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CHAPTER ONE

Introduction

AVERY F. GORDON AND CHRISTOPHER NEWFIELD

Multiculturalism has established itself as a major framework for analyzing intergroup relations in the United States at a time when it seems more obvious than ever that we cannot advance one inch as a society, or even remain where we are, without major changes in race relations in all their dimensions and new confrontations with racism. Yet as the term “multiculturalism” has appeared more and more frequently in current social and cultural debates, its meanings have become less and less clear. It acknowledges cultural diversity, but what else does it do? For some, it means renewed demands for assimilation in disguise. For others, it means a rejection of all the good things about “Western culture” that made America great. For still others, it is a simple descriptive fact about U.S. society that could serve as an everyday term for the interaction among the country’s five major “racial” or “panethnic” groupings: African Americans, American Indians, Asian Americans, European Americans, and Latino Americans.

The term “multiculturalism” has become current in the last five years, but little has been resolved about its meanings and effects. Why does multiculturalism still produce so much simultaneous rejection, ambivalence, and interest? How do its meanings vary? What cultural and political traditions is multiculturalism replacing or displaying? What are the promises and limitations of multiculturalism as a rubric for new knowledges? What prospects
does it hold for racial reconstruction as the United States enters a period of
general economic and geopolitical restructuring?

Mapping Multiculturalism is occasioned by these kinds of pressing ques-
tions as they surround the increasing ubiquity of the term. The essays
collected here map the terrain of multiculturalism in its varied dimensions
and effects and discuss its future. They question and challenge the cohe-
rence, value, and current uses of multiculturalism as a concept and practice.
They engage in the debates over the term. They analyze and criticize. In
many cases, they propose alternatives to the priorities that multiculturalism
encourages.

Mapping Multiculturalism convenes a range of scholars and artists work-
ing, regardless of their formal affiliations, in sociology, history, film, literary
criticism, inter-American relations, popular culture studies, political econ-
omy, critical legal studies, industrial and labor relations, Women's Studies,
Chicano Studies, African-American Studies, Asian-American Studies, and
American Indian Studies. One hallmark of the volume's contributors is that
they link race's complex cultural questions to questions of power and insti-
tutional authority. They see race and racism not only as intricate cultural
issues that involve all aspects of individual and group life, but as immersed
in economic, international, political, and policy dynamics. These scholars
and artists not only connect dimensions too long separated by the artificial
boundaries and restricted missions of academic departments. They also put
culture at the center of politics and society and thus change what culture it-
self means for the humanities and social sciences. Their endeavors suggest
the prospect of the wholesale restructuring of social and cultural knowl-
dge—including the establishment of alternative methods, histories, and fu-
ture projects—to better fit the often suppressed actualities that are the
United States.

Multicultural Dilemmas

Since multiculturalism resurfaced in the late 1980s, commentators have
offered a series of conflicting accounts of the term's basic meaning. The
authors of the present essays came together for a conference called "Trans-
lating Cultures: The Future of Multiculturalism?" at the University of Cal-
ifornia, Santa Barbara in November 1992, and since that time the debate has
only become more involved. As background for the following essays, we
offer here a short outline of some of these accounts. We proceed two by two
for the sake of a little exaggerated clarity, and we do not hereby imply a con-
sensus among the contributors about the meaning or the value of the term
multiculturalism or their agreement with our description of its most com-
monly expressed internal conflicts.

1. Is multiculturalism antiracist or oblivious to racism? Multiculturalism in
the 1980s sponsored renewed protests against white racism, and yet it ap-
ppeared to replace the emphasis on race and racism with an emphasis on cul-
tural diversity. Multiculturalism rejected racial subordination but seemed
sometimes to support it.

On the one hand, multiculturalism was a delayed antibiotic to the race
trends of the 1970s and 1980s, but better late than never. This period's at-
tacks on various uses of civil rights gave certain kinds of white racism a new
lease on life. The official doctrine of these attacks was not white supremacy,
however, but color blindness. The backlash against civil rights achieved its
greatest gains not by celebrating white racial consciousness but by officially
restricting the relevance of race. It did not defend white racism but claimed
that racism had passed from the scene. Conservatives had contended that
all Americans were living in a post-racist era, and their strong attacks on mu-
ticulturalism suggested that the latter had indeed contested this claim.
Multiculturalism, to the contrary, implied that race is everywhere. If you
thought there were mainly two races, multiculturalism insisted there are at
least five. If you thought race was a function of economics, multiculturalism
told you race is also central to your personal identity. If you let policy talk
convince you that race had been taken care of with antidiscrimination
statutes, multiculturalism reminded you that it constitutes all social rela-
tions. If you were led to assume that American culture would be better if
color-blind, then multiculturalism shocked you by showing that color con-
sciousness is American culture. And if you came to believe that avoiding race
meant peace, multiculturalism implied that avoiding it meant war. The dis-
persed and complicated presence of what Michael Omi and Howard Winant
call "racial projects" suggested that racial thinking, including the white racist
variety, had to be examined with a renewed intensity. Multiculturalism
underwrote this broadened investigation.

Well, maybe. For, on the other hand, multiculturalism often avoided race.
It designated cultures. It didn't talk up racism. It didn't seem very antiracist,
and often left the impression that any discussion of cultural diversity would
render racism insignificant. It was ambiguous about the inheritance and the
ongoing presence of histories of oppression. It had the air of pleading for a
clean start. It allowed "culture"'s aura of free play to attribute a creative
power to racial groups that lacked political and economic power. It was pro-
phrased on cultural respect. In general, granting reciprocity and diversity was compatible with insisting on some underlying cultural unity, as the history of cultural pluralism attests. Behind the celebration of diversity, then, lurked an ambivalent attachment to _e pluribus unum_, with _unum_ regaining command when white-majority rule was disrespected or challenged.

3. Is _multiculturalism_ grounded in grassroots alliances or diversity management? Multiculturalism sponsored contacts among people of color that avoided white mediation and oversight by white opinion. And yet, it became a popular term in managerial circles for controlling a multiracial and gendered workplace.

Sounding relatively upbeat, Kobena Mercer wrote that while the British version of multiculturalism was a Thatcherite tilting through the shoals of minority demands, "in the United States in the 1980s, against the background of neo-conservative hegemony, [multiculturalism]'s connotations suggest a breakdown in the management of ethnic pluralism and draw attention to the question of possible alliances and coalitions between various groups." Multiculturalism might not only support coalitions between groups but could also explore how intermixed and hybrid these groups were in the first place. As Trinh T. Minh-ha put it, "Multiculturalism does not lead us very far if it remains a question of difference only between one culture and another. Differences should also be understood within the same culture ... Intercultural, intersubjective, interdisciplinary. . . . To cut across boundaries and borders is to live aroud the malaise of categories and labels; it is to resist simplistic attempts at classifying, to resist the comfort of belonging to a classification, and of _producing classifiable works._" Or in Lisa Jones's terms, "First I arrived, fatter than an A&P chicken, just another black child in New York City born to a Jewish woman and a Negro man. . . . For many years I thought the entire world was a band of Latin, black, and Chinese children dancing around the maypole and singing 'Qué Bonita Bandera' and the few Ukrainians who served us lunch." Moving from fixed to mixed, multiculturalism sponsored an official identity that seemed to reflect social reality, and that enabled alliances to emerge from everyday life. The crisscrossed and in-from-everywhere things you do already were a better frame for coalitions than the formal categories of institutional processes, multiculturalism suggested. Hence so many explosive developments in concepts like the boundary-shattering borderlands, biraciality, and intersectionality. Multiculturalism reflected how coalition politics and even personal identity itself could evade the regulating effects of official procedure.

But at the same time multiculturalism was another name for that regula-
diversity. Gary Nash argued that “pluribus can flourish in these ways only if unam is preserved at the heart of the polity—in a common commitment to core political and moral values.” Cultural diversity often regarded culture, in Chandra Talpade Mohanty's terms, “as noncontradictory, as isolated from questions of history,” as a realm of individual attitudes in which diversity leads to the reduction of prejudice but not to any change in the relative positions of various groups. Cultural diversity noted differences in values and outlooks while ignoring the differences of social position that influence those values. Commentators on multiculturalism have repeatedly warned that it teeters on the brink of lapsing into insipid encouragement of variation with little idea of what difference it makes, like quality-of-life rankings that give more points to the city that has all four kinds of major-league sports teams rather than just two or three. Multiculturalism seemed torn between demanding and avoiding the full conjuncture of political, social, and cultural elements that affect our racialized everyday lives.

Some of these conflicts over the basic meaning of the mere word “multiculturalism” follow from the remarkable range of uses to which it’s been put. It has indeed referred to “the life of various ethnic groups, racial diversity, gender differences, international issues, non-Western culture, cross-cultural methodologies, sexual preference, and the physically challenged.” But the term also manifests mainstream American irresolution about these four conflicts. Does a democratic United States require orderly racial hierarchy or racial equality? Does American society have one or many centers? Will the bottom or the top control intergroup conflict—will control be relatively popular or relatively elite? Finally, is cultural knowledge intrinsic to or outside of social relations and political life?

Obviously actual choices are not as binary as these heuristic questions suggest. There are combinations, and these vary from place to place. But the elements of these combinations are often at odds with one another, and reflect a profound and gendered ambivalence about these issues. It is simply not possible to invoke an “American Creed” of equality and democracy that rejects racist and exclusionary attitudes, for any such creed is in fact divided within itself. The creed is itself incessantly dubious about the benefits of racial equality, a nonhierarchical society, grassroots control of intergroup relations, and culture's influence on politics. Multiculturalism was hatched into an ambiguous relation to a “post-civil rights” white racial consensus that does not oppose but instead produces the Janus-faced—or Hydra-headed—contradictions around race, racism, and culture. Were there indeed a set of “core American values” ready to assert unambivalent an-
tiracism and democratic equality against their opposites in American life, we would not be in our fourteenth decade of working toward racial Reconstruction of an America without slavery. Multiculturalism, adopting something like the eight stances we've described, has not escaped the conflicts within the consensus it attempts to revise.

The end of the Cold War has not brought the openings for national reeducation that many hoped for. Part of the reason has been the successful replacement of the communist threat with equally global "ethnic threats" in the minds of many important opinion makers. The columnist Charles Krauthammer fired an early shot against an "intellectually bankrupt 'civil-rights community,'" which he claimed "poses a threat that no outside agent in this post-Soviet world can match"—"the setting of one ethnic group against another, the fracturing not just of American society but of the American idea."¹⁴ Economic and social decline have been attributed not to inefficient and inequitable domestic policy but to allegedly uncontrollable international forces such as world wage competition and ethnic hatred. As we complete this introduction, anti-immigration sentiment in California has managed to link a pervasive sense of economic disintegration to undocumented minimum-wage laborers rather than, say, to avoidance of urban investment or the investment strategies of aerospace firms.

Current trends are tipping ambivalence into retrenchment and restriction. We recur to the four dilemmas listed earlier. First, around the pursuit of antiracist projects, the dominant tendency has recently been to define race not as a social force flowing from center to margins, from the powerful to the less so, but as the threat of chaos wielded by the margins and the powerless against the center. Mainstream common sense in post-Cold War America increasingly ties race consciousness not to First World sovereignty over other peoples (including others within) but to the others' power to transform the globe into a smoldering ruin.¹⁵ "Race" and ethnicity are being radically remodeled into synonyms for the weak's senseless and self-destructive threats to the strong.

Second, recent years have enhanced the prestige of common culture as the primary defensive barrier to the dangers posed by the existence of ethnicity and race. Plurality is increasingly seen as a dangerous thing. Although Lynne Cheney, once christened by George F. Will as the "secretary of domestic defense," has temporarily shed her armor, excessive domestic differentiation remains a threat.¹⁶ Cheney's liberal replacement at the National Endowment for the Humanities, Sheldon Hackney, was unable to devote his confirmation hearings to a theme like increased independence of and representation for "minority" cultures. He was instead compelled to denounce that form of "political correctness" that is "overly solicitous of minority groups and fashionable and trendy concerns."¹⁷ Common values, shared principles, core beliefs, national purpose, bringing people together—all these, in this prescription to transcend actual economic and political processes, are invoked repeatedly against a nameless but standing threat of civil war.

Third, the post-Cold War policy mainstream traces domestic and international poverty and war to excessive local control. It rarely blames histories of excessive management or current top-down alliances of international and local officials. Manufacturing failures are attributed to union demands in a global economy rather than to the international institutions and behaviors that comprise that economy itself. Or trouble in the Los Angeles Unified School District is attributed to disruptive teachers, students, and unions rather than to funding decisions in Sacramento. Diversity management is thought to balance impartial and uniform structure with inclusion and openness; it supposedly offers the best virtues of moderation, in which the clash of vibrant, creative energies can be organized and reconciled by the comprehensive and balanced overview provided by the leadership above. Direct coalitions, on the other hand, attempt to make a supervisory wisdom amongst themselves. In the last few years, they have been repeatedly castigated as at worst divisive and at best antiquated in today's interconnected and transnational flows of resources and information.

Finally, the post-Cold War period has seen a circling of the wagons around increasingly ossified political processes, defending them against direct forms of participation and expression. One famous symptom was the attack on "political correctness," which amounted to an attack on the relevance of cultural identity, experience, and history to the governance of institutional affairs. Culture would be encouraged when controlled by a resurgent emphasis on "Western culture" as a repository of unchanging values, a giant "book of virtues." This meant keeping politics out of culture. Culture would be discouraged when it represented a local, changing, spontaneous, unregulated compilation of historicized individual perspectives. This meant keeping culture out of politics. Strong forms of multiculturalism see culture as expressing and changing how people see their place in the world. The aftermath of the Cold War tends to make the logic of the world invincible. The political process becomes inaccessible to everyday culture and the latter's insights into desire and need.

So we could end up with this conglomeration of the restrictive side of
these four dilemmas. American society declares itself postracist and blames all racializing stigma on its targets, declaring exclusions to be the benefits of a common culture while managers supervise a self-perpetuating political and economic process in the name of diversity. That would be terrible. On the other hand, we’re used to it. It’s what’s been going on, and for quite some time. Too many other countervailing things are happening in every kind of community in the United States for these four developments to achieve any simple success.

The essays in this book, though fully aware of problems like these, attempt to circumvent their conditions and outcomes. The essays have been grouped under general rubrics intended to highlight the ways in which they are not confined by the dilemmas we’ve been outlining here.

Overview of Organization

The book is organized into several sections.

Part I, “Mapping Multiculturalism,” situates the concept in connection with a range of related discourses about race, culture, and power. It offers essays that link multiculturalism to existing race-based and/or oppositional discourses. How does multiculturalism connect to the history of antiracist struggle in the United States? How does its structure and efficacy compare to the oppositional narratives of postcolonial discourse? Does it build and improve upon Marxist notions of the liberation of oppressed groups, or does it reject (or sidestep) Marxism? Would such a sidestepping be helpful or not? Does multiculturalism continue civil rights protests, or is it a characteristic product of the post-civil rights period? How does it aid or hinder the civil rights effort to establish party-based social movements? Does it successfully expand race-based political activism into the cultural realm?

In “From Farce to Tragedy,” Jon Cruz considers multiculturalism’s relation to Marxist and post-Marxist forms of social critique. What has multiculturalism given up through its distance from Marxism? What role does multiculturalism play as it negotiates between global capitalism and the fiscal crisis of the state? Angela Y. Davis’s “Gender, Class, and Multiculturalism” asks whether multiculturalism hasn’t traded in the critical insights of the distinguished histories of antiracist and antiseat struggle for the dubious prerogatives of diversity management. She suggests that multiculturalism cannot accomplish the necessary transformation of social relations, and falls far short of the coalition work performed by women of color. M. Annette Jaiman Guerrero argues in “Academic Apartheid” that multicultur-
Politics” elaborates, through reconsideration of Nietzsche’s genealogy of the logics of resentment, the ways in which some of the emancipatory aims of politicized identity are subverted not only by the constraints of the political discourses in which its operations transpire, but by its own wounded attachments. Less a critique of identity politics than an analysis of its investments, Brown’s essay calls for a reevaluation of the relationship between pain, political recognition, and the agonistic theater of forging alternative futures. In “Multiculturalism as Political Strategy,” Cynthia Hamilton discusses the history of the manipulation of racial and ethnic identity as a management tool in the workplace. She argues that multiculturalism fails to see how multi-racial workers are made political citizens of U.S. capitalism’s “work culture,” and thus can’t imagine how racial or cultural differences might offer a real alternative. In “Racialization in the Post-Civil Rights Era,” Michael Omi notes that in recent years the racial dimensions of political and social life have expanded rather than declined in significance. Omi identifies three key examples of this trend—the development of new racial subjects as a result of panethnic consciousness, the emerging crisis of white identity, and the increasing racialization of electoral politics—and discusses their implications for mainstream politics. “Screening Resistance,” a conversation between filmmaker Lourdes Portillo and scholar Rosa Linda Fregoso, situates the formation of Latina/o identity in an international Latin American context.

Part III, “Reading Multicultural Narratives,” examines already existing descriptions of U.S. culture as multicultural. These narratives have been around for a long time—they have played a central role in the survival of nondominant U.S. cultures. What do their readings of the country’s multicultural past say about the uses of multiculturalism as a guide to the future? Do accounts of the U.S.-Mexico border imagine a multicultural entity? Does multiculturalism add to or detract from the realities of cultural conflict? How do these narratives locate individuals in racial groups? Does a “border” sensibility improve interaction across cultures and teach cures to fear and loathing? How has linguistic and cultural translation served as a paradigm of multiculturalism? What do existing narratives say about improving cross-cultural relations within and across national boundaries?

In “Language and Other Lethal Weapons,” Antonia I. Castañeda examines the experience of children, principally Tejana farmworker children, as translators of culture. Basing her analysis on interviews with women whose families lived in various labor camps in the state of Washington during their childhood in the 1950s, Castañeda examines the cultural and political effects of that experience, suggesting that such translation is a process so fraught with conflict, subordination, and pain that it may not be understood by multiculturalism’s notions of enlightening cultural exchange. Angie Chabram-Dernersesian’s “The Spanish Colón-ialista Narrative” discusses an international form of multiculturalism, Spain’s “Colón-ialista narrative” of 1992. Chabram-Dernersesian offers a multinational analysis that demonstrates how the Colón narrative enlists subjegated U.S. identities to develop a fully Eurocentric paradigm of Hispanic multiculturalism. In “Multiculturalism and Racial Stratification,” Neil Gotanda reads Judge Joyce Karlin’s sentencing colloquy in the widely publicized case of People v. Soon Ja Du. Gotanda shows how Karlin, justifying probation in the shooting of African-American teenager Lataisha Harlins by Korean grocer Du Soon Ja, used multicultural techniques to establish a racial hierarchy of model and monitored minorities. Ramón Gutiérrez’s “The Erotic Zone: Sexual Transgression on the U.S.-Mexican Border” argues that many borderland Americans use negative sexual stereotypes to suppress the dependence of white middle-class prosperity on the intimate presence of Mexicans. Gutiérrez suggests that “multicultural” contact easily coexists with polarizing domination and paranoia, leaving the conjunction of sexuality and economics untouched. In “Site-seeing through Asian America,” Renee Tajima explores the complexities of Asian-American identity across the major changes in Asian-American social positions over the last four decades. The themes of her partly autobiographical narrative include the decline of Asian-American assimilation and the continual interaction between Asian- and African-American histories of protest.

Part IV, “Multi-Capitalism,” connects group and individual identity to recent changes in national and international economics. The section brings diverse expertise to bear on concrete questions of the relation of culture to political economy. Multiculturalism arises in a context in which culture is a commodity to be bought and sold in a multinational marketplace altered by the globalization of production, the rapid development of international finance, the simultaneous advance of high-tech and sweat labor in the United States, U.S. domination of cultural markets, and the hybridization of nearly all cultures around the world. How does multiculturalism translate this rapidly changing political economy? What is the future of local culture in the context of the internationalization of culture and economy? Can local cultures resist transnational capitalism without directly confronting it? Does connecting culture to economics improve the opportunity for cross-cultural alliances, or not, and why?

Richard P. Appelbaum, in “Multiculturalism and Flexibility,” reviews Marx’s arguments about globalization in order to investigate the emergence
of new transnational forms of labor exploitation, the "information-based economy," and the meaning of flexibility. Drawing on his study of apparel production in Los Angeles and Asia, he reflects on multicultural capitalism. In "The Class Question in Global Capitalism," Edna Bonacich argues that class remains a life-threatening aspect of social organization and social dynamics in the profoundly racialized manufacturing sectors that thrive in Los Angeles. She suggests ways multiculturalism might link race and gender to union struggles and other kinds of worker response to the ongoing consequences of the capital-accumulation process. Appelbaum and Gregg Scott's "Travelogue" offers a short visual essay on the factory districts in Los Angeles and various Asian cities. In "Unified Capital and the Subject of Value," Paul Smith explores the meaning of German reunification. Focusing on the rise of racism and xenophobia and the struggle over the stakes of an authentic German culture, Smith argues that these are aggravated by factitious unifications of capital and labor; the need to oppose these while opposing white supremacy may be a major lesson for U.S. multiculturalists. Patricia Zavella's "Living on the Edge" examines the problems of Chicano families living in poverty in the American Southwest. Arguing against "culturalist" arguments that attribute Chicano employment patterns to having better work attitudes than African Americans, Zavella indicates how culturalism, in conjunction with American family ideology, veils institutional discrimination and exclusion, and ignores the differences between the specific situations of different communities of color.

Part V, "Multiculturalism and the Production of Culture," explores artistic production as a type of social movement that can not only represent traditionally marginalized groups and individuals but fashion public policy. Here, the papers address such questions as: How can multiculturalism be reworked to more closely suit the needs of the cultures it claims to defend? What lies beyond multiculturalism? What will the future of cultural self-determination look like? How do nondominant cultures define winning cultural contests? How do we define a cultural community? What are the histories that have created cultural identities and movements? What is an artistic coalition, especially across cultural difference? How is multiculturalism produced by cultural institutions?

Steve Fagin's "Machine Talk" reflects on his experiences with presenting his video on the overthrow of Philippine president Ferdinand Marcos in 1986, The Machine That Ate Bad People. Fagin discusses his efforts to enact political expression through televisual fragmentation rather than coherent metanarratives and interacts with a UC San Diego audience that is sometimes critical of his format. In "It's All Wrong, but It's All Right," George Lipsitz explores the question of what popular culture consumers and artists do not know, and the "mistakes" they make while trying to figure things out. He suggests that "mistaken" ideas often contain crucial insights about the social construction of identity and the unreliability of surface messages. Lisa Lowe's "Imagining Los Angeles in the Production of Multiculturalism" analyses how the Los Angeles Festival of the Arts (1990) obscured the divergence between the aesthetic representation of cultural difference and differences in material resources. She identifies multiculturalism's tendency to produce consensus by homogenizing differences while also identifying oppositional moments in the festival, ones growing out of juxtapositions of different cultures that acknowledge contradiction without asserting generalizable oppressor/oppressed relations. And in "A Style Nobody Can Deal With," Tricia Rose investigates the postindustrial urban context of hip-hop culture and the political implications of hip-hop style. Analyzing the South Bronx as a critical symbol for urban ruin in the United States, Rose shows how hip-hop artists, who were designated as surplus labor, instead transformed obsolete vocational training skills in such fields as printing, drafting, electronics repair, and auto mechanics into the basis for artistic commentary on the crossroads of lack and desire in African-Diasporic communities.

These essays explore the contradictory and powerful meanings of the concept of multiculturalism and reject its terms altogether when that becomes necessary. Above all, the forces they describe, and the force of the work itself, suggest a comprehension, a momentum, a passion that means come what may, there shall be no going back.

Notes
1. Joe R. Feagin and Melvin P. Sikes recall that in a 1981 book Wealth and Poverty, once called the 'Bible of the Reagan-Bush administrations,' economist George Gilder declared there was no need for government action to assist black Americans because it was virtually impossible to find a serious racist in a position of power and because major discrimination had been effectively abolished in the United States (Living with Racism: The Black Middle-Class Experience [Boston: Beacon Press, 1994], 6).


16. George F. Will, “Literary Politics,” *Newsworl*, 22 April 1991: 72. As a paranoid rapture, the passage stands the test of time: we must attend, Will wrote, “to the many small skirmishes that rarely rise to public attention but cumulatively condition the nation’s cultural, and then, political, life. In this low-visibility, high-intensity war, Lynne Cheney is secretary of domestic defense. The foreign adversaries her husband, Dick, must keep at bay are less dangerous, in the long run, than the domestic forces with which she must deal. Those forces are fighting against the conservation of the common culture that is the nation’s social cement.”