Vectors of the Radical: Textual Exchange and Global Political Struggle in the 1960s

Mike Sell

The history, technologies, and discourses of globalization increasingly dominate the journals, debates, and curricula of the humanities and social sciences. A year and some post 9/11, we're surely at the beginning of what promises to be a long-lived trend. The humanities and social sciences are engaging with globalization because so many of their assumptions, categories, and methods are under intense pressure from the diversity and complexity of global history, global culture, and global violence. Some fairly brutal interpersonal and institutional battles in academic departments have occurred over these issues (thankfully, not my own, which is systematically moving toward a global orientation). But there are deeper currents here that go beyond the merely institutional. My own disciplines—in addition to English, performance theory and cultural studies—have been profoundly affected by the four-decade upward spike in communication, migration, entertainment, international trade, military strategy, and cultural exchange, a spike catalyzed by the Marshall Plan to save Europe from Soviet-style Communism. Globalization may indeed have suffered a temporary setback with the recent market crashes of Southeast Asia and South America, the accounting scandals and internet bubble-pop in the U.S., and the collapse of global tourism after the 9/11 hijackings, but surely not for long—military and migratory movement remains robust. This momentary hiatus in some sectors of globalization strikes me as an excellent opportunity to consider how scholars and teachers think about some of the key concerns of our times—specifically, freedom of expression, association, and religion—and their relationship to a global culture at war with itself. In short, if the humanities and social sciences have been shaped by globalization, then it's appropriate—if not downright necessary—that we understand how they've been shaped and how they might be used in turn to shape the forces of globalization.

Works and Days has long been devoted to exploring the ways that technology and the humanities intersect, so globalization is a

perfect subject for its pages. After all, one of the engines of globalization—and the continually changing conceptions of human expression and self-understanding that globalization entails—is technology. Whether we're talking about navigational, cartographical, and keel innovations in Western Europe in the 15th-century or wireless telecommunications right now, technology has always served as a catalyst for the coming-together of dispersed regions, communities, and eco-systems. That said, the technology that I'm calling into question here and the approach to globalization that the contributors and I are taking might strike regular readers as a bit off the path to the extent that the technology discussed by the contributors to this volume is so old and familiar—so cozy—that many of us hardly think of it as technology at all. But as will become clear, the historical period and technology in question are all too relevant to an era of virtual communities, e-texts, pandemics, and the War on Terror. We live in an era when more and more things, people, language, and ideas are moving across borders—national, cultural, and environmental borders being the most significant—than ever before. Oil, guns, pop music, brand-name knock-offs, cheap labor, and soldiers are the commodities *du jour*. Obviously, we live in an era when the necessity of acting against local injustice while judging and conceptualizing that action in a global context is of crucial significance, particularly for teachers and learners.

So why look back forty years to try to make sense of these kinds of issues, and why look at the material history of things like comic books, performance styles, manifestos, symposia, and scripts? Readers might object that the global crisis of the 1960s is only one chapter in a history of globalization that extends centuries into the past, one chapter among many in the long, variegated history of transnational and transregional exchange. Globalization—its meaning, its significance, its practical impact on socio-economic and geopolitical structures, its occasional reordering of cultural assumptions, its impact on literary and performance form—has long been a global concern. Think of the Opium War between Great Britain and China; the great modernist art and literature movements of the mid-20th century; the arguments and finance schemes surrounding the construction of the transatlantic telegraph line, the Panama Canal, and transcontinental railroads; the spice, tobacco, banana, and coffee trades; the non-alignment movement of the late-20th century, which saw the affiliation of Asian, African, and later, Latin American nations in an effort to move outside the strategic aims of the U.S. and U.S.S.R.; the murkily lit chocolate clubs of the American east coast during its revolutionary period; the close cooperation of military and civilian organizations during the early development and launching of satellite communication systems; the intertwining of culture and epidemiology in the AIDS pandemic and responses to it; the triangle trade of slaves, rum, and trade goods that dominated the Western hemisphere for two centuries; the development of organizations like the United Nations, the World Trade Organization, International Monetary Fund, and other, oppositional organizations such as Amnesty International

and Greenpeace; pan-indigenous resistance and Green theory; the mathematics revolution that closed out the European Dark Ages; and so on. In all these moments, questions of politics and culture, of border conditions and community responses to the challenging (if not the complete destruction) of those border conditions have figured prominently. Even viewed against this long, heterogeneous background, the 60s stand out as a remarkable, singular moment in this history (as singular as all the others, one might say, but in a distinct way). During the 60s, the idea of globalization began to break free from the historical mire into which both state-managed capitalism and bureaucratic communism had wandered (the mire called the "Cold War") and entered a new phase, one that saw the conceptualization of new forms of freedom (which were, Michel Foucault tells us, new forms of power) and the rise of right-wing, fundamentalist governments to contain and divert that kind of innovative thinking and practice. A phase that also saw new modes of global community appear

Key to this new community was the text—text, written, edited, and printed across a highly diffuse textual distribution and translation network. Whether clandestine, state-sponsored, entrepreneurial, or community-owned, the first half of the Cold War saw printing presses, text workers such as editors and translators, and the textualized body (the holder of theory, the performer, the witness) challenge the status quo in all kinds of economic and cultural situations. The causes of this increase in textual production and circulation were varied: the wider availability of cheap (though still expensive compared to today) and easy-to-operate duplication devices such as the mimeograph and gestetner, the increasing number of professional translators, the critical mass achieved by the avant-garde as it became a part of liberal-arts and art-school curricula, Cold-War-funded cultural exchanges between nations, the rise of international symposia devoted to the performing and visual arts, the international paths of journalists, the increase in funding for visiting research and teaching assignments, rapidly deflating travel costs, and radio and television. As a result, concepts, experiences, theory, practices, and embodied experiences were passed across national, ethnic, and ideological boundaries, transforming global culture both quantitatively and qualitatively.

Thus, the globalization of cultural, political, and aesthetic radicalism in the 1960s can't be understood without careful consideration of the production, circulation, and translation of texts across boundaries of all sorts. The implication is that, at a certain level, all of the essays in this volume are materialist in orientation. The *printed word* and the *embodied word* are the key terms here. Both were crucial to the conception and growth of politically and culturally radical, internationally focused groups that attempted to control, strengthen, or destabilize the forces of globalism. What is meant by "text" here, though, is something more concrete than is usual among those who study texts, literary or otherwise. Though these writers don't call into question (nor necessarily engage with) the basic premise of the "textual turn" in the humanities and social

sciences inaugurated by Friedrich Nietzsche, Ferdinand de Saussure, Jacques Lacan, and Claude Lévi-Strauss, the notion of text that's most common here is more thing-like than what we'd normally assume, as much an object as a cultural paradigm or Foucauldian episteme. It would be absurd to ignore the role of television, radio, and telephone during the 60s—not to mention groups that exploited these media such as Yippie! or the National Liberation Front of North Vietnam—but the fact remains that for virtually all radical left- and right-wing political groups and administrative bodies prior to the advent of the world wide web, the written and embodied texts were the cheapest, most portable, most reliable, and best concealed media available for widespread and informationally dense communication.

The materialized word has long played an important role in the dissemination of ideas and the creation of self-identified global communities. Think, for example, of Paul's letters to distant missionary outposts in Corinth and Epheseus. The early Christian church was essentially a network of letter writers. The consequences of this textual matrix was, fourteen centuries and thousands of miles distant, an upsurge in syncretic religions across the Gulf of Mexico and the Southeast Atlantic. The 1500s also witnessed the development of new forms of embodied text; specifically, the memorial and performance texts carried by slaves and indigenous peoples after the conquest of the book-burning, literate, Catholic and Protestant colonists. The embodied text hybridized with the printed text to ensure survival (e.g., the Quiché Mayan *Popol Vuh*). The key works of the European enlightenment, as another example of texts that were exchanged in both printed and embodied form, passed across an astonishingly convoluted matrix of exchanges. Texts like *The Rights of Man* were transported by print and mouth from the southeastern seaboard of the post-Revolutionary USA and the mercantile ports of France to the cane fields and gold mines of the Caribbean and Central and South America. Such texts were acquired by radical Christian missionaries who passed them in turn to slaves and freemen who, translating the texts into oral form (and, as a consequence, customizing them for the needs of their communication situation), generated very quickly a revolutionary movement that reached its peak in the Haitian revolution of 1791-1804. This only begins to map the territory and borders across which the discourses of Enlightenment traveled. Haiti was a constant source of unease for the slaveholding states of the U.S.; the crackdown on the American slave community following Haiti contributed to the meltdown of the Southern agrarian system and forced a constitutional decision on the slave question. In effect, the exchange of texts across what Paul Gilroy calls "the Black Atlantic" resulted in a wider and more progressive reading of the very texts that spurred the French and U.S. revolutions in the first place. This exchange also initiated an ongoing debate concerning exactly how significant a role European texts played in pan-African revolutionary movements relative to African religious, political, and ethical traditions—and vice versa.

How much translation actually occurred?

The roadmap gets more and more tangled as we trace these vectors, producing unexpected spatial and temporal continuities that are a bit overwhelming to contemplate, let alone narrate. In addition to the better-known exchanges, feedback cycles, and debates that circulated around the Atlantic, we can find other vectors that impacted the development of revolutionary republicanism in Europe and the Americas. It's often forgotten that, in addition to the atheistic humanism of Voltaire and Rousseau, revolutionary republicanism was influenced, if in less pronounced fashion, by the legal and administrative codes of the Iriquois league of nations and Confucian meritocracy, the latter brought in with the cups, saucers, and dishes of Chinese artisans. Classical Greek philosophy, another signal influence on the revolutionary republicans, was itself an object crisscrossed by transport and translation since its recovery from Moorish libraries in the pre-dawn hours of the Enlightenment. Moreover, it has been convincingly argued that Greek thought was itself a hybrid of Asian and African traditions.

Acknowledging this dense matrix of exchanges and translations sheds new light on our own times, particularly the current, highly volatile, and for the moment generally ignored polarities of wealth and power in the western hemisphere. The event of revolutionary Latin America that was initiated by textual exchanges among slaves and missionaries in San Domingo and Haiti and conditioned by exchanges among the Mediterranean, North and West Africa, Asia, and North America for the previous five centuries was still unfolding a century and a half later with the founding of the Organization of American States in 1948, the overthrow of the Jacobo Arbenz Guzmán regime in Guatemala by the C.I.A. and the United Fruit Company in '54, the Cuban revolution of 1958, and the disastrous Bay of Pigs invasion three years later. When we speak of vectors of the radical, we speak of it against the background of a five-hundred-year history of textual exchange, a process that accelerated during the Cold War as ideological, national, and cultural communities attempted to outmaneuver or affiliate with one another, intensifying the production of highly reticulated spatial and temporal networks.

The flow of text—of novels, pamphlets, ritualized gestures, ways of speaking, plays, poems, memoirs, comic books, catchphrases—has proven to persistently trouble the flows of power, whether in the form of economic constraints on publishing and sales, official censorship, the detention of writers, the control of textual literacies, or in the form of community-owned copy machines, tutoring, self-education, informal book lending services, study circles, and the like. Such paths serve as a kind of ideological infrastructure for transnational, cross-regional, pan-ideological political movements and the various cultural performances that revise and reiterate the credos of such movements.

The printed page remains a vital technology for those who wish to subvert authority and for those who hope to maintain it. The internet, the emblem of the post-print era, is many things to many

people, but it is primarily a cheaper, faster way to transport text. Certainly, the authorities and other watchdog organizations are aware of this. Police, watchdog, intelligence, and military organizations carefully monitor textual content on the internet. What is perhaps most intriguing when we begin to compare the role of text in political movements during the pre- and post-internet eras is that there is little difference between them. Radical movements in both eras are profoundly empowered by the ready availability of ideological tracts, historical documentation, propaganda, and organizational theory—it just happens that one era relied on paper and ink, another on pixels and byte-rates. Just as surely, the traces left by writers, middlemen, and readers from both eras (on bookshelves and hard drives) often give authorities vital clues to map the nature and extent of the movements that oppose them.

The results of such mapping are inevitably imprecise—innocents are inevitably caught in the dragnet, their lives damaged or destroyed. The need to stop tolerating government restraint on travel, trade, and association appears all the more important in this regard, despite the violence of radical organizations and their threat to global community and justice. Mark Kramer describes how "East German authorities prohibited the sale of certain Czechoslovak publications in the GDR [during 1968], ceased issuing visas for tourists wishing to travel to Czechoslovakia, curtailed scientific and cultural exchanges, and imposed restrictions on broadcasts from Czechoslovakia," steps similar to those taken in Poland around the same time (128-29). These initiatives were the result of a purported connection among travelers, theories, and texts, a recognition—in short, that all were a form of "contagion." In this case, the contagions were read as purely ideological.

Less subtle readings occurred that remind me of Lee Edelman's argument that the recognition of sexual deviance is essentially metonymic in nature (taking a part for the whole), but ultimately transformed into a metaphoric assignment of essential identity. The authorities in the 60s did not necessarily orient deviance around sexuality, though such readings weren't rare (in some ways, virtually all members of the counterculture were regarded as feminine by the authorities, as is clear when we consider such popular insults as "pinko" and "longhair"). David Foster's essay on translation and transculturation in Buenos Aires suggests clear connections between efforts to police national boundaries and efforts to police sexual boundaries. Non-native texts and non-heterosexuals were both viewed as threatening to patriarchial, totalitarian political systems.

Xenophobia is more often the case; G.D. White thoroughly documents how the failure of British authorities to think beyond the dusty alien subversion model resulted in both unrestrained development of new social and political praxis on the part of the rebels, and cartloads of good excuses for the police to impound foreign texts and monitor and arrest non-Brits. In Poland, the spread of globalizing "contagions" in 1968 was policed through, in Tariq Ali's and Susan Watkins's words, "pandering to ancient preju-

dices": "In a country where the bulk of the Jews were destroyed in the Holocaust and some killed by good Catholics when they returned to their homes, the Polish Communist Party play[ed] the race card" and accused demonstration organizers of collaboration with "Zionist" elements (60). A similar strategy occurred in Mexico where the *granderos*, the infamous Mexican riot police, systematically identified foreign agitators as the cause of student uprisings. Were it not for the atrocious, still unprosecuted, and unmemorialized violence it enabled, such identification would be worth laughing over; as Ali and Watkins note, "Mexicans with foreign surnames featured prominently on the lists of 'principle agitators' and the police go so far as to record Mexican names like Emilio, Antonio, and Maria Antoieta, as Émile, Antoine and Marie Antoinette, with duly Frenchified last names" (165).

Given increasingly troubling privacy issues on the internet, particularly concerning groups viewed as a threat to capitalist interests, I suspect that the printed page will enjoy a renaissance among the various anti-establishment political groups, including fanatic organizations like Al Qaeda and the various neo-fascist groupuscules that pepper Europe and North America. The kind of fuzzy logic that links together groups working for global justice with that kind of patent idiocy is nothing new. When law-and-order regimes around the world cracked down on intellectual and cultural radicalism during the early 1970s, radicals who sought shelter in academic institutions, who could leave their home countries, or who were willing to embrace more flexible ideological stances and strategies were the ones who weathered best. The ideas that survived were those committed to text, to structured forms of memory such as community orature, or to the performing body.

Edelman's work offers a number of interesting parallels to the way texts become, well, textualized as a consequence of crackdown, fad, and subcultural formation. Texts aren't just bundles of signs arranged in linear form; they are themselves signs—metonyms, metaphors. Writing apropos of gay visibility politics and the ethics of outing (the practice of forcibly revealing the sexuality of those passing as straight), he states, "Just as outing works to make visible a dimension of social reality effectively occluded by the assumptions of a heterosexist ideology, so that ideology, throughout the twentieth century, has insisted on the necessity of 'reading' the body as a signifier of sexual orientation" (732). Edelman captures the dual edge of the material dimension of global radicalism that we're exploring here, what he calls a "double operation." Text—and Edelman sees homosexuality as fundamentally textual, a structure of significance based on structured, reproducible relationships of similarity and difference—is a *diacritical* marking that enables both the global spread of various kinds of codes as well as the control of the media that carry those codes, especially individuals. Text is one of the "vast arrays of signifiers" that can be read as evidence of subversive identity and intent. The text can itself be textualized; it can be read metonymically (a noteworthy element within a larger picture) and metaphorically (as an

emblem of an identity).

This dual role—as both medium for communication and signifier of affiliation—is in part due to the flexible sturdiness of text, its ability to survive its original contexts and communities. Anarchism is an especially intriguing example of the way texts and textual trade routes can function as fairly stable ideological infrastructures, especially in the absence of formal organization or secure territory. There has been precious little institutional coherency to the anarchist movement at any of its historical peaks. This lack of coherency was revealed (and reinforced) after the 1892 bombing of Paris's Café Terminus. After that, French police and legislators initiated a massive crackdown on the anarchist "conspiracy" (arresting more than 300, successfully prosecuting only a handful). This lack of coherency was also shown in Russia after the rebellions at Gulyai-Polyé in 1918 and Kronstadt in 1921 were crushed by the Bolsheviks; and in Spain following the withering away of the agricultural collectives shortly after 1936 when the governmental wing of the movement was lured into military struggle a year later (see Guérin 98-104 and 114-43). How did anarchism survive this horrific sequence of events only to flower again during the 1960s and 70s in calls for worker self-management and then again in the 90s in Seattle and other sites of the World Trade Organization's annual meeting? Calling anarchism a "living tradition" only makes sense if we trace its vitality as a living *textual* tradition, a tradition lacking party, headquarters, and popular support, but enjoying a lean but hardy life at the level of the page and the body—in new editions published by small, fly-by-night firms; in actor training programs; old editions mimeographed for college courses; in turns of phrase; excerpts translated; paperbacks stuffed in purses; musty copies fading in used-book-store windows; a secret sign; a special issue of *Works and Days*.[1]

The 60s is increasingly *textual*, and scholarship on the 60s is carried out more in back stacks, used bookstores, and inherited ways of speaking than through action or human interaction.[2] Oddly, as the 60s fall farther and farther back—becoming more textual as memoirs are written and participants die or lapse into forgetfulness—its global dimensions become more clear. So do its historical continuities. If the printed word served as a material support for synchronic, global continuity in the 60s, it was also a support for diachronic, historical relationships, too—but rarely do such relationships come without careful, critical interrogation. Even an absurdly incomplete list of texts and writers widely exchanged in the 1960s suggests how vital and diverse global radicalism as a textual phenomenon was and how far into the past the texts gazed and how persistent (if embattled) the textual legacies are in our own time. The written texts of Jean-Paul Sartre, Frantz Fanon, Jean Genet, Che Guevara, Simone de Beauvoir, Arthur Miller, Patrice Lumumba, Guy Debord, Malcolm X, Ho Chi Minh—all enjoyed broad circulation in printed form by 1968, and all looked back into the radical past. The embodied texts of Antonin Artaud, Merce Cunningham, Anna Halprin, Vsevelod Meyerhold, Konstantin

Stanislavski, Fluxus, and other performative modes were also widely circulated, and they too looked far back into the past to such traditions as commedia dell'arte, clowning, and commonplace activity.

That said, it would be absurd to see the circulation of objects as clear evidence of global coalition and community. To do so would be to fall into fetishism; that is to say, into mistaking things for deep, considered, coherently democratic social relations. But the things remain and get our attention, thanks to publishing firms like Grove Press in the U.S., the U.K.'s Blackwells, Sur of Argentina, De of Turkey, and the state publishing apparati of China, the Soviet Union, and Cuba, all of which specialized in the acquisition, translation, and dissemination of foreign texts. Theoretical texts served as especially strong global linkages—and potential blocks for critical assessment of those linkages. For examples, we could look at the *foco* theory developed by Cuban revolutionaries, codified by Regis Debray, and rapidly disseminated by military advisors, underground presses, left-leaning publishing houses, and national security forces; or the writings of Mao, which became a kind of *lingua franca* for both the New Left and the Tricontinental movement inaugurated in Havana in 1966; or academic discourses such as Structuralism and Sociology, which found their way to virtually all centers of higher learning, often playing a significant part in local unrest as students, professors, and administrators battled over their legitimacy. Just as strong were the critical methodologies and aesthetic practices of performance. The field of performance studies and the hardy exchange networks forged by dancers, actors, and ethnographers beginning in the late 60s have only grown more strong since then. But again, we should always be wary of mistaking things for social relations. (On the other hand, we shouldn't leave things out of the picture; a person who would become a good friend and collaborator introduced himself to me when he recognized the glossy, bright orange cover of the Continuum Publishing Company's edition of Adorno and Horkheimer's *Dialectic of Enlightenment* sitting next to my coffee cup.)

To understand the complexity of these synchronic and diachronic relations, we need to bring analysis down to a more specific, determinate level where we can deal with texts as both things and as performances. Of special significance in the social constitution of this synchronic matrix of community and communication are two human agents. First, translators, who played as vital a role during the 60s as they have throughout the history of textual exchange: ensuring that critical thought and beautiful language passes across linguistic, national, cultural, and political boundaries. There are many examples from which to choose (in fact, all of the texts I just mentioned). One of those I've thought much about is M.C. Richards's 1958 translation of Antonin Artaud's *The Theater and Its Double* from French into English, a labor of love that initiated a wave of cultural ferment in the U.S. and Canada and augmented the wave already rolling in the U.K., fundamentally changing the way millions produced and experienced culture, especially the

more intense forms of popular culture such as rock 'n' roll and recreational drug use. For other examples of the vital role played by print translators, see Sehnaz Tahir-Gürçaglar and Bina Friewald's essays in this volume. Both writers document the vital role played by translators in the creation of progressive politics and culture. Indeed, in Turkey (Tahir-Gürçaglar's concern), translation was viewed by a succession of national administrations and their political and popular challengers as an integral part of the nation's entrance onto the international stage. Translation quite literally constructed (and deconstructed) the nation over the course of the 20th century.

Friewald warns us against culturally biased or culturally ignorant readings of translated theory. There are complex linguistic, subjective, and discursive networks that mediate communication across borders. In the case of the translation of French feminist texts in the 1970s, a deeply rooted nationalism kept many U.S. readers (many of them limited to English translations) from engaging seriously with the diversity of French critics and from apprehending the specific subjectivity of translators. In both Tahir-Gürçaglar and Friewald's essays, we discover intriguing social and political dimensions of textual materiality: the relatively slow pace of marketing and shipping commodities (itself a form of translation) such as books, and the even slower pace and inherently destabilizing implications of translation are determinate factors in the creation of diachronic/historical links between geographically and historically dispersed communities. Rather like the weird temporal fold created in 1965 when Structuralism and Poststructuralism were simultaneously introduced to the U.S. by Derrida et al., Friewald shows how French feminism was folded into its American cousin courtesy of, among other things, an extremely thin reading of the complicated word *jouissance*, a reading that, over the years, has continually constituted and revised a transnational feminist community. Grant Farred traces the intersection of British New Left historiography, Antonio Gramsci's theories of hegemony, and postcolonial theory and practice in the Indian subcontinent. His is ultimately a theoretical issue that is profoundly anchored to a historiographical concern; by tracking the texts and addressing the strange three-decade lag between the translation by Louis Marks of Gramsci's *The Modern Prince and Other Essays* in 1957 and the critical response to it, he is able to pose Subaltern Studies as a critical position within postcoloniality—which, in this light, appears as a disturbingly parochial and conservative discourse intent on disguising class violence in the postcolonial world. In the cases of French feminism, Turkish critical theory, and Subaltern Studies, we see evidence of exactly how difficult yet mundane it is to create a global revolution. Globalization is translation.

As Lawrence Venuti writes in *The Scandals of Translation*, because of this, "suspicion and neglect . . . continue to greet the practice of translation, especially in the United States and the United Kingdom." The source of suspicion is the inherent instability of text-in-translation. Therefore, according to Venuti, translation

can be a particularly subversive activity, a process that "scandalizes values that have long dominated Anglo-American culture," especially its infatuation with identity, with devising firm and final names for things. This subversive effect is especially apparent when translation occurs within the same linguistic system, but across ideological boundaries. We see this in the case of right-wing analysis of countercultural activism in Britain during the 60s, aptly analyzed by White in his essay "Holding the Mirror up to Hatred" below. There, we find British military, police, and intelligence organizations confronted by a truly unprecedented challenge, a challenge they refused to read except as evidence of alien subversion, a classic case of translation shaping conceptualization. The consequence of this blockage is decidedly ambivalent, as White demonstrates. If Venuti sees translation shaking the foundations of the West, White shows that it also enables its shoring-up.

A second human factor in cultural globalization is those individuals who physically crossed borders and carried with them textual traditions in material form (books and such) or in immaterial (memorized, kinaesthetic, etc.) form. One thinks of, say, Julia Kristeva and Tzvetan Todorov, who carried to France the Czech tradition of structural linguistics (itself the consequence of another carrier, Roman Jakobson, an émigré from the U.S.S.R.). In a sense, such individuals are "embodied texts," and the risks they take in the service of global community can be extreme. Many of the essays herein give credit to such textualized bodies. Bill Mullen turns insistently to Robert Williams for proof of a surprising linkage between Beijing and Detroit. Mullen shows that Williams, best known for his role in the 1961 uprising of blacks in Monroe, North Carolina, was both a carrier of text and a symbolic text himself. Forced to flee the U.S., he became both an inspiration for and a writer of texts that explored the concept of exile as a unique dimension of Tricontinental thought and expression. The shortcomings of Williams's theories and the slow pace and erratic quality of translations begin to seem strangely alike; in Mullen's words, an "unresolved" collection of "makeshift ideologies and temporary or transient positionings." Seth Baumrin documents the development of Eugenio Barba's anarcho-syndicalist vision of actor training as a process of nomadic border-crossings and a visceral discomfort with official institutions of all kinds. Baumrin's essay helps us understand why the Barba "method" (if it can be called that) has proven so effective in promoting ethically and aesthetically progressive forms of intercultural exchange and creation. The Living Theatre also played a vital role as translator, carrying its anarcho-pacifist message across extremely varied socio-political situations in the U.S., Western Europe, and Brazil. The dilemmas it faced translating its own practices in response to the conditions and contingencies in which it performed are examined here in provocative fashion by David Callaghan. Very much like Williams, the Living encountered many borders, some that could be crossed, some that couldn't (and the two could often be hard to tell apart).

Students played an especially important role as embodied vec-

tors, of course, as is reflected in Kunio Nakamura's essay on the Japanese political youth movements and their reading cultures. Able to carry and communicate their texts somatically (and in a sense glamorized by their refusal to translate French Existentialist terms into Japanese), students were often able to cross cultural barriers in rapid fashion and with surprising results, but also doomed their textual exchanges to the eddies of fashion and emotional intensity. Because they *were* in some sense the text, the interception of human agents by authorities was much more problematic than a confiscation of a book or a magazine run. In Japan, these embodied texts (this is meant quite literally; Nakamura describes a poster that appeared during the period of student unrest that featured a young man's tattooed back inscribed with poetry) brought into play paternal and maternal guilt. Nakamura describes a poignant moment when a mother of a young radical pondered in public, poetic fashion why her son had such "clear, undisturbed eyes." Likewise, the Japanese Right viewed the youth as wayward children, as is reflected in Yukio Mishima's *Gogo no eikou* (or *The Sailor Who Fell From Grace With the Sea*). The embodied text is perhaps the greatest challenge to the control of information and expression, particularly in bourgeois-liberal societies, since it brings into play ethical, moral, emotional, and legal considerations distinct from those surrounding non-human commodities.

The physical sites where political leaders, academics, activists, and artists gathered to share and cultivate concepts and vocabulary are also significant in the history of textual exchange during the 1960s. One might think of international conferences held at Havana, Baltimore, Berlin, and Prague in this respect. In his essay, Foster looks at Buenos Aires as a rich meeting place of political, aesthetic, and philosophical traditions. Carol Motta uses the metaphor of crossroads to describe sites like Buenos Aires. In her essay describing Paris as one point on a triangle linking Nigeria, Brazil, and France, Motta advances a rather distressing point: the exchange of cultural goods at such crossroads does not in any way ensure the exchange of culture. More often, the exchange results in exactly what Marx warned us against: fetishism, the substitution of things for social relations. Without adequate attention paid to the media of thought, the thought of history becomes something like what Czech philosopher Jirí Cvekl described in 1968:

> Specific and comprehensible qualities of things and people change into abstract symbols . . . Concrete people acquire a spectral likeness because they are treated as nothing more than symbolic points of intersection of socio-political characteristics, such as "class origin" and "positive attitude." Human qualities are replaced by an ideological and political scheme that is manipulated so as to maintain the appearance of orderliness (qtd. in Kusin 41).

These essays resolutely avoid this kind of manipulation and sys-

tematically explore the ironies involved when trying to base historical, critical, and practical knowledge on things. One of the goods whose international exchange is described in Motta's essay—the short-lived Brazilian theatrical tradition called *tropicalismo*—was created by artists and audiences who were perfectly aware of these ironies. The misunderstanding of *tropicalismo* by Parisian critics simply confirmed the message that Brazilian artists and audiences had long passed back and forth among themselves: Brazil was an exotic fetish for the West, and the cultural workers who created *tropicalismo* knew it.

If these essays demonstrate anything, it is that, whatever the medium and whatever the conditions of exchange, the movement of text across borders brings about all kinds of change to the message carried by that medium, simultaneously establishing and destabilizing a link across time and space. Whether we focus on the specific qualities of the first translation into Japanese of Sartre's *L'Être et le néant*, the changes in the Living Theatre's performance practices necessitated by the specific political and economic situation of a rural Brazilian village, or the impact of Structuralism on the Concrete Poetry or Performance Arts movements, the changes inevitably bring into play both theoretical, practical, and social dimensions. Speaking to such changes regarding the genre of critical theory, Edward Said asks if, "by virtue of having moved from one place and time to another, [a theory] gains or loses in strength, and whether a theory in one historical period and national culture becomes altogether different for another period or situation" (qtd. in Taylor 90). Emphatically, empirically, yes; theory does gain and lose in strength, does transform across contexts. As the contributors make clear, ideas, categories, and critical methodologies are resilient when in textual form, but also highly unstable and vulnerable to search and destruction.

This paradoxical quality makes texts very good at putting down roots in places far from their site of origin. But it's unstable, nonetheless, and deceptive, too; shared texts can fool us into thinking that more than objects are being shared. Many commentators on the 60s, both those contemporary with the events and those after the fact, have criticized the application of theories formed in response to specific cultural, economic, and political issues to contexts very different in nature. The transportation of, say, Maoist theories of cultural revolution from Beijing to other climes receives attention in this volume. There are "gaps in correspondence," to borrow a phrase from Mullen, that appear in the common ground of shared texts, gaps that threaten the very notion of deep historical, political, and ethical affiliation. In his essay, Alan Filewod describes the internecine battles of Maoist groups in Canada, implying that gaps in the translation of Maoist praxis were the fulcrums used to apply parochial forms of ideological pressure. Once we take seriously how theory is read from language to language and from culture to culture, how it is implemented as praxis only after it is implemented as language, and how it becomes the object of critique, then the notion of global radicalism in the 60s seems

more and more like a dream of historians rather than an empirical fact; or, in Filewod's terms, a clever manipulation of public appearance to disguise behind-the-scenes contradiction and incoherence. So is it even possible (or worthwhile) pursuing global studies of radical politics?

Ironically, it's exactly at this limit that the possibility of a global vision finds new strength. As the contributors demonstrate, the history of textual exchange often illuminates the kinds of limits identified by Walter Benjamin in his troubling essay "The Task of the Translator." Benjamin asserts what has become something of an article of faith among translation studies (and Poststructuralism, too): that there is a fundamental ontological gap between linguistic fields that disables translation. Translation, in his view, is by no means a process of intercultural communication, but rather a process of *destruction*, a systematic, dialectical, subversive materialization of cultural, linguistic, and political boundaries that must be crossed if there's any hope for a truly global culture. Yet such boundaries remain basically intractable.

Despite this, Benjamin doesn't give up hope on the global, but hope is couched in the terms of negative dialectics. He argues that the destruction wrought by translation is a vital, negative condition for the development of global community and communication. There is, in his view, a universal language that is brought into view through such destruction. The universal language envisioned by Benjamin is not any kind of socialist Esperanto, no natural or naturalizable language that can be spoken or written; rather, it is a material matrix in which the relationship of signifiers and signifieds (i.e., "This word in German is like that one in Mandarin"—the traditional concern of conservative translators) is no longer the central concern. Instead, what concerns the globalist is the relationship—and the material supports of that relationship—of distinct linguistic structures. It is the mediated relationship of socio-cultural language structures that constitutes the field of the global. What becomes visible in translation, according to Benjamin, are the economic, cultural, and historical determinants of the text as such, the ideological infrastructures that must be recognized and criticized before any global culture can even be conceptualized. The great humanist dream of the universal solubility of the translated word, disproven when examined in the context of specific translations, supplies empowering methods for identifying the disciplinary, material, and socio-historical grounds of any specific representation of the global. The text as a matrix of linguistic systems that, in translation, interfaces with other matrices, enables us to, in John Mowitt's words, "name the alterity that simultaneously constitutes and subverts the context of disciplinary reason" (25).

The consequence of such naming is that formerly concealed infrastructures of thought and communication can be systematically addressed, appropriated, and revised by activists, organizers, and cultural producers. What Benjamin suggests is that any effort to describe globalization as a cultural phenomenon must inevitably contend with the concrete complexity of translation and

transculturation. Significant linkages of knowledge and power are constituted by acts of translation and transculturation, as Tahir-Gürçaglar's essay on translation and national development demonstrates. Without an understanding of what constitutes those acts themselves, the linkages disappear from view. Keeping an eye on how the translated or transculturated text is allowed to disappear from view is a first step toward articulating a truly global vision. According to Mowitt, "The text thus appears within a confluence of disciplines that enables one to question both their synchronic relations and their sociohistorical supports" (24).

In other words, the impossibility of translation goads us toward more sophisticated, critical understandings of the global and the limits (which may prove to be temporary or permanent) to global justice. Correspondence, to use Mullen's term, is both a relationship of identity and a relationship of difference, a matching and a writing. To recall the work of Diana Taylor, when texts move across boundaries, issues arise that aren't just about the meaning of the text (the natural writing abhorred by Derrida), but "one of political positioning and selection" (91). Taylor describes transculturation as a "shifting of socio-political . . . borders," a process that "modifies collective and individual identity [and] changes discourse, both verbal and symbolic" (90-91). The coiner of the term, Cuban anthropologist Fernando Ortiz, characterizes transculturation as a "transitive process from one culture to another" (qtd. in Ibid., 91). What is perhaps most intriguing about this process is that its scholarly reconstruction can reveal histories, local practices, and material networks that have been overlooked. Many of the essays that follow make good work out of this idea; in particular, Motta's essay on the tangled network woven by theater workers in Nigeria, Brazil, and Paris; Callaghan on the interactions between the Living Theatre and poor *favelas* in Brazil and working-class neighborhoods in Pittsburgh (where he explicitly uses the theory of transculturation developed by Ortiz et al.); and Baumrin's on the advocacy work carried out by Barba for his friend and collaborator, the Polish vanguardist Jerzy Grotowski. Mullen discusses Maoist China and Black Detroit in terms of their mutual espousal of "nonalignment." Their work demonstrates that the best use of texts and theories in histories of globalization is as an aid for the mapping of boundaries, for describing modes of difference that might otherwise fail to be perceived.

Taking account of such matters can be a difficult process, one that requires interdisciplinary methods and great care with evidence. We should never just conflate principles and pages. Even so, there is good reason to risk a materialist reading of theory itself, as long as we're clear about what is meant by "materialist." Derrida, for one, has been among those who have most carefully charted the relationship of concepts and the material practices of writing and reading without falling into vulgarity. He's demonstrated the troubling impact of writing—as practice and medium—on the Western philosophical tradition, its claims, and its key issues; in fact, going so far as to argue that that tradition can be

understood as a series of efforts to marginalize and police the ungovernable, unpredictable effects produced by the material infrastructure of thought, by writing. This idea is raised most pointedly in *Of Grammatology*, where he notes that voice-centered discourses have "always placed in parenthesis, *suspended*, and suppressed for essential reasons, all free reflection on the origin and status of writing, all science of writing which was not *technology* and the *history of a technique*, itself leaning upon a mythology and a metaphor of natural writing" (103, italics Derrida's). Derrida argues that efforts to get around the materiality of writing and establish transcendent, unqualifiable truths tend to lead to the marginalization and victimization of difference on both the social level (chauvinism, homophobia, colonialism, etc.) and the epistemological level (the failure to acknowledge the "play" of textuality in the knowing of Being).[3]

When these ideas are applied to historiographical methods (periodization, for example, or economic determinism), they raise significant questions and problems. Among these is the theme to which I've repeatedly returned: the contingencies of the local. Derrida has addressed the issue of translation and transportation of texts in ways that raise difficult questions for those who assume that a theory translated retains its conceptual shape. But he has done so without abandoning the idea that the text can serve as a politically significant medium for cross-border affiliation. In line with a number of reader-response critics (Wolfgang Iser and Stanley Fish, in particular), he suggests that the ambiguities and multiplicity of meaning that manifest around texts when read in diverse contexts are best understood not as some pre-existing potential in the text ("polysemy"), but as an unpredictable consequence of textual exchange and transportation. According to Derrida, the transported text is best understood not as itself the medium of communication (a "natural writing"), but rather as a contingent locale in which codes shared by readers and writers find space for intersection and self-differentiation (1991). The text is a crossroads.

There's a paradoxical point here that I'd ask readers to keep in mind as they look over the essays: the text may be profoundly destabilized as it is uprooted from its original cultural/linguistic context, yet it still retains a reliable stability. Much like the signature—both singular and identical every time it is signed—the exchanged text marks a site for innovative, unprecedented critical perspectives. In summary, perhaps the best use of texts and theories in histories of globalization is as an aid for the mapping of boundaries and for describing modes of difference that might otherwise fail to be perceived.

This is no easy task, though. Venuti has addressed the failure (specifically, of philosophers) to address the materiality of reading practices, speaking in particular to the materiality of translation. He writes, "Translation exposes a fundamental idealism in philosophy by calling attention to the material conditions of concepts, their linguistic and discursive forms, the different meanings and functions they come to possess in different cultural situations" (24).

Close-reading G.E.M. Anscombe's 1953 English translation of Wittgenstein's *Philosophical Investigations*, Venuti discovers a great deal of cultural difference, invisible politics, and textual play around the widely accepted Anscombe translation of the Wittgenstein aphorism, "Denn die philosophischen Probleme entstehen, wenn die Sprache feiert" ("Philosophical problems arise when language goes on holiday"). The specifics of his critique are too subtle to summarize; Venuti demonstrates, ultimately, "the determinations and effects, not only of the translation but also of Wittgenstein's philosophy, the social conditions concealed by his conservative notion of the language-game" (28). Through comparative study of the source-text and its translation, Venuti is able to trace Wittgenstein's attitudes toward the relationship of work to leisure, of the serious to the nonsensical, toward, more generally, the labor of cultural production itself. Rather than attempting to equalize the translations, Venuti argues, the scholar/critic should discover and examine the "remainders," that which doesn't make it across the border and that which appears by surprise on the other side. The "unpredictability of the remainder," he notes, "means that not all of its effects are so conspicuous or so significant" as that seen in Anscombe's translation (29). Irregardless, "[t]he most subtle effects in philosophical translations are also the most powerful in assimilating the foreign text to the disciplinary discourses and institutions of the domestic culture.

This domestication occurs with any translating. Indeed, it is necessary if the foreign text is to become intelligible . . ." (Ibid.). We see an instance of such analysis in Nakamura's essay (translated by Masaomi Kondo), which analyzes the radical youth movement in Japan as a contradictory manifestation of internationalism (via the translation of Sartre, Lévi-Strauss, Barthes, and others; the importation of American television and film; etc.) and parochialism. His brief comments on the refusal by Japanese youth to speak Sartre's terms *project* and *engagement* in Japanese confirm this assertion. As a contemporary Japanese critic noted, such audibly untranslated words gave them (and those who pronounced them) a "cassette effect," by which he means a titillating sense of hidden, precious value, an intoxicating sense of transhistorical, transcultural relevance that, on closer examination, was hardly the case at all. In fact, according to Nakamura, this emotional register, always volatile, was the motive and doom of Japanese youth radicalism. He reads the emotional attitude of this movement as it was represented in novels by the right-wing nationalist Yukio Mishima and in the texts it read: Sartre, first and foremost, but also American TV series about the mythical "Old West," Anthony Burgess's *A Clockwork Orange*, and local cultural products like those of radical philosopher Takaaki Yoshimoto and Shuji Terayama, Japanese avant-garde theater's most unrelenting force.

Nakamura's essay delineates the forces that gave the Japanese student movement a profoundly (and unconsciously) ironic edge at one extreme, a profoundly romantic edge at the other, proving that, if translation is impossible, this impossibility is a spur to more

sophisticated understandings of the limits of community and communication. This idea finds agreement with Ilka Saal's analysis of the distinct receptions accorded Bertolt Brecht's theories and plays in the U.S. during the 1930s and 60s. Her description of the cultural and political contingencies involved in the translation of a particular modernist political aesthetic reveals, unexpectedly, the importance of local, vernacular traditions of political identification to the very modernism that attempted to transcend such vernaculars. The possibility of trans-historical links depends fundamentally on the hierarchies within which translation occurs; the decentering of the Manhattan theater scene (e.g., Off-Broadway and Off-Off-Broadway) was necessary before Brecht's theories of political theater could find a place. In other words, modernism had to be translated into vernacular terms. Such terms inevitably bring into consideration local ways of speaking, doing, and being that don't intersect with modernism. She demonstrates, ultimately, that Brecht's success in the 60s was merely a failure of a different kind.

Essays like Nakamura and Saal's—like all of those herein—demonstrate that there is history carried by texts-in-translation, history whose partial reconstruction is the goal of this volume of *Works and Days*. Textual exchanges fundamentally impacted globalization in the post-World-War-II era and continue to impact it today, and yet there has been no systematic study of this impact. The consequence of this shortcoming is that we have yet to comprehend key failures of the era (among these, the failure to theorize translation and transculturation as constitutional to any global struggle) as well as historical and contextual continuities that link the 60s to our own time (for example, radical Islam, which played a significant role among anti-establishment activists in Turkey, Ethiopia, and Indonesia).

Existing studies of the 60s as a global phenomenon have tended, with a few notable exceptions, to focus not on such individuals and communities, but on large-scale concerns such as the abandonment of the gold standard by the Nixon administration and its impact on balance-of-trade payments with Europe and Asia, on the development of agro-business, the growth of media corporations, or the Cold War. I'm not arguing that such concerns are insignificant; hardly so. Nor am I arguing for the inefficacy of studies devoted to them or the methods used to make sense of such entities. What I am arguing is that global studies lack a crucial material determination—the materiality of writing and reading—that is vital to an era in which the relationship of the local and the global was of utmost importance. This relationship is inconceivable without the mediation of text. Thus, there is a failure to understand a technology that structures understanding—a fatal strategy, Martin Heidegger argued throughout his life.

The failure to account for the textual object and its behavioral situations is especially odd considering that the human sciences—political history and cultural studies especially—have taken what has been called a "textual turn" in recent decades (in the Americas starting in the mid-60s, in Western Europe a decade or so earlier,

in Eastern Europe and Russia in the 20s). The metaphor of text has proven astonishingly solvent, enabling scholars to, in essence, read politics, fashion, public behavior—basically everything—as forms of text, convoluted systems of signifiers and signifieds, "mobile armies of metaphors and metonyms," to paraphrase Nietzsche.

The irony is all the more intense when we take account of the vectors that helped constitute this turn toward semiotics, structuralism, and poststructuralism. I've mentioned Todorov and Kristeva, but we should also note the great migration of French theory in the early 1960s enabled by the state-sponsored translation journals of Turkey and in Baltimore at the 1966 Johns Hopkins symposium on Structuralism. The irony is further compounded when we consider that these theoretical trends—trends that have given us the materialist concepts of *écriture* and *episteme*—were themselves the consequence of acts of translation and transculturation reminiscent of the boundary-crossing texts of 18th-century revolutionary republicanism. French structuralism was the consequence of Czechoslovakian texts inspired by Soviet studies and translated into French; furthermore, these translations were read by intellectuals (such as Louis Althusser and the writers involved in the *Tel Quel* journal and publishing projects) who were in the process of absorbing the lessons of translations of Mao (Young 187). The political valence of structuralism is complicated by this history; Gregory Elliott has argued, to borrow Robert Young's summary, that "French postructuralism . . . involved what amounted to a Maoist retheorization of European political and cultural theory, as well as its complex connections to Indian postcolonialism, which has also been deeply affected by Maoism" (Ibid.). The threat to the foundations of Western society posed by the theories of textuality—a threat often decried by right-wing pundits and self-appointed academic cops—is very real if we keep the textual history before us. Perhaps most distressing is the fact that, according to Young, this issue has yet to be fully explored. The paths of vectors of the radical—whether textual objects like plays and slogans or more complex vehicles such as political exiles or nomads—reveal evidence of political struggles, individual and community sacrifices, violence, and the forgotten.

Unfortunately, despite the textual turn in the humanities and social sciences, we find persistently non-materialist responses to this turn, such as those focusing on narrative structure (e.g., Hayden White et al.), metaphorics (the New Historicism), ideology (Althusser), or the deconstruction of encoded "metanarratives" (e.g. Jean-Francois Lyotard, Derrida). Reading culture as text does not necessarily mean reading culture as paper stock, ink, and press. Jameson himself admits this when he describes his own approach to history-as-text in *The Political Unconscious*:

> As the traditional dialectic teaches us, the historicizing operation can follow two distinct paths, which only ultimately meet in the same place: the path of the object and the path of the subject, the historical origins of the

> things themselves and that more intangible historicity of the concepts and categories by which we attempt to understand those things. In the area of culture, . . . we are thus confronted with a choice between study of the nature of the 'objective' structures of a given cultural text (the historicity of its forms and of its content, the historical moment of emergence of its linguistic possibilities, the situation-specific function of its aesthetic) and something rather different which would instead foreground the interpretive categories or codes through which we read and receive the text in question.

"For better or for worse," he continues, "it is this second path we have chosen" (9). And it is this latter path that most textually oriented historians have taken, too.

As Jameson would surely admit—and as I hope I've begun to convince my reader, leaving the rest to my colleagues—codes and epistemes can't be considered outside of their economic and material determinations. Further, the economic and material determinations of thinking can't be considered outside of textual determinations (a point developed by Mowitt). In sum, there is another determination in the textual dialectic mapped out by Jameson. Perhaps the text is itself the meeting place—the crossroads, to borrow from Motta again—of the two paths of dialectical analysis. Each of the contributors examines a specific case of textual exchange that impacted in some way the shape of radical political and cultural movements in the 1960s and whose shape and implications can be determined to some degree of certainty and complexity, and this notion of the text as the meeting place of dialectical analysis seems to hold true. These essays rove across disciplines—theater, literature, and translation history; performance and cultural studies; political and critical theory—and differ widely in their approaches, but one thing unifies them all: from the perspective of the text, the 60s appear quite different from the decade we read about in the history books.

In lieu of a conclusion, it would be best to admit the shortcomings of my work as editor and the gaps that readers will find in this volume despite the luxury of pages and assistance I've been given. I've brought together scholars from a wide range of academic discourses, and despite their success describing exactly the kind of subjective conditions and situated acts of exchange that can dislocate and energize our thinking and teaching about the culture wars of past and present, there are concrete conceptual limits to this collection. There is, first of all, too much emphasis on texts composed in Western Europe and the U.S. Certainly this reflects the enormous significance of Western radicalism to the period as well as the economic and cultural power of the West, which enabled it to produce and distribute enormous quantities of textual matter. But it also reflects more mundane issues, including my own linguistic, discursive, and community limitations. We should also recognize the difficulty of this approach; it was hard to find people who could

address simultaneously textual history, critical theory, and historiography. Despite the assistance of colleagues around the world, I have assembled only a tiny group to respond to this challenge, all of whom rely on the West as a touchstone. Though it would be silly to think of globalization without the West, it would be better if there were a more diverse range of vectors here, particularly given the enormous significance of the Non-Aligned Nation movement of the period.

Second, there is little detailed analysis of linguistic translation along the lines of Venuti's reading of Wittgenstein and his English translator. To my mind, this is one of the most important aspects of the textual-vector approach to globalization. Friewald's essay on the translation of French feminism is an exception and Nakamura mentions briefly a significant aspect of Japanese translation. More of this kind of work—and my apologies to those I might have overlooked in my research—is needed to give weight to all globally oriented scholarship. Translators are due at least something akin to the (admittedly lean) institutional support and scholarly interest that dancers and performance artists have enjoyed since the early 70s.

Readers will notice that I've arranged the essays in alphabetical order according to the last names of the contributors. Though I had originally planned on arranging the essays by genre (theater and performance, literary studies, critical theory), textual ontology (written or embodied), and/or by region (Western Europe, North America, South America, Asia, Africa), the final products defy such easy arrangement and any effort to do so might promote the very kinds of compartmentalization that these essays effectively outwit. That said, some rough groupings might be suggested for readers with specific interests. For those engaged in theater and performance studies, I'd refer you to the essays by Baumrin, Callaghan, Motta, and Saal, and note that Foster, Filewod, and Nakamura make significant mention of theater and performance, too. Literary texts play a key role in Filewod, Nakamura, Saal, and Tahir-Gürçaglar. Political and critical theory are the major emphases of Farred, Filewod, Friewald, Mullen, Tahir-Gürçaglar, and White. The written text holds center stage for Farred, Foster, Friewald, and Tahir-Gürçaglar; the embodied text for Baumrin, Callaghan, and Motta. Filewod, Nakamura, Mullen, and Saal place equal emphasis on both. Regional categorization is another way to plan readings. As I've mentioned, all the essays make substantial reference to Western Europe and/or the U.S., Western Europe (esp. France) more often. Eastern Europe is discussed at length by Baumrin (Poland) and Tahir-Gürçaglar (Turkey). Quebec figures prominently in Friewald's essay and Canada is the primary focus of Filewod's. Nakamura's essay extensively discusses cultural radicalism in Japan and Farred's positions one pivot of the triangular history of Subaltern Studies in India (he also mentions Australia briefly). Mullen discusses China at length and Maoism features prominently in Filewod. South American regional concerns are discussed at length by Callaghan (Brazil), Foster (Argentina), and Motta (Brazil).

Motta discusses Nigeria in her essay; Mullen briefly mentions Cuba in his essay; and Farred roams broadly, if briefly, across many Third-World regions and nations. Having engaged in this bit of bad-faith, I'd ask the reader to forget all this and approach the essays without preconceptions.

A final note. It's been a pleasure assembling this special volume of *Works and Days*. My thanks to David Downing, who essentially gave me his journal for a year and gave me a year's worth of help when I needed it. His willingness to bank these pages on what was essentially a well-educated bit of hallway bluff has taught me a lot about collegiality. His patience with my gaffes is also appreciated. Thanks as well to Patrick Clark for his hard work, especially during the initial search for contributors and the concluding editorial crunch. Indiana University of Pennsylvania's Dean Brenda Carter, College of Humanities and Social Sciences, and Faculty Senate supplied some material and research support, as did the Department of English, including secretaries Esther Beers and Jackie Bruner. Mona Baker, Lawrence Venuti, and James Sosnoski helped put me in contact with contributors in Europe, Africa, and Asia. Special praise is due to Tony Leon, an IUP English-History major whose independent study in the winter of 2002 helped me to track down contributors and write coherently about translation and transculturation. Our conversations shaped a significant portion of this essay. Thanks of a singular kind go to Kate Trifilio for giving me the time and space to work on this project, a particularly daunting task given the recent arrival of our two baby boys. And my thanks to the contributors, who accepted prolix criticism with equanimity, producing work that exceeded my expectations and confirmed my suspicion that texts can tell histories far different than the ones we read in them.

Notes

[1]Specifically, the Spring 1992 issue devoted to the troubled position of anarchism within literary studies.

[2]This is not entirely the case, though. A seminar at the 2000 American Society for Theatre Research conference, "Research and Pedagogy for a Turbulent Decade: Self-Reflexive Practice and Radical Performance of the 1960s," showed that, for theater historians and performance theorists, the textuality of the 60s is hardly a given. For examples of this kind of questioning, see the essays in *Theatre Survey*: *The Journal of the American Society for Theatre Research* 41.2 (May 2002).

[3]For an exemplary text, see Derrida's *Dissemination*.

Works Cited

Ali, Tariq and Susan Watkins. *1968: Marching in the Streets*. New York: The Free P, 1998.

Artaud, Antonin. *The Theater and Its Double*. Trans. M.C. Richards. New York: Grove P, 1958.
Benjamin, Walter. "The Task of the Translator." Trans. James Hynd and E.M. Valk. *Delos* 2 (1968): 76-99.
Bracken, Len. *Guy Debord—Revolutionary*. Venice, CA: Feral House, 1997.
Derrida, Jacques. *Dissemination*. Trans. Barbara Johnson. Chicago: U of Chicago: 1982.
_____. Selection from *Of Grammatology*. *Critical Theory Since 1965*. Ed. Hazard Adams and Leroy Searle. Tallahassee, FL: Florida State UP, 1986.
_____. "Signature Event Context." *A Derrida Reader: Between the Blinds*. Ed. Peggy Kamuf. New York: Columbia U, 1991.
Downing, David B., ed. *Works and Days* 10.1 (Spring 1992): *Anarchism in Literature, Theory, and Culture: Toward a Non-Authoritarian Society*.
Edelman, Lee. "Homographesis." *Literary Theory: An Anthology*. Ed. Julie Rivkin and Michael Ryan. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishers, 1998.
Flockemann, Marika. E-mail to author. 12 Nov. 2001.
Graham-Jones, Jean. "Transculturating Politics, Realism, and Experimentation in 1960s Buenos Aires Theatre." *Theatre Survey* 43.1 (May 2002): 7-22.
Guérin, Daniel. *Anarchism: From Theory to Practice*. New York: Monthly Review P 1970.
Jameson, Fredric. *The Political Unconscious: Narrative as a Socially Symbolic Act*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell UP, 1981.
Klatch, Rebecca E. *A Generation Divided: The New Left, the New Right, and the 1960s*. Berkeley: U of California P, 1999.
Kramer, Mark. "The Czechoslovak Crisis and the Brezhnev Doctrine." *1968: The World Transformed*. Ed. Carole Fink, Philipp Gassert, and Detlef Junker. New York: Cambridge UP, 1998.
Kusin, Vladimir V. *The Intellectual Origins of the Prague Spring: The Development of Reformist Ideas in Czechoslovakia, 1956-1967*. New York: Cambridge UP, 1971.
Mowitt, John. *Text: The Genealogy of an Antidisciplinary Object*. Durham, NC: Duke UP, 1992.
Nietzsche, Friedrich. "On Truth and Lying in a Non-Moral Sense." *The Norton Anthology of Theory and Criticism*. Ed. Vincent B. Leitch et al. New York: W.W. Norton and Company, 2001.
Taylor, Diana. "Transculturating Transculturation." *Performing Arts Journal* 38 (1991): 90-104.
Venuti, Lawrence. *The Scandals of Translation: Towards an Ethics of Difference*. New York: Routledge, 1998.
_____. "Translation, Philosophy, Materialism." *Radical Philosophy* 79 (1996): 23-34.
Young, Robert J.C. *Postcolonialism: A History*. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishers, 2001.

seth baumrin

SETH BAUMRIN

INSTITUTION:

Department of Visual and Performing Arts,
Rutgers University-Newark, Newark, New Jersey, USA

FIELDS:

Theatre History, Theory, Directing, and Acting

RECENT PUBLICATIONS:

"No Longer in Search of an Author, a Character Defines Herself: Pirandello's *Six Characters in Search of an Author* Viewed within the Context of Eugenio Barba's Experimental Performance Methodology," *Modern Drama* 44.2 (2002): 174-86.

"Jig Cook: Stage Manager for an American Renaissance," *Journal of American Drama and Theatre* (Fall 2000): 55-74.

"My Grandfather Konstantin Sergeievich: Interview with Eugenio Barba" *Mime Journal* (1998/1999): 28-51.

ABSTRACT:

Eugenio Barba's earliest work, the product of systematic international journeys and intercultural "barters," provides an anarcho-collectivist praxis that enables a critical theory of any theater event or group, draining these of geopolitical particularities while enabling a more refined understanding of the event or group's cultural impact.