terms.

180 Multiculturalism seeks to include representatives of traditionally neglected groups and offer an alibi for liberal reform that may not, in fact, exist. In this effort, the educational system has manifestly entered the important promotional work of encouraging tolerance, pluralism, and diversity as rearguard damage control (Cruz 32). Under this format, multiculturalism serves as an institution's strategic response to a perceived deterioration of progressive policies, Civil Rights gains, and demographic change. Toward the same goal of teaching tolerance, institutional offices of diversity, workshops at teachers' conventions, publisher's marketing sessions, and curricula in primary and secondary schools throughout America now all target "cultural diversity" and multicultural literacy as prime directives.

Multiculturalism presupposes two basic ideas. First, it recognizes that U.S. history is not solely reflected in the activities of one race (white), one language group (English), one ethnicity (Anglo-Saxon) or one religion (Christianity). It quite correctly claims that African-Americans, Latinos, Asian-Americans, Native Americans and others have made central contributions to American culture. It also suggests that beneath the differences among Americans there are some underlying principles and values that bring them together, such as notions of equality, democratic government, individual liberty, etc. (San Juan 1995, 230). The assumption behind multiculturalism is that, given the ethnic plurality in American society, universities must "create an environment which will uphold, promote and instill multicultural values" premised on the notion that knowledge and information will presumably lead to a more enlightened, tolerant and, therefore, more democratically representative society (San Juan 1995, 224). However, such a theory of diversity presupposes and requires the notion of a common Americanism, a final transcendent and self-reproducing essence that binds all Americans together. It requires a national character that guarantees the individual's right to differ (San Juan 1995, 225). This view of multiculturalism celebrates the competing claims of an assimilationist "common culture" and fulfills the desire for a free-wheeling social order founded on the principle of unity in multiplicity (San Juan 1995, 223). This rendering of multiculturalism as spectacle revisions the image of America as a melting pot into America as a salad. America as a multicultural salad is now not only colorful and beautiful, but capable of being consumed. This transformation begs the question: "Who is the consumer?" (Davis 45).

Stanley Fish has identified two forms of multiculturalism operating in American academe today: what he has termed the boutique as opposed to the strong version. Boutique multiculturalism establishes a superficial relationship, wherein students

are encouraged to admire and recognize the legitimacy of traditions other than their own. They stop short of approving other cultures when some value at their core generates an act that offends the canons of civilized decency as they have been either declared or assumed. In other words, boutique multiculturalism embraces difference up to the point precisely when it matters most to committed members (Fish 378-79). Strong multiculturalism, in contrast, claims to accord a deep respect to all cultures at their core. Each has the right to form its own identity and nourish its own sense of what is rational and humane (Fish 389). For strong multiculturalists, the first principle is not rationality or some other supracultural universal, but tolerance. Strong multiculturalism works to the point where a culture whose core values you are tolerating reveals itself to be intolerant. At this juncture, you can either stretch your toleration to expand to their intolerance or condemn their core intolerance and therefore no longer accord it respect. The strong multiculturalist usually opts for the latter choice in the name of the suprauniversal. In short, strong multiculturalism reveals itself to be not very strong after all. Essentially, it is not very distinct from boutique multiculturalism,¹ just a deeper instance of what boutique multiculturalism presents in a shallow form (Fish 383). Fish does not see either form as able to come to terms with difference, although their inabilities are asymmetrical. **181**

The philosophy and ethics of multiculturalism were first brought to prominence by Charles Taylor (Taylor 1992) and discussed subsequently by other scholars (Taylor 1992, 1994). Fish's above-cited article was a response to this debate and his concepts of boutique multiculturalism were patterned after these arguments. One side of the debate was presented by Steven C. Rockefeller who posited our identity within the universal as primary and more fundamental than any particular identity such as citizenship, gender, race, or ethnicity (88). The universal will win out over the individual because the individual is the foundation of recognition of equal value and the related idea of equal rights. Individual choice cannot be pursued to the point where it interferes with, prescribes, or proscribes the choices of others. Rockefeller's concept promotes a politics of equal dignity in which the local is subordinated to a universal value of free rational choice. Under a politics of equal dignity, shared potential is protected by law and particular forms of its realization (tradition, religion, ethnic allegiances) succeed or fail in the market-place "give and take" (Fish 381).

In opposition to Rockefeller's thesis, Charles Taylor promotes a politics of difference (Taylor 1992, 38), where the preferred value that is protected and fostered is the unique distinctiveness of the particular (Taylor 43). Taylor's multiculturalism is, essentially, the pedagogical praxis of a politics of recognition. Fish describes Taylor's politics of difference as nothing but strong multiculturalism (Fish 382). Boutique multiculturalism is akin to Rockefeller's recognition of equal dignity. It views the core values of cultures as overlays on a substratum of essential humanity and thus tolerates them without taking them seriously or seeing them as truly core (Fish 379). It honors diversity superficially with a deeper loyalty paid to universal potential.

Fish claims that neither boutique nor strong multiculturalism comes to terms with difference (Fish 385). Boutique does not take it seriously; we are all essentially alike. Strong multiculturalism takes difference seriously as a general principle but cannot take seriously any particular difference that refuses to be generous in its own turn; it cannot allow their imperatives full realization in political programs since it would inevitably lead to the suppression of difference (Fish 386). Boutique multiculturalism views difference in terms of matters of lifestyle. It honors diversity in its most superficial aspects, with a deeper loyalty given to some notion of its universal potential. In these competing notions of recognition, Fish questions where respect for the Other actually resides, in tolerating difference (and, thereby, “disrespecting” it) or in taking it seriously enough to oppose it (Fish 388). Jürgen Habermas and Amy Gutmann, in their contributions to the multicultural debate, bypass this dilemma by presenting what Fish terms a vision of the world as a philosophy seminar where differences between rational persons can be talked through (Habermas 133). Fish opines that

182 you do not respond to evil with tolerance, assuming that its energies will dissipate in the face of scorn; you respond to it by stamping it out (Fish 392). Fish concludes that multiculturalism is ultimately an incoherent concept (Fish 388). It points to a disjunction of intellectual and institutional practices from operations of corporate business structure. Other critics are equally dismissive in their assessments. Noam Chomsky has dismissed multiculturalism as a form of fetishized knowledge. Russell Jacoby noted that multiculturalism flourishes as a programme while it weakens as a reality (Jacoby 124). Wahneema Lubiano condemned it as an empty abstraction used by administrators to take the political heat off their institutions for their failure to diversify (Lubiano 68). Under multicultural initiatives, students are still held to Euro-American values for education and life success (Guerrero 61). Studying the Other in multiculturalism’s thoroughly appropriated and diluted fashion ensures that the continued domination of Eurocentric knowledge remains unchallenged.

Slavoj Žižek has characterized multiculturalism as an experience of the Other deprived of its Otherness. The idealized Other of multiculturalism dances fascinating dances and has an ecologically sound holistic approach to reality, while practices like wife-beating remain out of sight (Žižek 11). In other words, multiculturalism appears to many as nothing more than a subterfuge for business as usual. One can offer a selection of ethnic or racially specific courses without addressing the ways in which the focus of what we understand as Western culture is itself incomplete and distorted (Lubiano 68). American Indian Studies, for example, can be brought onto campuses as a “polite pseudo-intellectual vehicle to provide the appearance of ethnic diversity.” Native American cultural production thus provides validation to supposed insights and conclusions of Euro-American academia, rather than any Native American tradition of scholarship offering an alternative to Eurocentrism and its institutions (Guerrero 56)

The key problem here is that identity is not simply a matter of positionality nor is the multicultural ideology a way to recuperate sensibilities disintegrated by society

and the labor market (San Juan 1992, 4). The real concern is not just the texts that transmit the heritage of the humanities in order to preserve standards and promote excellence, but rather, “Who consumes the tasty salad?” In more concrete and less flavorful terms, we can formulate the situation as follows: Who defines the standards of excellence and whose interests are at stake? Who should articulate the purpose and meaning of a humanities education and how? The multicultural battles at Stanford University over the revision of the canon met with considerable resistance from factions decrying the replacement of the classics from the Western tradition with lesser valued works from minority literatures. However, part of the resistance also stemmed from what was seen as the cooptative strategy behind such canon revision. Did not the process of liberalizing the canon by simple addition of non-Western texts denote tokenization and exhibit a patronizing tolerance (Pratt qtd in San Juan 1995, 231)? If non-white materials are perceived as “add-ons” to white structures, they never address the centrality and dominance of the latter (Gordon and Newfield 87). Ultimately, difference should make a difference (Davis 48).

183

The simple fact is that not only conservative think tanks and champions of the Western canon criticized the institutionalization of multiculturalism. Minority critics and students made their voices heard. At the University of Texas, Chicano students expressed their uneasiness regarding multiculturalism. They viewed it as a bland, catch-all phrase connected with diversified reading lists or required courses on non-Western cultures. They perceived it as a means of thwarting a head-on confrontation that should take place over institutional racism (San Juan 1995, 224). Their perception had a good deal of validity. As an imposition of some norm of tolerance, multiculturalism is inherently a form of control (Essed 210). Satisfied with bracketing the Other, multiculturalism glosses over pressing problems of a political, legal, and economic nature.

In reality, multiculturalism only offers the illusion of victory over racism. It does not dignify anyone, as some have charged, because it does not address the issue of who has the power to determine what courses are taught, what requirements are established (San Juan 1995, 224–25), and who gets hired. It does, however, beg the question: who really benefits from the identity industry? This is a central question that should be addressed. At this juncture, however, one can safely claim that, contrary to its inflated aspirations, multiculturalism does not guarantee equality of opportunity or access to resources for the disenfranchised. Multiculturalism does not liberate anyone. It is more interested in managing the Other within the American continuum than analyzing non-Western reality. In fact, the case can even be made that multiculturalism provides a smokescreen for societal and institutional unwillingness to change the academic situation of minorities.

It would be one thing if multiculturalism were just a faulty theoretical paradigm and subject of recondite academic debates. The problem, however, is its widespread implementation. In practice, the Third World is studied in many American universities solely under the umbrella of multiculturalism. It becomes what has been

designated by that rather vague moniker of “postcolonial literature.”² The reasoning behind this packaging of alterity is obvious: multiculturalism and postcolonialism are easy. They do not involve really learning about another culture or demand mastery of another language. In multiculturalism and postcolonialism, all groups preserve their own heritage as long as they speak English (Prashad 112). Multiculturalism and postcolonialism thus feed American monolingual arrogance and cultural isolationism. In the Internet age, when the globalization of English has contributed to diminishing the need to learn other languages, the Other can, thanks to multiculturalism and postcolonialism, be consumed “on the cheap.” Moreover, the celebration of pseudo-diversity found in these pedagogies in no way compromises American tendencies to cultural provincialism, triumphalism, or indifference to the world. Like those popular ethnic fairs one finds in the States, multiculturalism and postcolonialism allow students to taste other cultures without digesting them.³ Quite often, the resounding global education that these pedagogies ultimately offer a literature student can consist of nothing more than snippets from Arundhati Roy, Toni Morrison, or Maxine Hong Kingston (Talbot). In a multicultural or postcolonial literature classroom, there is the presumption that one can grasp the world by reading selections from representative women of color writing in the English language.

184

As a result, there is no real incentive within these pedagogies to respect “other” intellectual histories or genealogies. With multiculturalism, there is little desire to contextualize the ethnic experience or broaden its significance by drawing any association to a source culture that might extend knowledge beyond the theoretical master narrative. In this regard, Ann du Cille has voiced her distrust for the new-found interest that multiculturalist studies exhibits for African-American women (du Cille qtd in Rapaport 2). She notes that while multiculturalism appears to honor the field of black feminist studies, it actually demeans the work by treating it not as a discipline with a history and body of scholarship. Du Cille’s complaint regarding African-American Studies speaks to another problem: its appropriation of the Other and its selectively ignorant exploration that ensures a general failure of engagement. Such deficiencies ultimately reveal the hubris of those who presume to speak for and hence co-opt the Other.

The political advantages of these pedagogies bear mentioning. While students may learn little regarding the languages, literatures, histories, or philosophies of other cultures, university administrators and faculty can pretend that they all have somehow confronted alterity. If you add texts to the curriculum marked by “otherness,” then you have provided a non-threatening element of diversity, without having to engage *real* diversity. Multiculturalism and postcolonialism as practiced in universities and colleges in the United States today feed institutional and individual desires for engagement without actual effective engagement. As a corollary, they foster the pretense that academic criticism functions as a political act and support the myth, common to most poststructuralist theory, that textual culture can replace activist culture. A discourse of freedom, individuality, and tolerance sustains cultural igno-

rance (Srivastava 16), while the critic aspires to appear relevant on a global level. In this process, the real world and the variety of its literatures are eclipsed by the larger professional hegemonic project.

Some Americans of color have learned to deconstruct such strategies of personal and professional development. There are those who recognize that fragmentary and a-contextual representations of ethnic identity are promoted by an intellectual and administrative mainstream out of a deep cynicism regarding the Other as a fossilized object of clinical experimentation. Indeed, multiculturalism has been condemned as a patently deceptive and self-serving upper-class democratization (Fox-Genovese 142), providing a situation governed by a seemingly inclusionary logic of pluralism that only preserves the status quo (Okada 198). It has also been recognized as fostering a discredited form of scholarship and canon formation. Nevertheless, the field of literary studies and its institutional backers have embraced the ethnicity paradigm by promoting the teaching of the multi-ethnic literatures of the United States. The political benefits are just too great. Multiculturalists can attempt to grasp the transhistorical similarities of what is perceived as American culture *and* engage in the essentialism of basing their vision of American culture on an overly apologetic and reactionary ethnicity paradigm. Werner Sollors, the white senior African-Americanist in a pre-Gates Harvard, subscribed to this universalist interpretation in which race is presented as merely one aspect of ethnicity. One attains status through achievement and identity by descent with the ensuing free play of polarities.⁴ For many humanists today, race is merely a metaphor.

There is a significant problem with such visions of race: They support inferential racism. A series of racist premises, propositions, and a set of unquestioned assumptions enter into the construction of the ethnicist model and its neutralized representation of events and situations. Such assumptions allow racist statements to be formulated without any awareness of the racist predicates upon which they are grounded. Epifanio San Juan has discovered, perhaps, the most spectacular example of multiculturalism as it is anthologized and taught in the American classroom. He cites the case of *American Literature*, the ninth volume of *The New Pelican Guide to English Literature*. The chapter in this volume dedicated to American Indian literary production is extraordinary. It is filled with quotes ranging from Pound, Ginsburg, Whitman, Rimbaud, Cassirer, Breton, and Rabelais. Native American writers are named only at the end of the chapter (Ford). No specific reference is made to genocide and the continued disposition of American Indians (San Juan 1991, 223). Essentially, what we have in this volume is an exemplar of the very process I have been discussing—the pretense of inclusion that cloaks continued exclusion. In fact, this volume offers something even worse than the customary exclusion of an earlier age. It presents a type of dumbed-down ethnicity-oriented scholarship that pretends to take seriously underrepresented cultures, while providing less information regarding them than when they were largely excluded from the canon. Such scholarship

offers a more subtly constructed hegemonic vision of race, one that has been codified in textbook and anthology form as a valid pedagogic approach.

From a marketing standpoint, it is not only the fragmentary and irresponsibly incomplete representation of minority populations within syllabi that is necessary, but the presence of minority faculty is also important. However, their inclusion into the teaching ranks is often less significant than their presence “doing minority things.” A black female junior faculty member who wrote her dissertation on Lully is not permitted to teach French Baroque opera, but “encouraged” to teach Scott Joplin. Some minority faculty have been known to get uppity, expecting to teach courses in fields where they have trained. This, too, has been managed. If an institution can fill its quotas with minority multiculturalists, it need not recruit minorities in under-represented (i.e., traditional) fields. One need only make the minimal effort to pass muster as an institution valuing diversity. It is of primary importance that the people of color be given jobs in fields that deal with minority issues because the minority hire exists to showcase not only the institution’s commitment to hire people of color, but also its commitment to minority programs. Behind the dual role imposed on minority hires (to be a person of color and “do the minority thing”), there is the deep cynicism of institutions regarding the minority instructor’s ability to perform in traditional disciplines where they cannot rely on ethnicity-specific intuitive knowledge. Pedagogies of alterity allow universities to balkanize minority professionals under the guise of inclusion and supplant ethnic minorities whose fields of expertise do not reflect and publicize their ethnicity. In some instances, the institutionalization of identity studies enables universities to showcase their commitment to minority studies without even having to promote minority hiring.

186

If one cannot be a minority in American universities today, one must find a way to identify with a minority situation. This strategy is dictated less by genuine curiosity than the fact that universities are motivated by marketing concerns. Marketing in this context is twofold. First, there is marketing to and through university administrators and deans who buy into the idea that alterity initiatives are the most advanced and “logical” approach to the Third World and the miasma of competing national ethnicities. Multiculturalism, for example, has clearly degenerated into the diversity of college catalogues, state- or corporate-managed United Colors of Benetton pluralism (Shohat and Stam 6). It assuages institutional needs to recruit and restructure with supposedly cutting edge responses to new socio-economic realities. Administrators can pad their scorecards with curricular diversity, even if their institutions maintain an abysmal record in real diversity. Second, this context allows individual academics to emerge as luminaries in the theoretical/critical pantheon: they then market themselves as theoretical stars to attract grant money and the university markets them, in turn, as model minorities to attract students and occlude their failure to diversify in any real sense.

Contrary to what multicultural and postcolonial initiatives might suggest, the Other defies packaging, especially by a cadre of cynical professors and administra-

tors seeking the political engagement that they and their institutions never quite achieved in more propitious times. While claiming to offer a viable mechanism for adjustments of power within historically white-dominated societies, these pedagogies serve often nothing more than a cosmetic purpose. Some might pretend that they are workable models for civic tolerance in societies struggling to free themselves from the burden of their white supremacist past (Hutcheon and Richmond). Others may view them as willfully aestheticizing discourses that inadvertently serve to disguise persistent racial tensions. In actuality, however, multiculturalism and postcolonialism merely affect a respect for the other as a reified object of cultural difference. More importantly, they deflect attention away from social issues such as discrimination, unequal access, and hierarchies of ethnic privilege that are far from being resolved (Huggan 126).

Multiculturalism and postcolonialism do not really help those for whom they purport to speak. While affirming the virtues of the margins, they leave the centers of power uncontested (Gitlin 236). They claim to offer the putative end of metanarratives: all kinds of representations and cultures are deemed as valid as others (Lyotard). However, as Rey Chow has noted, they still only offer a one-way street. Some form of white culture is the one recognizing the non-white culture. In order “to be” or “speak out,” the non-white culture must seek the legitimacy and recognition from white culture and use the language of white culture to produce itself (Rizvi 63). Multiculturalism and postcolonialism are really about assimilation with domesticating egalitarian demands attached. They obscure issues of power and privilege. Multiculturalism, in particular, deals with differences by making them tokenistic (Chow 113).

Multiculturalism arose in an attempt to uncover occluded and submerged identities and to liberate the repressed through the dissemination of peoples’ histories. Its project was to redraw the boundaries and affirm the authority of internal colonies. The process became fetishized into a cult of ethnicity that seeks to unmask and repudiate inferential racism. By promoting a showcase tolerance of diverse ethnic practices, multiculturalism and postcolonialism can also be seen a strategy of an academic elite seeking to displace, diffuse, and thus intensify class, gender, and racial contradictions. The case can be made that the culturalist abuse of ethnicity serves to mask hegemonic domination under the pretext of pluralist tolerance (San Juan 1992, 15) or valorize differences to guarantee sameness (San Juan 1995, 237). Class divisions and systemic inequalities remain intact.

In essence, multiculturalism can be viewed as nothing more than a cynical ploy on the part of scholars and institutions to, under the guise of tolerance and inclusion, avoid difference. Like postcolonialism, it is a strategy of cooptation. Personally, I share the scepticism of Fish and Žižek. However, I also see such pedagogies of alterity as posing a real threat to Comparative Literature as a discipline.

Because such pedagogies do not require comparative literature’s linguistic skills or an expert’s familiarity with specific national cultures and histories, they promote

faux-disciplines with little need for theoretical, political, and cultural homework (Srivastava 15). English departments have taken over world literature, teaching it exclusively in translation and using teachers who do not specialize in foreign languages and cultures. In North America, this practice has frequently entered the areas of graduate studies, the writing of theses and dissertations and even published scholarship. The same arrogance that allowed English department-trained and -based scholars to claim theory and the world as their domain, should not permit them now to coopt Comparative Literature. In the past, we comparatists have stood by and watched national literature scholars, cultural critics, and just about anyone who wanted to, self-identify themselves as comparatists. Perhaps, it is time that we reclaim our discipline and we would do well to define our point of view—the study of literature as a social practice—as well as assert our commitment to respect the world’s specificities in time and space which dictate linguistic and cultural competence. As Milan Dimić noted in one of his last lectures, comparatists are not only more apt to avoid conscious and unconscious homogenizing through a dominant perspective, but they also have the proper training and can demonstrate the ability to competently switch cultural and linguistic codes according to the object and the purpose of their study (Dimić). Kwame Anthony Appiah has been known to sing the praises of “rooted cosmopolitanism.” But, I am suspicious even of this formulation. It still smacks of the elitism of the metropolitan center.

188

The reality is that before any identity-based pedagogy can succeed, there needs to occur a decolonization of the other in the United States. Without this decolonization, any theory or pedagogy of alterity serves merely as academic dogma and orthodoxy. As such, it contributes to what one critic has termed “institutionalized apartheid” (Guerrero 50). By presenting the ethnic with accommodationist resolutions, multiculturalism serves as a strategy of containment and cooptation and Euro-American privilege remains intact. In fact, as we saw in the *Pelikan* anthology of Native American literature, the manner in which the other is taught often supports belief in the presumed superiority of Western civilization. Theories and pedagogies of alterity have not allowed raced groups to move beyond the show and tell domestication of late nineteenth-century folklore (Cruz 32). Under multiculturalism and postcolonialism, the other remains an externally imposed exotic caricature transformed into a cultural text.

WORKS CITED

Chomsky, Noam. *Towards a New Cold War: Essays on the Current Crisis and How We Got There*. New York: Pantheon Books, 1982.

- Chow, Rey. "Theory, Area Studies, Cultural Studies: Issues of Pedagogy in Multiculturalism." *Learning Places: The Afterlives of Area Studies*. Eds. Masao Miyoshi and H.D. Harootunian. Durham: Duke UP, 2002. 103-18.
- du Cille, Ann. "The Occult of True Womanhood." *Female Subjects in Black and White: Race, Psychoanalysis, Feminism*. Eds. Elizabeth Abel, Barbara Christian, and Helena Moglen. Berkeley: U of California P, 1997. 21-56.
- Cruz, Jon. "From Farce to Tragedy: Reflections on the Reification of Race at Century's End." Gordon and Newfield. 19-39.
- Davis, Angela Y. 1996. "Gender, Class, Multiculturalism: Rethinking 'Race' Politics." Mapping Multiculturalism. Gordon and Newfield 40-48.
- Dimić, Milan. "Proliferation of Literary Theories and Consequences for Comparative Literature." Unpublished paper presented at the Fiftieth Anniversary Conference of ICLA, 2005.
- Essed, Philomena. *Understanding Everyday Racism: An Interdisciplinary Theory*. Newbury Park: Sage Publications, 1991.
- Figueira, Dorothy. "The Profits of Postcolonialism." *Comparative Literature* 52.3 (2000): 246-54.
- Fish, Stanley. "Boutique Multiculturalism or Why Liberals Are Incapable of Thinking about Hate Speech." *Critical Inquiry* 23 Winter (1997): 378-95.
- Fox-Genovese, Elizabeth. "The Claims of a Common Culture: Gender, Race, Class, and the Canon." *Salmagundi* 72 Fall (1986): 131-43.
- Gates, Henry Louis. "Pluralism and Its Discontents." *Contention: Debates in Society, Culture, and Science*. 2.1 Fall (1992): 69-79.
- Giroux, Henry A. Post-Colonial Ruptures and Democratic Possibilities: Multiculturalism as Anti-Racist Pedagogy." *Cultural Critique* Spring (1992): 5-39.
- Gitlin, Todd. *The Twilight of Common Dreams: Why America is Wracked by Culture Wars*. New York: Metropolitan Books, 1995.
- Gordon, Avery F., and Christopher Newfield. *Mapping Multiculturalism*. Minneapolis: U of Minnesota P, 1996.
- Guerrero, M. Annette Jaimes. "American Indian Studies and Multiculturalism." Mapping Multiculturalism. Gordon and Newfield 49-63.
- Habermas, Juergen. "Struggles for Recognition in the Democratic Constitutional State." *Multiculturalism: Examining the Politics of Recognition*. Ed. Amy Gutmann. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1994. 107-48.
- Huggan, Graham. "Exoticism, Ethnicity, and the Multicultural Fallacy." "New" Exoticism: *Changing Patterns in the Construction of Otherness*. Ed. Isabel Santaolalla. Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2000. 91-96.

Hutcheon, Linda, and Marion Richmond. *Other Solitudes: Canadian Multicultural Fictions*. Toronto: Oxford UP, 1990.

Jacoby, Russell. "The Myth of Multiculturalism." *New Left Review* 208 November-December (1994): 121-26.

Lubiano, Wahneema. "Like Being Mugged by a Metaphor: Multiculturalism and State Narratives." *Gordon and Newfield* 64-75.

Lyotard, Jean François. *La condition postmoderne: rapport sue le savoir*. Paris: Minuit, 1979.

Okada, Richard. H. "Areas, Disciplines and Ethnicity." *Learning Places: The Afterlives of Area Studies*. Eds. Masao Miyoshi and H.D. Harootunian. Durham: Duke UP, 2002. 190-205.

Patai, Daphne, and Will H. Corral, eds. *Theory's Empire: An Anthology of Dissent*. New York: Columbia UP, 2005.

190 Prashad, Vijay. *The Karma of Brown Folk*. Minneapolis: Minnesota P, 2000.

Pratt, Mary Louise. "Humanities for the Future: Reflections on the Western Culture Debate at Stanford." *Falling into Theory: Conflicting Views on Reading Literature*. Ed. David Richter. Boston: St. Martin's P, 1993. 55-63.

Rapaport, Herman. *The Theory Mess: Deconstruction in Eclipse*. New York: Columbia UP, 2001.

Rizvi, Fazal. "The Arts, Education and the Politics of Multiculturalism." *Culture, Difference and the Arts*. Eds. Sneja Gunew and Fazal Rizvi. St. Leonards, Australia: Allen and Unwin, 1994. 54-68.

Rockefeller, Steven, C. 1992. "Comment." *Gutmann* 87-98.

San Juan Jr. E(pifanio). "The Cult of Ethnicity and the Fetish of Pluralism: A Counter Hegemonic Critique." *Cultural Critique* 18 Spring (1991): 215-29.

———. *Racial Formations/Critical Transformation: Articulations of Power in Ethnic and Racial Studies in the United States*. Atlantic Highlands: Humanities P, 1992.

———. *Hegemony and Strategies of Transgression: Essays in Cultural Studies and Comparative Literature*. Albany: State U of New York P, 1995.

Shohat, Ella, and Robert Stam. *Multiculturalism, Postcoloniality, and Transnational Media*. New Brunswick: Rutgers UP, 2003.

Srivastava, Aruna. "Postcolonialism and Its Discontents." *Ariel* 26.1 (1995): 12-17.

Talbot, Margaret. "Other Woes." *New York Times*, Magazine Desk, 18 Nov. 2001.

Taylor, Charles. *Multiculturalism and "The Politics of Recognition": An Essay*. Gutmann 1994.

Žižek, Slavoj. *Welcome to the Desert of the Real!: Five Essays on September 11 and Related Dates*. London and New York: Verso, 2002.

ENDNOTES

- 1 To be a strong multiculturalist, you would have to be really strong and therefore not multiculturalist at all since multiculturalism is predicated on the belief in the distinctiveness of a culture to the point where it expresses itself in the determination to stamp out distinctiveness of some other cultures (Fish 385).
- 2 For a discussion of the definition of postcolonialism, see Figueira 246-47.
- 3 The function of spectacle and consumption with regard to multiculturalism has resonance in the Canadian context, where the initiative is institutionally and governmentally widespread. University multicultural initiatives have been compared to the caravans organized each year under Ontario's federal multicultural policy. Each of the varied "cultures" represented in Ontario has its own float and is paraded through the streets "for the WASPS to gaze upon, for the ... vultures to devour, hence the Quebecois' term 'multivulturalism'" (Davis 45).
- 4 Gates opposes the thesis of cultural equity, the notion that since people are equal under the law, their productions must therefore be considered as representative of those groups and at least of equal value to other groups (71).