Introduction

What does it mean, in practice, to “gender” Transnational American Studies? And, conversely, what does the study of gender gain through sustained dialogue with Transnational American Studies? Whether we view gender and transnationalism as themselves fields of study, or as tools for doing analyses of American culture (broadly conceived), the growing trend to situate these terms relationally is bringing important intellectual benefits.

One pathway for highlighting this evolving process is to consider the history of each term as a keyword often employed in multi-, inter-, and transdisciplinary cultural studies. In arguing for this linkage as worthwhile (even, perhaps, crucial) to American Studies, a look back to Raymond Williams’s groundbreaking Keywords and its various heirs is instructive. “Gender” (Williams 1983[1976]) is not included either in Williams’s original 1970s’ keywords list or in his 1980s’ update. (Williams does treat “Sex,” though not as “sexuality” would typically be described now in relation to the field of Gender Studies.) Alan Durant’s 2008 Critical Quarterly essay contextualizes the decision-making driving Williams’s original selection of terms as an artifact with 1950s–1960s’ roots (Durant 2008, 123). To illuminate the contingent—and necessarily evolving—nature of such lists, Durant also re-issues Williams’s call within the Keywords volumes of 1976 and 1983 for readers to view blank pages there as invitations to “amendments, corrections and additions” (quoted in Durant 2008, 122). Durant himself describes an experiment with attendees at a 2007 seminar in Cambridge, UK, where ten participants were asked to identify ten items from Williams’s work to delete and ten new terms to add. Intriguingly, neither “gender” nor “sexuality” emerged from this exercise as a necessary addition (Durant 2008, 141).

However, “gender,” as well as “sexuality,” did appear in the 2005 revised edition of Keywords under the editorship of Tony Bennett, Lawrence Grossberg, and Meaghan Morris (Bennett et al. 2005). “Transnationalism” is not, however, on these editors’ list of new entries, nor did it emerge from Durant’s experiment with collective list-making, though globalization had by this time claimed a spot for both adjudicatory groups. Intriguingly, in fact, Durant used the example of “globalisation” and “geopolitical changes” such as “British decolonisation, the end of apartheid in South Africa, and global warming” to illustrate how large-scale social change leads new terms to claim keyword status (Durant 2008, 126). This
gradual incorporation of both gender and globalism (which we might view as a precursor to transnationalism) should therefore remind us that, if keywords themselves come and go, linkages like the one envisioned in this very essay are, also, contingent in the long run, no matter how crucial they may seem at a given moment. As I write this essay, both “gender” and “transnationalism” seem relatively safely ensconced in the American Studies lexicon, so proposing possibilities for connecting them becomes a logical next step. Indeed, right now, in our early twenty-first century time frame, gender and transnationalism seem eminently harmonious in a shared capacity to productively support American Studies.

Here’s one case in point. Julian Wolfrey’s Critical Keywords in Literary and Cultural Theory (2004) offered a detailed gloss identifying major themes in Gender Studies, such as the impact of gender ideology, distinctions between gender and sex, and the need for scholarship to address connections between patriarchy and power. Wolfrey’s presentation also emphasized the contested and unstable nature of gender. These traits fell clearly in line with American Studies’ growing resistance to received narratives from that field’s prior history, such as the myth of US exceptionalism, as well as with the rejection of stable geographic boundaries for “America.” Influential voices in that chorus had been assembled, for instance, in the essay collection, The Futures of American Studies, edited by Robyn Wiegman and Donald E. Pease (2002). This trend in American Studies to extend “America” outward beyond the US has been illustrated more recently through projects like Camilla Fojas and Rudy P. Guevara’s edited volume, Transnational Crossroads: Remapping the Americas and the Pacific (2012), along with the launch of the online Journal of Transnational American Studies and the growing but over-due visibility of American Studies programs offered outside the US.

In gender studies, calls from scholars like Inderpal Grewal have offered parallel resources for redefining that field’s landscape of inquiry, including Transnational America: Feminisms, Diasporas, Neoliberalisms (2005) and the textbook Grewal co-authored with Caren Kaplan, An Introduction to Women’s Studies: Gender in a Transnational World (2002). Thus, at the same time that Gender Studies was increasingly complicating its foundational themes so as to examine the fluidity of gender and sexuality, and re-positioning the field in a global context, so too was American Studies.

Affirming these compatible views of gender and transnationalism, the Keywords for American Cultural Studies (edited by Bruce Burgett and Glenn Hendler (2007)) included Lisa Lowe’s treatment of “Globalization” and an ambitious treatment of “Gender” by Judith Halberstam. Lowe’s sweeping review of cultural critics’ engagement with globalization as a generative keyword wove in multiple examples of its interaction with gender to analyse important social phenomena, including the shift from a US-situated, male-gendered manufacturing workforce to more transnational female service industries; recalibrations of US identity mythology away from idealized visions of rural manhood and geopolitical dominance through post-World War II power; and the rise of transnational feminism linked to human rights movements. On a parallel track, Halberstam’s (2007) essay, while underscoring multi-disciplinary approaches to gender studies, explicitly acknowledged trends in gender research as influenced by global perspectives. Overall, we can see that American Studies, in line with its self-reflexive, expansive, and interdisciplinary nature, has been connecting trends in gender analysis with the movement to situate the previously-US-focused field transnationally.

A comparable development is evident in disciplinary-oriented explications of the work Gender Studies should be doing now. Oliver Janz’s and Daniel Schönplüg’s Gender History in a Transnational Perspective (2014) asserts that “Historians the world over have accepted the challenges of a new global perspective on women’s and gender history,” even while recognizing that “global networks, exchanges and interdependencies are not recent phenomena”
(Janz and Schönplflug 2014, 1). That is, essays in the Janz/Schönplflug collection distinguish between the relatively recent scholarly commitment to transnationalism and actual historical experiences of gendered actors operating transnationally, a not-new phenomenon they see as having been under-examined for too long. As part of a stance advocating for transnational Gender Studies, Janz and Schönplflug’s “Introduction” takes up such questions as the difference between “international” and “transnational,” terms they distinguish by viewing the former as (primarily) involving official governmental units and the latter as focusing on more informal social networks (Janz and Schönplflug 2014, 2). They see transnational work as involving experiences potentially forming networks, movements, and spaces of interaction to “bridge boundaries” and develop new “rules and … specific features that cannot be traced back to their national origins” (Janz and Schönplflug 2014, 2). Therefore, although their collection frames its exploration of gender and transnationalism around the particular discipline of history, Gender History in a Transnational Perspective contributes to the trend of linking the two frameworks.

Similarly, a special 2016 issue of the Gender and History journal presents a cluster of essays examining how historical research’s empirical and theoretical interpretations are viewing gender formation as an interactive social process resisting fixed binaries and borders such as the nation. Consistent with the gender work outlined above, this special issue also affirms important goals such as complicating previously overgeneralized terms like “women’s” as a category of analysis. Further, in an indication that American Studies’ increasing conjunction of analytical points like transnationalism with gender has become a frequent practice for Gender Studies itself, the introductory overview by Shireen Hasim salutes essays by Anna Krylova, Mary Louise Roberts, Linda Gordon, and Lynn Thomas for productively pairing gender with another concept (in their case, agency, intersectionality, binarity, and crisis).

Given such approaches appearing in multiple academic areas, we should note how individual projects from multiple disciplines are explicitly linking “gender” and “transnationalism” in their research designs from the outset. Catherine Nolin’s Transnational Ruptures: Gender and Forced Migration (2006) exemplifies this strategy by using a gender lens to challenge assumptions about immigrants’ responses to their new homes, both during and after migration. Nolin’s project draws on her background in human/cultural geography and on her commitment to feminist activism in tracking women refugees’ moves from Guatemala to Canada. Her book’s focus on two American spaces outside the US signals its affiliation with a more literal form of Transnational American Studies. Her use of gender to showcase women migrants’ distinctive experiences—such as the social networks they join during stages ranging from emigration itself to maintaining homeland connections—affirms Nolin’s commitment to combining the two lenses.

Migration and associated cross-cultural experiences, in fact, have been among the most productive topics for researchers yoking Gender Studies with transnationalism in American Studies. Patricia R. Pessar and Sarah J. Mahler have retraced a growing prevalence of gender as a lens for studying transnational migration back to the 1970s, when they say such research arose in a limited way, to increased attention in the 1980s (though with over-emphasis on quantitative data-gathering over multi-faceted analysis), to their own efforts to promote a more theoretically informed approach in the 1990s (culminating in a special issues of the journal Identities: Global Studies in Culture and Power). By 2003, their essay on “Transnational Migration: Bringing Gender In” for The International Migration Review (Pessar and Mahler 2003) could point to multiple strands of emerging scholarship, such as connecting studies of gender and migration to other transnational social trends, creating more longitudinal projects, adding in more studies of children, and focusing on geographic areas beyond the Americas.
Indeed, as both an actual experience evident in today’s media-saturated cultural landscape and a ready metaphor inviting theorizing, migration now serves as a generative nexus for such research. And gendered mobility need not involve a permanent relocation in order to illuminate meaningful transnational cultural exchange. Some projects, such as Nolin’s referenced above, still concentrate on gendered subjects seeking a permanent new home somewhere in the Americas. But the profile of Kato Shidzué (or Baroness Shidzué Ishimoto) in Karen Kuo’s *East is West and West is East* (2012) takes a different tack focused on cultural transfer by examining the impact of Ishimoto’s meeting activists Margaret Sanger, Mary Beard, and Agnes Smedley during travel to the US and the Japanese woman’s subsequent campaigns against nationalism and industrialization’s abuse of female workers back in Asia. On the more literary side of American Studies that blends a nod to its “myth and symbol” heritage with an embrace of comparative transnationalism, Juanita Heredia has juxtaposed narratives by two authors chronicling connections between gender and border-crossing identity formation. Overlaying gender and transnationalism to read their narratives, Heredia’s content analysis situates Chicana author Sandra Cisneros’ *Caramelo* and Peruvian-American writer Marie Arana’s *American Chica* comparatively (2007). Heredia’s intercultural reading reveals similarities around transnational gender identity formation that can be traced alongside distinctions linked to genealogy, ethnicity, and place-based differences. Taken together, projects like Nolin’s, Kuo’s, and Heredia’s embody an American Studies attuned to both gender and transnational contexts of experience—including addressing the intellectual tensions still operating at their conjunction.

In line with such research, a number of other studies capitalize on one of the central concepts in feminist thought today—intersectionality. For example, consistent with intersectionality’s calls to highlight race, ethnicity and social class differences to resist overgeneralization, studies of gender in a transnational American Studies context are employing such strategies as comparative geographic analysis and attention to generational differences. Accordingly, in his essay for *Diaspora*, Augusto Espiritu drew careful distinctions between the lives of Carlos Bulosan and Carlos P. Romulo and between typical representations of their careers as depicted in Asian American Studies (Espiritu 2003). Critiquing a gendered ideology of “hero construction” tied to expectations for a male immigrant leader, Espiritu sought “to enlarge the conceptual categories” framing these two different figures “by interpreting their lives and texts from the perspective of reciprocity, gender, and performance” (Espiritu 2003, 363). For Espiritu, the longstanding elevation of Bulosan exemplifies, in part, the rhetorical construction of an immigrant hero, whereas the virtual erasure of Romulo reflects the impact of multiple differences in their backgrounds, including their political perspectives and their social class identities.

Along related lines, in my own work for one chapter of *Managing Literacy, Mothering America* (Robbins 2006[2004]) on the US missionary Laura Haygood’s life in China across multiple decades, and in a later series of collaborative studies of Nellie Arnott’s early twentieth-century service as a missionary educator in Angola, I have sought to position the American women’s foreign mission movement in a fluid transnational network shaped by and shaping gender roles (Robbins and Pullen 2011). We need to recognize that the gendered performances of many cross-cultural agents like individual missionaries, medical workers in Doctors without Borders, and Peace Corps members, even when situated within a seemingly consistent transnational organization, come to us through complex representational filters. In the case of missionaries, even those affiliated with seemingly homogenous enterprises such as Protestant evangelizing, our efforts to recover their experiences depend on such complex sources as denominational magazines framed for a particular audience—usually white, middle-class donors back in the US. So, for example, analysis of the gendered
transnationalism carried out by two African American women (Nora Gordon and Clara Howard) serving at a Baptist station in the Congo toward the close of the nineteenth century should note differences in how their stories are told in a periodical for a well-to-do white audience potentially sending financial support from New England versus how these same young women are characterized for young black students reading about Gordon and Howard in the *Spelman Messenger*, the gender-and-race-affirming periodical of their alma mater in Atlanta (Robbins 2017, 58–64).

Whether we zero in on the particular case of Laura Haygood (a privileged, well-educated white American and longtime administrator in an outpost of the British empire), Nellie Arnott (an initially-insecure white American teacher in a Portuguese stronghold during the race for Africa), or Nora Gordon and Clara Howard (African Americans enacting a vision of race-based servant leadership in the Congo), these gendered, transnational social agents should be seen as operating within a matrix of complex, sometimes contradictory, cross-cultural relationships. Their experiential networks would rarely, if ever, fit straightforwardly into such neat categories as “US imperialist.” Neither, of course, would we want to cast them as carrying out a purely liberatory program—even when Arnott is determinedly bringing young Umbundu girls into a safe space for schooling that honors their resistance against an early arranged marriage in ways foreshadowing many of today’s transnational campaigns for girls’ education. When Arnott’s own magazine stories for donor consumption back in the US emphasize young “heathen” women’s hesitancy to embrace conversion to her religion, we should recognize both the audience-related performative features of this gendered discourse and related signs of Arnott’s own limited ability to reach a level of intercultural understanding that we seek today. When multiple contested influences come together in any transnational space, after all, gender is not performed in isolation, but within an ongoing constellation of social forces contributing to individual identity formation and to the ongoing, multifaceted work of culture-making. And that would include institutions ranging from a local mission school to the multi-national, interlocking organizations guiding foreign missions led by diverse management teams representing different denominations.

Undoubtedly, feminist scholarship has moved away from overgeneralized categories such as “women” to addressing identity structures such as race and social class as interacting with gender. This approach, in turn, provides models for attending to local community, regional, national, and international differences operating within and across transnational sites of social action. Considering a transnational space or experience as being “intersectional,” similar to a gendered performance being “intersectional,” requires examining both terms in the most localized context possible. At the same time, we can still identify nodes of social action as gradually forming networks which, connecting through cross-site cultural exchange, may even become, themselves, transnational in their impact.

Thus, when studying missionary teaching, a gendered Transnational American Studies would take into account differences between the social authority of a male preacher at a particular station and an unpaid wife serving alongside him: gender-informed analyses can underscore how patriarchy-connected power differentials shape both the transnational space of action and individuals’ lived experiences there. On a parallel front, a carefully localized consideration of transnational activity by missionaries interacting with a native population in a particular place helps us draw important contrasts between an early twentieth century posting of American missionaries to Hawai‘i, where the US was itself a colonizing power, versus individuals being sent in the same decade by the same US-based missionary organization to Angola. In that second locale, Protestant teams from the US could be viewed by the Portuguese rulers as potentially dangerous collaborators aiding local blacks’ resistance by providing
access to literacy learning, resisting European settlers’ participation in the slave trade, and offering up a brand of Christianity at odds with the colonizing power’s Catholicism. The nation-inflected affiliations and associated gender performance of a missionary in that Angola location at that time would be quite distinctive from his/her Hawai‘i counterpart—despite their both being paid by the American Board of Commissioners of Foreign Missions (ABCFM).

If marking distinctions operating within a seemingly coherent social enterprise is one essential commitment of an intersectional gendered transnationalism, we can still connect these concepts to illuminate experiences most interesting for their gendered promotion of shared values and social practices across borders. In that vein, one strand of gendered Transnational American Studies can explicate (and sometimes even celebrate) community-building resistance against social norms based in restrictive gender and national identity norms. For example, we might critically re-examine such solidarity-seeking enterprises as the nineteenth-century women’s suffrage campaign, or the women’s peace movement during World War I, or, more recently, the networks of gendered activism now combatting sex trafficking of young girls across borders.

In attending to points of affiliation, collaboration, and shared vision alongside elements of difference, our efforts to combine gender and transnationalism analyses need to scrutinize where and how cross-cultural forces influence both individuals and related social structures of interaction. One fruitful pathway should shift the focus of inquiry and interpretation from the most mobile actors (whether men or women) crossing borders from one national location to another to the gendered responses of people living in the transnational spaces where others’ mobility has an impact. So, for instance, per one case referenced above, though students who attended Nellie Arnott’s mission school in Angola did not usually cross borders themselves into a different national setting, their village became a transnational space by virtue of her presence there. What impact did her work have on individuals and the community, in terms of re-figuring the gendered social practices at play, and to what extent did individuals there begin to see themselves as part of a transnational community—say, one connected through certain new gender practices in domestic life, or through a negotiated accommodation of multiple spiritual traditions, or at other nodes of cross-cultural contact? Addressing such questions entails moving beyond Arnott’s own textual records to such sources as letters written by former students after her return to the US and stories from later generations of Angolans still being shaped by the previous mission work there.

In their introduction to Gender History in a Transnational Perspective, Janz and Schönpfug suggest that their scholarly practice addresses similar questions by combining both a comparative approach focused on highlighting differences at play within a specific case with interpretations highlighting “transfers across cultures” (Janz and Schönpfug 2014, 3). Combining these two perspectives, they point out, enables analysis of “the complex processes of exchange taking place, generating effects of appropriation, refusal, reinterpretation and translation” (Janz and Schönpfug 2014, 4). This blended methodology can also better explore the ongoing process of community formation in transnational spaces, including networks that become institutions and thereby “bridge boundaries and incorporate trace elements of the different contexts from which they evolved” (Janz and Schönpfug 2014, 4).

One of the benefits—and associated challenges—of such work is bringing often-marginalized cultural agents into the forefront. How? Similar to the embrace of intersectionality as an analytical tool, scholars are drawing on the feminist recovery movement’s techniques to find, describe, and interpret textual records and current voices positioning gendered transnational experiences within more comprehensive social matrices than when we focus on
individuals with fuller access to opportunities like mobility or institution-building. Beth Piatote’s *Domestic Subjects: Gender, Citizenship, and Law in Native American Literature* provides one apt model (2013).

Piatote uses the domestic space of Native American communities—which were and are themselves distinctive nations—as a site of inquiry for recovering how indigenous citizens resisted the assimilation movement between 1879 and 1934, including its government-managed schools and the allotment of Native reservation lands. While Piatote’s study involves tracking the gendered roles of such agents as white field matrons and paternalistic administrators, she asserts a different core emphasis for her project: “The primary objective of this book is to make visible the resilience of the tribal-national domestic by centering the intimate domestic (the Indian home and family) as the primary site of struggle against the foreign force of U.S. national domestication” (Piatote 2013, 4). In other words, in the context of my advocacy here for linking of gender and transnationalism—and especially for using these terms with support from feminist practices like intersectionality and recovery—Piatote is constructing an interpretive framework that situates the contest over sovereignty within Native American communities as a *gendered, transnational* conflict carried out on multiple planes. She offers new readings of texts by writers like S. Alice Callahan (Creek), E. Pauline Johnson (Mohawk), John Milton Oskison (Cherokee), and Mourning Dove (Okanogan) to show how they “found themselves on the front lines of defending home and family during the assimilation era”; further, she locates their writings in a shared site of inter-tribal resistance where law, literature, and other gendered interventions interact (Piatote 2013, 11). Piatote stresses that, consistent with both the distinct tribal national identities of these activist-writers and the patriarchal power of their opponents from US and Canadian nations, this history of sustained gendered conflict must be viewed in *transnational* terms. Indeed, she argues: “This book demonstrates … that any examination of Native Americans during this period is of necessity transnational at its core, centering on the contest between two forms of sovereignty—settler-national and tribal-national rule—as competing national formations” (Piatote 2013, 10).

An approach akin to Piatote’s, intertwining both gender and transnationalism, can be as readily applied to contemporary social sites as to historical ones. Christopher Pullen’s *LGBT Transnational Identity and the Media*, for instance, examines how the transnational network-building capacities of our new technologies offer expansive versions of mobility affirming “proactive possibility of new connections” (Pullen 2012, 5). Specifically, he affirms: “For LGBT identity, the advent of transnational media connections, across diverse nations, East and West and the developed world and the Third World, offers new scope for sexual identity, in ways previously unseen” (Pullen 2012, 6).

For Pullen, the ability to envision an “imagined” LGBT community acquires theoretical energy from thinking about transnationalism as independent of actual migration across territorial lines and instead achievable through “a Deleuzian potential” producing “a new shared imagination” (Pullen 2012, 6). On a pragmatic level, Pullen suggests, solidarity projects like those addressed within various chapters of his essay collection draw on new media practices that erase (or at least undermine) the specifics of geographic location, instead creating “connective strands” nurtured through technology-supported exchange (Pullen 2012, 7). While celebrating this potential, Pullen does hope his own and future scholarly-activist work can avoid cultivating an Anglocentric LGBT transnational vision or one that excludes such aspects of sexual diversity as asexuality and intersexuality (Pullen 2012, 9). In any case, whether or not Pullen’s collection achieves his introduction’s stated goal of “a focus on difference as cohesion” (Pullen 2012, 15), this project’s tracing of particular instances when
twenty-first-century media exchanges have promoted a queer cosmopolitanism accrues epistemological dividends from bringing new media studies into dialogue with gender and transnationalism.

The collection also demonstrates how expanded analytical spaces such as queer cosmopolitanism can enhance our understanding of “America.” For instance, Bruce E. Drushel’s chapter revisits George Takei’s “coming out” in the waning days of Star Trek storytelling and speculates on what the impact of that revelation might have been, had it come earlier (Drushel 2012). While Star Trek is repeatedly referenced as extending beyond the global out into aspirational space, Drushel also explores (and thereby illuminates) the nationally located experience of Takei’s family during the World War II internment of Japanese Americans to justify the actor’s reluctance to reveal a potentially disruptive aspect of his identity.

Ultimately, one result of such multi-faceted linkages may sometimes be having “American” fade into the background of our interpretive frameworks. For media studies, in particular, the boundary-crossing potential of discursive exchange is being continually enhanced as more and more individuals across the globe acquire access to communication tools. (Here, on a personal note, I remember discussing with a young tour guide in rural China how his entire family’s daily life—and their sense of themselves—shifted when they acquired one shared cell phone.) As part of that process, the formation of “nation” as a source of meaning and identity is increasingly undermined, replaced (or at least supplemented) by other affiliative frames.

At the same time, as the post-World War II sociopolitical power of “America” (especially the US) declines in (and in the aftermath of) the Trumpian era, we could well see a growing emphasis on other nations’ cultural capital reflected in scholarly projects organized around gender and transnationalism. Academic analyses may increasingly take on positions like Smitha Radhakrishnan’s Appropriately Indian: Gender and Culture in a New Transnational Class. Her study of a “new form of Indianness realized by Indian IT professionals” hinges in large part on what she terms “cultural streamlining” (Radhakrishnan 2011, 22), which enables a particular “transnational class” of feminized IT workers in and from India to navigate a global economy while maintaining strong ties to their national culture (Radhakrishnan 2011, 21). Tellingly, Radhakrishnan employs project design and interpretive tools I have discussed here as particularly useful to scholarship yoking gender and transnationalism. In Appropriately Indian, these include intersectionality (in this case, with a heavy emphasis on social class distinctions) and careful attention to comparative geography (here, an effort to address Indian IT workers situated in several locations beyond India, such as South Africa). In addition, Radhakrishnan deploys a strategic brand of feminist recovery blending standpoint self-positioning with interviews and textual analysis (such as setting participants’ responses to popular cultural imagery depicting Indian women IT workers in boundary-crossing magazines like Wired alongside the author’s own readings).

Radhakrishnan folds into her introduction two elements that may forecast a shifting position for “America” in cultural work linking gender and transnationalism. One is a personal narrative. She tells the familiar story of her father’s migration to the US as a graduate student, but also chronicles his return to India to marry there before bringing his new bride back to America, and she describes how her own “background” (a term presented as a social-class-related keyword central to her study) has enabled her whole family to succeed away from their homeland while maintaining a strong Indian identity. This story reverberates with echoes from her earlier, more analytical discussion of why she has adopted the term “transnational” for her project, even though, she notes, “global” seems to be dominating popular discourse (including the conversations with her interviewees). Her explanation of
“transnational” lays out two crucial aspects of its meaning in her project (the sociological class of people she is studying and the national-boundary-crossing dimensions of her scope). However, Radhakrishnan also says she uses “transnational” to “assert the continued importance of the ‘national’ even as it might be transcended” (Radhakrishnan 2011, 18). And the national site whose culture, whose role as a site of self-definition, remains intact and therefore most critical, is India’s: even for Indians who have emigrated, and also for their children, to be a transnational IT professional actually enables continued participation in the homeland, through means such as travel and other social practices that nurture “a shared sense of cultural belonging.” So, she explains, “[t]he nation, as a territorial and cultural discourse, remains critical” (Radhakrishnan 2011, 19).
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