

4

The Cultural Periphery and Postmodern Decentring: Latin America's Reconversion of Borders

Nelly Richard

Remembering that *maps* are one of the most common cultural metaphors in our conception of the world, it is significant that the history of cartography is also the history of a certain rationalization: of how an order that measures and cuts up surfaces to articulate territories of signification and representation is, itself, subject to order. Both the geometric models and the visual categories employed by map-makers to formulate specific images of spatiality reflect the structures of knowledge which define the philosophical and cultural thinking of a tradition. From time immemorial the concentric representation of space has drawn an image of finiteness and completeness which symbolizes that form of universal knowledge whose domain is enclosed – sealed – within the perimeter of the circle. This symbolization operates as an image of totality, establishing a fixed point which permits the measured evaluation of relationships of proximity and distance that either draw together or separate all other points distributed in space: 'Each historical period or cultural tradition selects a fixed point which functions as the centre of its current maps, a physical symbolic space to which a privileged position is attributed and from which all other spaces are distributed in an organized manner.'¹ The privileged position which this centre defends, and then translates into authoritarian roles – taking decisions, fixing rules, exercising control, etc. – stands out most forcefully in the opposition we can mark as centre/periphery.

The centre traditionally stands for the place of the symbolic concentration of values and power. Following the tradition of Western metaphysics, the centre symbolizes that *whole* in which the founding meaning of origin and truth is concentrated. The centre articulates the representation of space by delineating outlines (fixing limits) and simultaneously graduating the degrees of intensity between the *middle* (the point of greatest saturation and gravity of meaning) and the *borders* or *edges*: those zones in which the loss of clarity issues in a lack of definition.

The relationship staged between centre and periphery assumes paradigmatic dimensions in the case of a European-dominated Modernity which synthesized in the image of the centre its rationalizing ideals of dominion and control (light), while conceiving of the periphery (shade) as a zone of subordination to its civilizing hierarchy. The countries of Latin America, their imaginaries replete with the ethos of cultural colonization, have been tributaries of this geographical and symbolic polarization. It is one that sets the *centre* (modernity and progress; metropolitan advance) against the *periphery* (traditionalism and regionalism; provincial backwardness). Centre and periphery thus reproduce the model-copy opposition: the centre acts as a model (the metropolitan paradigm of a 'point of reference' to be comprehended, applied and enforced in questions of politics, in philosophical constructions and across the syntax of cultural styles), while the periphery is defined as a reflex extension condemned to the reproduction and imitation of a succession of 'original' moments. Model and copy are the categories of power and meaning that international Modernity dispenses in favour of an image of the centre that is consistently subordinate to the metropolitan – and cosmopolitan – concept of the new.

The transformations in train (those breakdowns in the grand narratives of universal modernity) within the postmodernist scene, shifted the authoritarian structure which validated the absolute hierarchy of the centre, and at the same time reasserted the role of the periphery (edge, border, margin), giving it the opportunity to emerge as a new 'protagonist', and in the process vindicating that which was previously censured as Other, as heterogeneous. In this sense, I understand the periphery not solely as a *place of operation* (a historico-cultural, or politico-social context) but also – and above all – as a *site of enunciation*: that is, as a discursive position/posture and a critical strategy of cultural negotiation.

CENTRED MODERNITY AND PERIPHERAL MODERNITY:
THE HETEROGENEITY OF THE BORDERS

The pact signed between *modernity* and *centrality* is expressed in diverse ways. First, Western modernity transmits its ideals of historical and technical progress through the networks of the metropolitan circuit which draw together and interconnect with the central countries, those national formations that share the same logic of development, the same history of 'civilizing' advance. Secondly, modern(ist) epistemology converts reason and history into self-centred totalities which exercise their dominion by relegating to the margins of logocentric thinking all that which resists or opposes its meta-abstractions. Constrained by this dual centralizing tendency, the peripheral formations had the experience of their underdeveloped modernity foisted upon them as a lesser and deficient (incomplete, failed) version of the model of developed modernity imposed by the centre. Nevertheless, various re-readings of Modernity, responsive to all that was expressed within it by that (censured or repressed) language of the 'intemperate', managed to subvert what might appear as a rote dependence on the unitary, fixed, register of Modernity. These re-readings have various orientations. One of them – which emerged from within European Modernity itself – uses the folds of the Baroque to reveal contradictions in the unifying synthesis of classical rationalism, and to confront the 'great founding figures of modernity – Subject, representative stability, Centre and Totality'² – with the anti-linear torsions of the decentred, which is, in turn, made over as a metaphor of 'the feminine'.³ A further orientation consists in exploring the map of universal modernity not from the self-fulfilling program of the glorious achievements announced in the epicentres of European civilization (Paris, London, Milan) but from the eccentric/ex-centric tracings whose capricious, dissonant, replicas confound the rectilinear logic of uniform progress and reason with their explosive figures of fragmentation:

between the end of the century and the 1930s, Austrian culture submitted received ideas of the 'subject' and 'substance' to a radical critique. The subject is no longer revealed as a unitary centre around which contradictions are hierarchized and synthesized, but to the contrary, as a chaotic place, set apart, where contradictions confront each other, cross each other and mix without

ever arriving at a resolution . . . Viennese culture, which tended to look for the truth on the surface of things, was also a cradle of postmodernism, of those processes which amplified the strong categories of thought and dispersed life into a collection of atomised, weakly linked parts, thus provoking the annihilation of conceptual order and the exhaustion of all reality.⁴

However, if there is an arena in which the paradoxes and contradictions of central modernity are exacerbated, an arena in which modernity ceases to be One and instead conjugates multiple and heterogeneous inclinations (and declinations), then this is Latin America. Here is a truly peripheral zone in which 'the contradictory meaning of [Latin American] modernity: the time of development traversed by the untimely of difference and cultural discontinuity',⁵ is well established, understood and appreciated.

Latin America became part of modern experience through its subordinated incorporation within the tendencies of progress – development and consumption – set in motion by the flow of goods and messages from Northern markets. But such flows are irregular. They are simultaneously absorbed or rejected by regional proclivities as they respond to differentiated mechanisms of reception which depend on the encrustations of the New particular to each local stratum. Certain modernizing impulses derived from the metropolis combine in strange ways with stratified regional pasts to create a sedimentation of heterogeneous memories, while other international rhythms are blocked by times and spaces which are resistant to their logic of progress or penetration. Such fragmentary, counterpoised, pulsions turn Latin American modernity into a collage of processes locked within a field of disparate, unstable tendencies. This is why in Latin America modernity betrays the linear scheme of development of a simple historicity by promoting the intersection of multiple and complex temporalities which unite and disunite in irregular bursts: 'In the case of Latin America, the motor of modernity – the international market – promotes and then reinforces an incessant movement towards the heterogenization of culture, setting into motion, stimulating and reproducing a plurality of *logics* which all act simultaneously, overlapping one another.'⁶ This plurality of simultaneous and contradictory logics underlines the sense of what J.J. Brunner calls the 'cultural heterogeneity' of Latin America:

cultural heterogeneity refers to a double phenomenon: 1. segmentation and segmented participation in the world market of messages and symbols whose underlying grammar is the North American hegemony over the imaginary of a large fraction of humanity. 2. Differential participations following local codes of reception, both group and individual, in the ceaseless movement of circuits of transmission ranging from publicity to pedagogy . . . Cultural heterogeneity means something very different from diverse ethnic cultures (subcultures), classes, groups or regions, or from a mere overlaying of cultures – whether they have found a form of self-synthesis or not. It means, primarily, segmented and differential participation in an international market of messages that unexpectedly ‘penetrate’ the threshold of local cultures, leading to a real implosion of the senses of consumption/production/reproduction.⁷

‘Cultural heterogeneity’ (Brunner) or ‘multi-temporal heterogeneity’ (García Canclini) of Latin American time-space, are the characteristics which best describe the *discontinuous* state of a historico-social formation comprised of memories and segmented imaginaries, interwoven with tradition and progress, orality and telecommunication, folklore and commerce, myth and ideology, rite and simulacrum, etc. The incoherent expressions of this peripheral modernity with its implants, transplants and shifting references, make it ‘a heteroclitite configuration of elements drawn from virtually anywhere, but always removed from their original context’⁸ and given a new function through the local dynamics of sign conversion.

Seen in this way, *borders* (especially Latin America as a border, a cultural periphery) are the places where models and references range beyond the networks of meaning ordered and controlled by the cultural hegemony of the centre, which obliges the signs to defend certain programs of representation aimed always at conserving the privileges accrued by centrality and totality. The ruptures in the universal design of central modernity liberate the meaning of those fractions of language and identity which are disseminated on the periphery of the universal-culture system, and which disturb the normative, official, control-codes of a ‘superior’ culture.

THE BORDER AS A FRONTIER OF IDENTITY AND
A TRANSCULTURAL CROSSROADS

The 'cultural heterogeneity' of Latin American space-time should not be understood as a mere aggregation of layers which passively lie over one another like the sediment of static pasts. Rather, it should be seen as the irregular combination of an already uneven series which has come to form part of an *active multiplicity* of conflictive temporalities.

Such a combination suggests a certain type of Latin American modernity which emerges as the tensional product of an interaction of forces that counterpose the international (metropolitan progress) and the regional (indigenous and popular traditions) within multi-layered formations. This concept of modernity stands in opposition to that presented by another Latin American vision, which is firmly anchored in the defence of a continental *ethos*: that is, of a Latin American identity whose *purity of origin* might be threatened by the interference of signs emanating from Northern modernity. According to this vision, the abstract universalism of the Western Logos and the functionalist rationalism of European modernity have disfigured the particular identity of Latin America by submerging its panoply of rites and beliefs beneath the mask Europeanizing ideologisms and technologisms.⁹

The collision of these two images of modernity (one as a super-imposed reference, and the other as an intermingled force) leads us back to the question of Latin American identity itself, and its divisions between the 'Own' and the 'Alien'. The entire history of cultural colonization, between whose lines of domination and subalternity Latin America has been forever ransomed, reflects the disjunctions of *identity by imposition* (when the Westernized norm of the Self enforces the reproduction of a monocultural pattern) or of *identity by opposition* (when the essentialist radicalization of the Other serves as a gesture of counter-identification). This interplay of being and seeming has been dramatized by Latin American cultural thought which sets *substance* (the indigenous background as the ontological reserve of a property-identity) against *appearance* (the mask of metropolitan culture as the mark of a borrowed identity). The entire continental – Latin Americanist – discourse of the quest and definition of 'Latin American identity' remained for the most part within the sway of this Manichean scheme which juxtaposes the internal (deep) and the external (superficial), the authentic

(native) and the false (foreign), the pure (virgin nature) and the polluted (industry and commerce), etc. So many of the controversies that enlivened the history of ideas in Latin America bear the scars of this skirmish between regionalism and cosmopolitanism (the polemic of modernism and of vanguards); between nationalism and multinational capitalism (the anti-imperialist critique of the North Americanization of consumption); between the Third World and the First World (the myth of resistance to the expansion of capital from areas which romantically phantasize that they are still free of trade and the traffic of the market-place); and so on.

Various shifts and reformulations of the coordinates of power – and of the circulation of power – which set up the play of forces between domination (the centre) and resistance (the periphery) have modified the theories of cultural dependency which formed the basis of thinking about Latin American identity in the 1960s. Certain of the changes in coordinates are related to the transnationalization of the information and communication markets which now disperse cultural power by following miniaturized networks for the colonization of imaginaries (passive consumption), but also of *differential resignification* of the messages transmitted (active and transformative reception). These movements of transference and interchange recombine *identities* (belonging) and *frontiers* (delimitation, circulation) in ways that are much more complex and subtle – as well as perverse – than was previously the case. They are movements that *detrterritorialize* the geographical course of the relationship between the 'popular' and the 'national': movements that demonstrate how Latin America has passed 'from the defence of the national and popular to the export of the international and popular',¹⁰ as with Brazilian television soap-operas which are consumed all over the world with a similar degree of success.

This detrterritorialization of the signs of cultural identity – exacerbated by the modernizing currents which disturb the boundaries of high culture and popular culture, of the national and the transnational, by combining hybrid registers of experience – makes it difficult to continue to defend metaphysical contemplation of that *being* which serves as the basis of Latin American substantialism concerning Origin. Such 'originary' thought mythologizes the past (roots, sources) and effortlessly converts it into folklore, a reservoir of guardians for a preset identity. The traditionalism and fundamentalism of the 'Own' is based on an archaic memory and a nostalgic return to origins. It takes no account of the fact that that

which is 'Ours' is the product of a dialogic interrelationship which crosses multiple and shifting registers of experience. Identity is not the ritual store of a founding (originating, transcendental) truth to which one must return in search of *one* sole sense of belonging. Identity is a moving construction which is formed and transformed according to the dynamics of those confrontations and alliances in which the cultural subject participates in ever-changing circumstances. From this point of view, 'authenticity' can only be the creative product of a mixture of pasts and presents selected with regard to alternative futures, assembling quotations in order to dialogize the Self (the Own, the Ours), and placing it in tension with a variety of Other repertoires with which it establishes relationships of borrowing and negotiation: 'metaphors of continuity and "survival" do not account for complex historical processes of appropriation, compromise, subversion, masking, invention, and revival'.¹¹ Once assembled, these repertoires give place to cross-cultural constructions in which the mixing up and confusion of signs takes the form either of *collage* (the unlikely coming together of pre-existing materials transposed contextually) or of *parody* ('an imitation which mocks the original',¹² by employing double meaning as a satirical device to challenge the authority of the model).

Mestizaje has been one of the formulations of the *impure* according to which Latin American culture has portrayed itself as a mixture. But *mestizaje* 'is not only that racial fact from which we come, but the current plot of modernity and cultural discontinuities, of social formations and structures of feeling, of memories, of imaginaries which mix together the indigenous and the rural, the rural and the urban, folklore and the popular and the popular with the massive'.¹³ These present-day crosses and appropriations connect into the history of syncretism and hybridization that Latin America inherited from its colonial past: operations of cultural transvestism which today the aesthetics of *simulation* and of *fragmentation* rename as postmodernist operations.

CULTURAL POWER AND THE DISSEMINATION OF MEANING

Centre and periphery sealed their relationship of hierarchy and dependence through the original-copy pairing which transcribes the dogma of cultural colonization: the original as first meaning

and the only one legitimized by the supremacy of the centre (the model), and the copy as a mimetic reproduction which translates it into an inferior, subordinated tongue.

The tradition of Latin American cultural thought always reserved for the 'enlightened elites' the task of mediating the gulf between progress and backwardness, spreading the lessons of the translated model. This was the machine for the production of outlines-of-culture, and reference-guides to metropolitan signification. The role of these 'enlightened elites' which had 'since independence . . . articulat[ed] foreign thought', has been to 'reproduce the international debate between European countries',¹⁴ by serving as *translators* of the canonized significations of the centre. Alberto Moreiras writes of 'translation' as a key agency of mediation through which Latin America has always attempted to resolve the distance between metropolis and periphery, continually adapting the *text* (the first enunciation) to the *reading* conditions of the context of reception-appropriation.¹⁵ Modernity imprinted the model with codes that absolutized its meaning as first, unique and total: a process that was legitimized universally through the canonic weight of the Western tradition.

In light of such formidable constructions, a key question (and its implications) comes to the fore: how is the transculturizing operation of the Latin American periphery to be redefined, especially when the 'text' to be translated is no longer the unique and foundational (vertical) text of the modernity of the centre, but rather the plural and disseminative (horizontal) text of a postmodernity which speaks to us of decentrings?

The postmodern scene contemplates various processes by which the 'strong' categories of rationality and the absolutization of truth – which modernity had elevated to 'master' status – can effectively be 'weakened'. As a register of 'a crisis of cultural authority, specifically of the authority vested in European culture and its institutions',¹⁶ postmodernity entails a questioning of various of the notions on which the supremacy of a fixed pattern of meaning was founded. These include: notions of *totality* (the disintegrated fragment replaces the completeness of the whole); of *centrality* (there is no longer any fixed point to justify the superior domain of an absolute reference); and of *uniqueness* (the monologic thought of the Self has been challenged by the dispersed heterogeneity of the multiple). One result of these challenges is the precipitation of a profound crisis of cultural identity.

We are now witnessing the pluralization of meaning, the fragmentation of identity, and new disseminations of power. Meaning systems have been pluralized and relativized: languages, history and society are rendered as texts, and no longer respond to forms of transcendental signification which subordinated the understanding of the real to its unique code of hierarchized reading. Instead, the new relativism permits signs to disperse horizontally as the plots (counter-narratives) of provisional and transitory interpretations. Identities are fragmented: the – homogenous and transparent – subject of metaphysical rationalism in command of her/himself has disintegrated into various Selves which combine multiple, unstable, traces of sexual, social and cultural identification. Power is disseminated: there is no longer some fixed polarity which localizes power in one centre, but diffuse networks which multiply and subdivide their points of antagonism and lines of confrontation. This postmodern ramification of power, which misaligns the topography of a centralized referent, giving rise to a fluctuating, multi-lineal network, supposes that 'centres' and 'peripheries' are now redrafted as multi-sited functions. These (and other) Postmodern redefinitions of meaning, identity and power necessarily inflect the whole notion of the *centre* in important ways.

The mass-mediated landscape of contemporary technoculture promotes the belief that the 'satellization of the real' precipitates the effects of planetary interconnection of a myriad of times-spaces scattered across the centre and periphery of 'the news'. It does so by giving an impression of *ubiquity* which solicits an understanding that 'the multiple images, interpretations and reconstitutions' of reality (which the news media distribute) function without any 'central coordination'.¹⁷ The apparent suppression of distance between the *event* as centre (production of reality) and the *news* as periphery (transmission-reception of information) comes about in two ways. First, because the news is consumed *simultaneously* in any part of the world, the sensation of a homogenization of content is created, leveling out the historico-social unevennesses caused by asymmetries of context. Secondly, the news itself erases the distance between event and information, through the hyper-mediation of the real as an image of an image which is overexposed and recycled to the point of hyper-realist saturation. This way of confusing the distances which mediate and separate the different points spread throughout the network of information production and communication gives the impression that the conditions for the reception of

news in separate (distinct and distant) contexts have finally been equalled out, and contributes to the perceived dysfunctionality of the opposition centre/periphery. Such a dissolution is assisted by the simultaneity of consumption – transnationalized by the information market – which serves to reduce and annul the *out-of-time* that is constitutive of peripheral backwardness.

It is not only the everyday influence of the mass media that blurs the traditional relations between centre and periphery: there are also important philosophical reconceptualizations of identity and difference. These include the postmetaphysical critiques of the philosophies of ‘difference’, which also seek to dissolve the opposition, governing the logocentric tradition, between centres as points of origination and foundation, and peripheries as derivative and subaltern. Text and writing are understood as pure webs of spacing and differings. The conceptual privilege of a primal trace which retains the transcendental meaning of a unique truth, and the value of the original as a model residing in the supremacy of origin, in its foundational hierarchy, are canceled out. These postmodern shifts reveal the contra-canonical features of a new fragmentation of meaning, now indeterminate and multivalent. They necessarily raise the question as to whether (and how) such changes modify the production and reception of the authority which had previously defined – and occluded – the periphery.

If the postmodern text is characterized by its ‘discontinuity’, we might also suppose that the postmetaphysical economy of the fragmentation and dissemination of meaning could be useful to the periphery as an anti-fundamentalist device in its rebellion against the dogma of the centre. It is in this sense that we should understand the affirmation that ‘postmodernity, for postcolonial societies, is an instrument of decolonization’.¹⁸ Given that ‘totalization threatens the possibility of emancipation for postcolonial societies because it has the ideological prestige of the lost original’,¹⁹ the postmodern critique of totalization effected from the dispersed fragment that emphasizes the breaking-up of the whole should become an instrument of anti-colonialist rebellion and liberation. We should not forget, however, that ‘totalization’ – which ‘is produced by the factic discourse of socioeconomic power and its ideological projections’,²⁰ – leaves its trace behind each time an enunciation transmits meaning, always capitalizing upon the value of a representation of authority. And, no matter how the dislocated rhetoric of postmodernism would draw it, we should also remember that the

centre continues to behave as a marker of prestige and authority. In fact, the centre, split up into multiple centre-functions, no longer carries out its role within the geographical realism of a metropolitan setting. The centre has dis-located itself into a series of centre-functions which exercise their power of authority by dictating usages, settling meanings, making rulings, decreeing currency, etc. The symbolic power of the centre derives from the privileged discursive spaces it occupies through its direction and control of an international network of metropolitan guarantees, comprising, for example, the most influential 'universities, journals, institutions, exhibitions, [and] editorial imprints' in the academic discussion of ideas.²¹

Furthermore, if we believe that the postmodernist theory of fragmentation – a rejection of the dogmatizing tyranny of the system or method – generates a disposition favourable to certain peripheral operations (such as the operations of quotation, of montage and collage, of parody, etc.) it must also be acknowledged that the practice of writing/rewriting the fragment (of any fragment, including a fragment of postmodernist theory) is not an undetermined practice. That is, the practice of the fragment is not a practice free from the determinants of power that rule the productions of culture. Neither the fragment, nor its rewriting, are immune to those givens which the 'word games' of cultural power exercise over devices and procedures, over-legitimizing or delegitimizing their use. This power leads to the fact that postmodernist theories of the fragment are received in the periphery as theories *mediated by* the signs of success which promote their status as theories forged in the discourse of 'American International[ism]' (Huyssen). These signs are mobilized so persuasively to demonstrate the irrefutability of enunciations generated in the centre that they reconstitute around the fragment an image of totality and systematization (that sanctioned by the efficiency switch of the metropolitan core) which removes all freeness and provisionality from the cuttings. Which is to say that the fragment, in spite of its desacralization of the matrix of authority of the whole, is resacralized by the periphery when the periphery applies it as material or procedure 'authorized' and legitimized by the 'superiority' of metropolitan theory.

As is well known, the hierarchy of the centre is based not only on the fact that it concentrates wealth and controls its material distribution. The superiority of the centre depends upon its being invested with sufficient authority to qualify it as a giver of meaning:

its symbolic advantage relies upon its monopolizing discursive and communicative devices to transact signs, values and powers, representing the area of the greatest condensation of signs, of the greatest circulatory and transactional density of current validated meanings. This is why in order to decentre the Centre, it is not sufficient to incorporate the rhetoric of the other (of the marginal, of the peripheral) within the progressive concerns of academic intellectuals. The pluralization and democratization of the mechanisms of cultural signification depend on the dehierarchization of the positions and functions of discourses which comprise the circuit of production and discursive and critical interchange.²² This dehierarchization is impelled by two types of force:

1. those which move certain international theorists of 'alternative postmodernity'²³ to dare to 'use privilege to destroy privilege'²⁴: that is, to break the exclusive, and excluding, monopoly of self-reference under the label of 'North American Academia,' calling on voices from other parts of the world to promote their strategies of socio-cultural intervention;
2. those which emerge from the border as a *site of enunciation* capable of mobilizing forces which traverse the limits of the systems of cultural distribution, thus revealing not only its arbitrariness (the fact that lines are drawn and redrawn by force) but also its *vulnerability*, given that new marginal pacts dealing with negotiations with signs constantly threaten to destabilize the legitimation of power.

(Translated by John Brotherton)

Notes

1. Bonaventura de Souza Santos, 'Una cartografía simbólica de las representaciones sociales', *Nueva Sociedad*, no. 116 (Caracas) (November-December 1991), p. 23.
2. Christine Buci-Glucksmann, *La raison baroque: De Baudelaire à Benjamin* (Paris: Editions Galilée, 1984), p. 34.
3. Ibid.
4. Claudio Magris, 'Esayo sobre el fin', cited in 'La remoción de lo moderno: Vienna del 1900' ed. Nicolas Casullo, (Buenos Aires: Nueva Visión, 1991), pp. 43-4. [trans. Graciela Ovejero]

5. Jesus Martin Barbero, *De los medios a las mediaciones* (Barcelona: Gustavo Gili, 1987), p. 165.
6. José Joaquín Brunner, *Un espejo trizado* (Santiago: Flacso, 1988), p. 219.
7. *Ibid.*, pp. 217–18 [trans. Graciela Ovejero].
8. *Ibid.*
9. See Pedro Morandé, *Cultura y Modernización en América Latina* (Santiago: Universidad Católica, 1984); especially ch. 12.
10. Renato Ortiz cited by Nestor García Canclini, *Culturas híbridas* (Mexico: Grijalbo, 1990), p. 290.
11. James Clifford in *The Predicament of Culture* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1988), p. 338.
12. See Fredric Jameson 'Postmodernism and consumer society', in Hal Foster (ed), *The Anti-aesthetic: Essays in Postmodern Culture* (Port Townsend, WA: Bay Press, 1983), p. 113.
13. Barbero, 'De los medios', p. 10.
14. Bernardo Subercaseaux, 'La apropiación cultural en el pensamiento latinoamericano', *Estudios Públicos*, no. 31 (Santiago), p. 42.
15. Alberto Moreiras, 'Transculturación y pérdida del sentido', *Nuevo Texto Crítico*, no. 6 (1991) (Stanford University), p. 108.
16. Craig Owens 'The Discourse of Others: Feminists and Post-modernism', in Hal Foster, *The Anti-aesthetic*, p. 57.
17. Gianni Vattimo, *La sociedad transparente* (Barcelona: Paidós, 1990), p. 81.
18. Moreiras, 'Transculturación', p. 117.
19. *Ibid.*, p. 116.
20. *Ibid.*
21. Gayatri Spivak cited by George Yúdice, 'El conflicto de postmodernidades', *Nuevo Texto Crítico*, no. 7 (1991) (Stanford University), p. 29.
22. Following the argument developed by Edward Said in the interview 'In the Shadow of the West', in *Discourses: Conversations in Postmodern Art and Culture* (New York: The New Museum, 1990), p. 95.
23. Yúdice, 'El conflicto de postmodernidades', p. 34.
24. Jean Franco, 'Going Public: Reinhabiting the Private', in G. Yúdice, J. Franco and J. Flores (eds), *On Edge: The Crisis of Contemporary Culture* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1992), p. 80.