Theorizing the cultural borderlands: Imag(in)ing "them" and "us"

Phiona Stanley, UNSW Australia
phiona.stanley@unsw.edu.au

Introduction

When you have to call about a utilities bill and the call centre keeps you on hold for ten minutes, do you draw? Doodle? Me, I fill scraps of paper with long, looping flowers and squat, fat cats with long whiskers. What about when you're waiting for someone on a dusty road and you happen to have a long stick to hand: do you sweep patterns into the dirt? I draw swoops and spirals, the patterns of soaring seagulls and walks I'm yet to take. These are not really drawings *of* anything, they're movements, habituated actions. One could, undoubtedly, read meaning into my unthinking lines, but (or because?) they're not entirely conscious; I do not aim to communicate meaning to anyone beyond myself. Indeed, if I do want to communicate, I have plenty of other tools at my disposal: I can use language (several, in fact). I can dress a certain way or wear specific shoes. I can show through the paralinguistic subtleties of gesture, posture or facial expression how I feel.

As adults, many of us rarely draw beyond these kinds of swooping, looping doodles, perhaps because we have no need (or no talent? or it is not culturally all that common?) to communicate through visual art. But many, perhaps most, children create visual art across diverse cultures, and many will imbue their creations with meaning (Alland, 1983). This is not to say that children have no other recourses for meaning making; drawing is just one way of depicting the world and one's place within it. But children's art offers a window both into the minds of individuals and their socialization environments (Bertoia, 1993; Gernhardt, Rübeling, & Keller, 2013; Hall, 2010; Lorenzi-Cioldi, et al., 2011; Rübeling, et al., 2011).

As a parallel to this, I draw cats because I like them and because they are common animals in my environment. My cats are stylized, influenced by other cat depictions in my culture, including cartoon cats such as Jim Davis's 'Garfield' and Simon Tofield's 'Simon's cat'. I also *know* that cats have whiskers and so I draw them in, even though, when I look at a cat, its whiskers are not necessarily visible, and other animals have whiskers too. But in my mind cats are all about the whiskers, so my (conventional) drawing of a cat has long, obvious whiskers. So although 'my' doodled cats are 'mine', they are also products of my culture's relationship with cats and they are influenced by the way my culture relates to, and depicts, cats (in particular) and the natural world (in general). My cat, for instance, sits on a mat rather than prowling the Australian outback in search of small, hopping marsupials to devour; my cultural view of cats is cosy domestication rather than rural destruction.

So while my doodles, perhaps, allow an insight to my individual mind, they also, perhaps more significantly, offer an insight into my culture. The same is true of children's drawings.

This chapter is not mainly about children's drawings, however. This chapter, like the book as a whole, is mainly about intercultural relations. Children's drawings simply provide data about how Culture A sees both itself and Culture B, and vice versa. Additionally, the intercultural interfaces in the contexts discussed in later chapters is of a specific kind: that between Indigenous and non-Indigenous people in myriad global contexts. This chapter therefore provides a theoretical background to later discussions: an overview is given of (intersectional) 'cultural' identities and the construction and uses of Others in defining (and feeling good about) the Self. As examples of these processes that may perhaps be termed 'Selfing' (a little used term) and 'Othering' (a widely used term), I draw in this chapter on a wide variety of historical and geographically diverse cases: contemporary British Internet memes, 1960s New Englander constructions of imagined 'Russians', ancient Athenian pottery depictions of Thracians and 'Amazons', 1950s US American identity work through imagined science fiction futures, ancient and contemporary Chinese notions of (racialized) Self and Others, and intersectional identity constructions of Indigenous Peruvians in contemporary urban novels from Lima.

Cultural descriptions as cultural products
In early 2014, a series of Internet memes appeared called "British people problems". Tongue-in-cheek, these "problems of excessive politeness" included the following:
- I don't feel well but I don't want to disturb my doctor.
- Having my hair cut, the barber said, 'Is that alright?' I nodded. It wasn't.
- A man in the supermarket was browsing the food I wanted to browse, so I had to pretend to look at things I didn't even want until he left.
- Yesterday, I arrived at a mini roundabout simultaneously with two other drivers from other directions. We're still here.
- I live outside the UK so when I say 'with all due respect' nobody realises I'm insulting them. (The Meta Picture, 2014)

These extreme (and yet oh so everyday!) non-confrontational behaviours, putatively 'typical' British and funny because they are so recognizably familiar, are examples of an important discourse type within intercultural relations: cultural self-descriptions.

Online social space, including social media such as Facebook, Tumblr, Instagram, and Flickr, can be theorized, in Habermasian terms, as public sphere (Chen, 2012). This is a discursive space in which social 'realities' are negotiated and constructed. This process, the 'social imaginary', works through the complex mutual presence of action and reaction, display and response:
> I wear my own kind of hat, but in doing so I am displaying my style to all of you, and in this, I am responding to your self-display, even as you will respond to mine. ... If my hat can express my particular kind of cocky, yet understated self-display, then this is because of how the common language of style has evolved between us up to this point. … It matters to each one of us as we act that the others are there, as witness of what we are doing, and thus as co-determiners of the meaning of our action. (Taylor, 2004, np)

Over time, social constructions produced in this way become invisible social 'realities', as tangible and 'real' as any other products or artifacts of a cultural environment. Thus the 'social imaginary' is described as:

> That set of symbols and conceptual frameworks particular to a social collectivity or network, which have been built up, modified, mediated and transformed over time, and which are drawn on in the sense-making process … The imaginary refers to the ways in which a nation or other grouping sees both itself, and others, that is, those considered not part of itself. … The media here is understood as a mediator and shaper of that set of projected and shared envisionings. (Lewis, 2009, p. 227)

In the same way as technologies are products of a given place and time, social constructions are similarly produced rather than natural. However, discursively produced social 'reality' is just as 'real' as any other cultural products:

> The child is brought up in a culture where he or she simply takes social reality for granted. We learn to perceive and use cars, bathtubs, houses, money, restaurants, and schools without reflecting on the special features of their ontology. They seem as natural to us as stones and water and trees. (Searle, 1996, p. 4)

Searle (1996, p. 12) differentiates between intrinsic facts (e.g. 'this object is a stone') and observer-relative facts (e.g. this object is a paperweight). And the problem with social 'reality', produced in social imaginary, is that while it purports to be intrinsically factual (e.g. British people are excessively polite) it is, instead, observer relative. That is, as Holliday (2013) describes, cultural descriptions (whether of the Self or the Other) are, *themselves*, non-neutral cultural artifacts, products of the culture making the description.

So whether a culture is ostensibly describing itself (as in the example above, of British over politeness) or describing another culture (as below, in the case of Steinbeck's 'Russians') cultural descriptions are cultural products specific to the culture that is doing the describing. This is particularly obvious when a cultural Other is constructed in the absence of any real-life experience of the cultural Other. Quoting conversations from his 1960 travels around the USA, Steinbeck (1962, p. 143-144) shows how 'Russians' were discursively constructed as a foil to American identities:

> 'Hardly a day goes by somebody doesn't take a belt at the Russians' … I asked, 'Anybody know any Russians around here?' … [He] laughed. 'Course not. That's why they're valuable. Nobody can find fault with you if you take out after the Russians. … Man has a fight with his wife, he belts the Russians.'
> 'You think then we might be using the Russians as an outlet for something else, for other things? … Maybe everybody needs Russians. I'll bet even in Russia they need Russians. Maybe they call it Americans.'

In addition, culture-specific social imaginaries divide society discursively into taxonomies and categories that are, themselves, no more intrinsically 'real' than statements made about characteristics supposedly true of those deemed to be in the various categories. Who, for example, is culturally 'Western'? Who are "the 99%", or the "1%", of society? Who are "the global poor"? What does it mean to be 'Indigenous'? Who is a native speaker of a language? What does it mean to be Black, or White, or any other category?

> Our modern imaginary [includes] ... categories of process and classification which happen or have their effects behind the backs of the agents. We each can be placed in census categories in relation to ethnicity, or language, or income

level, or entitlements in the welfare system, whether or not we are aware of where we fit, or what consequences flow from this. (Taylor, 2004, np)

So both the allocation of cultural categories and the ascribing of 'typical' characteristics to people in these categories are observer-relative constructions rather than natural 'facts'. Why, then, divide the world discursively into Self and Other and ascribe descriptions to each side? In the next section, I consider the *uses* of cultural divisions and descriptions.

Cultural descriptions as cultural mirrors

Visual representations of cultural Otherness have long been used to make sense of the Self by drawing a defining boundary around characteristics of the putative non-Self. Twenty five centuries ago, for instance, following violent altercations with cultural Others in the Persian and Peloponnesian Wars, Athenian identity work was undertaken through visual art appearing on pottery: vases of this period depict stylized, Athenian-imagined cultural Others, including both real (e.g. Thracians) and imagined (e.g "Amazon") out-groups. Thracians were portrayed as savages, wild, and stupid, with beards and tattoos marking them as Other (Moodie, 2013, p. 36), while the mythical Amazons, a formidable and fearsome female enemy, symbolized Athenian fears about matriarchal society and the dangers of women's power over men (*ibid*, p.43). This both reflected, and in part constructed, the way Athenian citizens of the period understood their *own* identities in contrast to those of imagined, and/or constructed, cultural 'Others' (Miller, 2000; Moodie, 2013). As has been theorized of this context, as now, a group's depictions of those it regards and constructs as cultural Others reveal as much, if not more, about the depicting culture themselves than those they purport to represent (Bohak, 2005). Indeed, Miller (2000, p. 413) describes as integral to the discourse of *ipséité* (Selfhood) the construction and articulation of *altérité* (Otherness). So Athenian culture, masculine and civilized, is saying as much about *itself* as the Other in its visual depictions of Otherness.

Another vivid example of this type of projecting of the artist's paradigm onto that ostensibly under scrutiny is given by Gilbert, who writes about the difficulty of extracting ourselves from our own time and paradigm in order to imagine ourselves in another:

Most reasonably sized libraries have a shelf of futurist tomes from the 1950s with titles such as *Into the Atomic Age* and *The World of Tomorrow*. If you leaf through a few of them you will quickly notice that each of these books says more about the times in which it was written than about the times it was meant to foretell. Flip a few pages and you'll find a drawing of a housewife with a Donna Reed hairdo and a poodle skirt flitting about her atomic kitchen, waiting for the sound of her husband's rocket car before getting the tuna casserole on the table. … You'll also notice that some things are missing. The men don't carry babies, the women don't carry briefcases, the children don't have pierced eyebrows or nipples, and the mice go *squeak* instead of *click*. … What's more, all the people of African, Asian and Hispanic origin seem to have missed the future entirely. (Gilbert, 2007, p. 111)

In the same way as the ancient Athenians and the 1950s futurists were paradigm bound in space, culture, and time, and could not depict cultural Otherness except through their *own* ontological, epistemolgical and normative paradigms, so the children's drawings that are the subject of this book provide insight into the young

artists' *own* cultures and times, including dominant social imaginaries and narratives about cultural Others, and normative notions of the Self as defined by the boundaries of cultural Otherness.

This same process, of constructing and reducing an Other to feel good about the Self, lies behind Edward Said's (1979, 1986, 1993) notion of Orientalism: the 'Orient' is a cultural and political construction of the hegemonic occident's imagination. The Orient is essentialized, exoticized, and marginalized; it is denied its own voice and is, instead, (mis)represented through categorization, distortion, and reductionism. The Orient is thus Othered by Western discourse, a process enabled by imperialism and postcolonial maintenance of hegemony. Orientalism may exaggerate positive as well as negative traits, for instance Su-lin Yu (2002) critiques Julia Kristeva's (1977) book *About Chinese women* as an Orientalist fantasy in which Kristeva romanticizes China as historically matrilineal and Mao-era Chinese women as 'autonomous, active, and sovereign rather than passive and non-participating … They are culturally superior to Western women' (Yu, 2002, p. 6-7). Clearly, though, this is just as reductionist as negative Orientalism, as it constructs Chinese women as unchanging and homogenous. It may be a 'nicer' Orientalism, but it still disallows Chinese women individual variation, selves, and agency. So Orientalism, whether ostensibly positive or negative, entails reduction and essentialism of cultural Others.

Occidentalism is similar, and has been variously defined (Conceison, 2004, p. 40-67). Here, I am taking it as the mirror image of Orientalism: the reduction and misrepresentation of the *West* by the *East* (Buruma & Margalit, 2004). One example of 'foreignness' being constructed for the purposes of self identity work is the use and positioning of foreign nationals in the People's Republic of China; I have written about this more extensively elsewhere (Stanley, 2013). One venue in particular in which this is evident is on (party-state-controlled) television shows, in which the role of foreign nationals is "performing [as] China-loving foreigners" (Gorfinkel, 2011, p. 288). Gorfinkel and Chubb (2012) describe their own experiences of appearing on Chinese television, analysing both the way they were depicted and also the underlying purposes of these constructions. Having foreigners dressed up in traditional Chinese clothes, speaking Chinese, experiencing Chinese cultural artifacts (supposedly for the first time), and singing Chinese children's songs works on a number of levels. First, it is a performance of 'Chineseness' that reflects how this is constructed locally. Second, it is a "showcase [of] foreigners' love for China … contestants' performances are frequently scripted to directly express attraction to, and love for, every aspect of China they encounter" (Gorfinkel & Chubb, 2012, p. 21). This serves to validate Chineseness through foreigners' approving gaze and to construct a China that is the envy of outsiders. Third, these shows infantilize foreigners, positioning them in subordinate positions looking up to and learning from China; this includes "scenes of them bowing to a Chinese master, often a child" (Gorfinkel & Chubb, 2012, p. 22). Foreigners are asked to feign struggling to use chopsticks and are represented as "wide-eyed, comedic, and eager to learn and discover the wonders of a mysterious and alien, yet wise and patient, China" (Gorfinkel & Chubb, 2012, p. 13). This constructs a Chinese-dominated 'cosmopolitanism' and the "metanarrative of China's national revival to its former, exceptional, central status under the guidance of the [Communist Party]" (Gorfinkel & Chubb, 2012, p. 18). Finally, these shows construct Chineseness as unique and foreigners as essentially *different*. As an example, song lyrics on one show described 'people with different skin and hair colours "curling

their tongues" to speak the "elegant Chinese language" devised by the "clever Chinese people" (Gorfinkel & Chubb, 2012, p. 11). The message is that although foreigners may speak Chinese and appear on Chinese television they are irreducibly foreign and not Chinese. This reinforces a strong construction of a deep-seated binary of Self and Other in Chinese discourses. While foreigners may be *accepted*, they are always *excepted* in China. McDonald (2011) writes:

> A series of … 'Great Walls of Discourse' has over the years been erected between 'the Chinese' … and 'the Foreigners', who with the best will in the world will never succeed in bridging the awful gap of their inherent foreignness. (p. 1)
>
> The Chinese habit of dividing the world into two parts – commonly expressed as *guónèi* 'inside the country' and *guówài* 'outside the country' – is a persuasive one, and is supported by a whole discourse[.] (p. 54-55)

But they are (racially?) different from us!

In some of the cases in this book, as with the Great Wall of Discourse described above, racial differences may be cited as an irreducible, essential, ostensibly biological difference. But race, in most literature, is a social construction (Coleman, 2009; Curtis & Romney, 2006; Johnson, 2003; Kubota & Lin, 2006; Kubota & Lin, 2009; Lott, 1999; McDonald, 2011, pp. 214-216; Romney, 2010; Root, 2007). This is not to deny that human bodies are different from each other and that some of these differences have social salience. Rather, racial categories are a human invention that are not supported biologically; our genetic makeup *does* vary, but this variation does not reliably correspond with our racial categories (Kubota & Lin, 2009, p. 2-3). One researcher/performance artist working on the social construction of race and identity has conducted a series of 'Projects' in which she performs different racialized identities:

> After observing particular subcultures and ethnic groups, Nikki S. Lee adopts their general style and attitude through dress, gesture, and posture. … She then spends several weeks participating in the group's routine activities and social events … From schoolgirl to senior citizen, punk to yuppie, rural White American to urban Hispanic, Lee's personas traverse age, lifestyle, and culture. Part sociologist and part performance artist, Lee infiltrates these groups so convincingly that in individual photographs it is difficult to distinguish her from the crowd. However, when photographs from the projects are grouped together, it is Lee's own Korean ethnicity, drawn like a thread through each scenario, which reveals her subtle ruse. … [W]hat convinces us that she belongs [is] her uncanny ability to strike the right pose. … Lee believes that 'essentially life itself is a performance'. (Museum of Contemporary Photography; Chicago, 2005-2009)

As Lee's photographs indicate, race is constructed as much by dress, gesture, posture, and 'attitude' (i.e. performance) as it is by phenotype.

However, in some cultural contexts, ideas and discourses about 'race' are rather different. Invocations of 'race' as a unifying or dividing category have recurred in Chinese political and social life for centuries (Befu, 1993; Gries, 2005, 2006; Sautman, 1997; Suzuki, 2007), and national mythmaking holds that the Yellow Emperor, born almost five millennia ago in (or *of*) the Yellow River valley, is the progenitor of all modern Chinese people; the 'yellow race' (Allan, 1991; Chow, 1997). Since the early twentieth century, Darwinian science has been invoked and indigenized in China, with 'race' constructed as extending from Yellow-Emperor

patrilineage and legitimized by taxonomies of human bodies and the 'fact' of unique, homogenous 'Chinese' phenotypical characteristics. This has included the use of *homo sapiens* fossil finds in China as evidence for a racial 'Chineseness' and the use of anthropometrics to assess the bodily dimensions of minorities, including Tibetans, to 'prove' their Chineseness. The ideas of place, race, and nation have thus been put to work in the name of national unity and state legitimacy. This includes the creation of a selective official history whose goal is:

> [T]o present a singular correct view of 'the real China' … [t]he party-state works hard to assert an essentialized primordial view of Chinese civilization, identity, and territory. … by promoting [what Jiang Zenmin called] 'correct theories and unified thinking'. … Any arguments that offer a more complex view of Chinese history [and] identity … are dismissed as 'unobjective' examples of 'Western bias'. … This unified understanding of China leads to a proliferation of pronouncements in the official media about what 'the Chinese people think' and what 'the Chinese people feel'. (Callahan, 2009, p. 33-34)

China's national identity discourse is constructed on the basis of a (raced) Self and in opposition to (raced) foreign Others. Foreign gestures that are less than fully supportive of this dominant construction of Chineseness, including the putative integrity and uniqueness of the Chinese 'race', are routinely condemned as (at best) foreigners' inability to understand China 'properly' or (at worst) *ad hominem* attacks and accusations of 'China bashing' (Callahan, 2009, p. 33-34).

Cultural identity: The intersectional and the narrative
The same may be true of other cultures' and individuals' identity discourses, including those of the Indigenous cultures discussed in this book. Race may be invoked as the primary defining characteristic of an individual's identity affiliation. However, racial labels, like identity narratives themselves, are constructions, and individuals' identities are also situated in other ways that are salient to their (cultural) identities. Martin describes how individuals' (and groups') identities are constructed and narrated:

> One proposes one's identity in the form of a narrative in which one can re-arrange, re-interpret the events of one's life in order to take care both of permanence and change, in order to satisfy the wish to make events concordant in spite of the inevitable discordances likely to shake the basis of identity. Narrative identity, being at the same time fictitious and real, leaves room for variations on the past – a 'plot' can always be revised … it is an open-ended identity which gives meaning to one's practice. (Martin, 1995, p. 8)

This means that phenotypical characteristics *are* a factor in our identities, both in terms of the identities we appropriate for ourselves and the identities attributed to us by others, but they are not the whole story. Also salient are the ways in which we perform, or display ourselves; as Taylor says above 'I can wear my own kind of hat'. This means that ascribed identity labels are not deterministic of who we are and what we are like:

> [M]eaning and identities are created in actual daily performances against a backdrop of norms and expectations held by speakers about how actors in certain social categories do, or should, act and talk. Thus, speakers and hearers have knowledge about forms of language typically used by speakers of different identities in particular situations … [the resulting] [i]ndexes, and knowledge of them, become part of Discourses that are shared widely in a culture, and are therefore resources which can be used in interaction for identity performances. (Kiesling, 2006, p. 265)

This is important to the chapters that follow, as it is important to pluralize both the Indigenous and non-Indigenous cultures discussed. Other identity labels including gender, sexuality, age, occupation, income, place of residence, and even race/ethnicity, may be more or less salient to the identity narrative/s of any individual or group than the fact of their Indigeneity or non Indigeneity (whether ascribed and/or appropriated). This speaks to the intersectionality of identities: we are much more than members of the Indiengous or non Indigenous 'cultures' to which we are allocated in the binaries of this book, and elsewhere. So while this book's premise is to explore how the Self and Other are discursively constructed and represented/depicted, the binary labels of Self and Other are necessarily arbitrary and may be problematic, and should not be seen as the only, perhaps not even the main, and certainly not deterministic, identity labels or narratives of the people concerned.

So, for instance, in the novels of Peruvian writer Jaime Bayly, Indigenous characters are frequently represented. Indigenous identities in Peru, particularly urban Lima, are widely regarded as a 'ruinous deficit' (Niño-Murcia, 2003, p. 125), and Bayly's depictions are no exception: 'cholo' men (to use a common derogatory term for Indigenous Quechua and Aymara Peruvians) are routinely depicted as savage, drunk, dirty, and immoral, while 'chola' women are flimsy caricatures of people at the very edges of acceptability: maids and whores (Aguiló Mora, 2013). This is rather ironic in novels that lament the discrimination suffered by (urban, male, middle-class) homosexuals in Limeña society: Bayly's protagonists are mostly young, White, relatively wealthy, educated, and urban, and shuttle transnationally between Lima and Miami. These depictions speak to identities that are rather more complex than an Indigenous/non-Indigenous binary would suggest. Identities are gendered, so while Indigenous men may be stereotyped as drunk and wild, Indigenous women are regarded as controllable, subservient housemaids. Here, attributed gendered identities trump Indigenous identities, creating intersectional identities of gender-and-ethnicity. The same process occurs along other axes of perceived and constructed difference, too: youth, Whiteness, relative wealth, education, urban(e) identities and transnationalism and travel. 'Cultural' identities, then, are intersectional and narrative, rather than binary and deterministic.

Conclusion

This chapter has provided a brief overview, and various examples, of the practices and problematics of cultural labelling, describing, and Othering. My intention is to inform and problematize the discussions that follow: to what extent, in the chapters that follow, are participants on either 'side' erroneous conflating intrinsic facts with observer-relative 'facts'? To what extent are within-culture constructions, whether about the Self or the Other, being taken as true (like the British peoples problems) rather than for what they are (which is constructions and stories about who we are, or wish to be)? And, when this occurs, as surely it will (after all, when I doodle even a simple cat I cannot help but say a lot about my own culture and norms; what more will be exposed when children draw the Self and the Other?) when this occurs, what happens? Is the process of in-group construction being used to support and feel good about the Self, as we saw with Athenian depictions of Thracians, Steinbeck's 'Russians', and Western foreigners appearing on Chinese television shows? Is it being used to create cultural unity and harmony (perhaps a good thing), and is this being done at the expense of cultural Others (perhaps a bad thing)? And how are cultural groups allocated anyway? Do I (mainly) appropriate my own cultural labels, or are they (mainly) attributed to me? And which of the many axes of potential difference

and significance are most salient in my own, and my groups', identity narratives, and how do I negotiate the intersectionalities of culture, gender, race, place, and every other potential label?

So many questions. This chapter has raised important, theoretical issues with a view to deepening the debate within and resulting from the chapters that follow. It is not my intention to propose that we stop describing Others -whether in words or pictures- indeed, to aim to do so would be akin to trying to hold back the tide. Instead, I want to raise these issues around what is going on whenever we depict Otherness, and to expose some of the inner workings of why we do it, how the process works, and what happens as a result. It is also important to mention, as I have above, that 'cultural' identities are far from unproblematic objectivities; culture is shifting, narrative, and plural, and we are no more determined by the categories into which we can be fitted than Nikki S. Lee is defined by whatever set of clothes and gestures she appropriates in any given photograph.

What does this mean for the readings of the chapters that follow? My advice is to try to approach the racism that you will find with as much compassion as you can muster: the kids who depict Australian Aboriginal Others as living as savages, or who depict urban Swedes as totally out of touch with happiness and nature are not coming from places of hatred. They are, as we all are, acculturated by the social imaginaries around us. No social construction of identity can ever be entirely neutral and, as with Orientalist and Occidentalist depictions, all cultural descriptions are products of the cultures in which they originate. The stories, and drawings, and descriptions that follow, then, are the starting points for discussions that, I hope, will be informed by the theoretical discussion in this chapter. It is not enough to 'correct' children's perceptions of the Other (as to replace one social construction with another is still to indulge in cultural labelling and describing, a conceptual rabbit hole down which it is possible to disappear for a very long time). Instead, the way forward from what may otherwise be a series of racist, problematic misunderstandings is to raise awareness of exactly the issues discussed in this chapter. This is what the book aims to do, by contrasting kids' drawings from different cultures so as to show that cultural description is at the same time both particular to the given society and universal. And from a growing awareness of such universals, I hope, can come understanding.

References

Aguiló Mora, F. (2013). La representación de la "chola" limeña en la narrativa (¿light?) de Jaime Bayly. *Entrehojas: Revista de estudios Hispánicos, 3*(1), 1-28.

Allan, S. (1991). *The shape of the turtle: Myth, art, and cosmos in early China*. New York: SUNY Press.

Alland, A. (1983). *Design process in six cultures: Drawing styles among nonschool children in Ponape, Bali, and Taiwan*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Befu, H. (Ed.). (1993). *Cultural nationalism in East Asia: Representation and identity*. Berkeley, CA: Institute of East Asian Studies.

Bertoia, J. (1993). *Drawings from a dying child: Insights Into death from a Jungian perspective*. New York: Routledge.

Bohak, G. (2005). Ethnic portraits in Greco-Roman literature. In E. S. Gruen (Ed.), *Cultural borrowings and ethnic appropriations in antiquity* (pp. 207 – 237). Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag.

Buruma, I., & Margalit, A. (2004). *Occidentalism: A Short History of Anti-Westernism*. London: Atlantic Books.

Callahan, W. A. (2009). *China: The pessoptimist nation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Chen, C. (2012). The creation and meaning of Internet memes in 4chan: Popular Internet culture in the age of online digital reproduction. *Habitus, 3*(1), 6-19.

Chow, K.-W. (1997). Imagining Boundaries of Blood: *Zhang Binglin* and the invention of the Han 'race' in modern China. In F. Dikötter (Ed.), *The Construction of Racial Identities in China and Japan: Historical and Contemporary Perspectives* (pp. 34-51). London: Hurst & Co. Ltd.

Coleman, R. R. M. (2009). All around the world same song: Blackness, racism, and popular culture in China. *Journal of Media Sociology, 1*(1/2), 5-21.

Conceison, C. (2004). *Significant other: Staging the American in China*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.

Curtis, A., & Romney, M. (Eds.). (2006). *Color, race and English language teaching: Shades of meaning*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.

Gernhardt, A., Rübeling, H., & Keller, H. (2013). "This is my family": Differences in children's family drawings across cultures *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology 44*(7), 1166-1183

Gilbert, D. (2007). *Stumbling on happiness*. London: Harper Perennial.

Gorfinkel, L. (2011). *Performing the Chinese nation: The politics of identity in China Central Televison's music-entertainment programs.* University of Technology, Sydney.

Gorfinkel, L., & Chubb, A. (2012). *Foreigners performing the Chinese nation: Between cosmopolitanism and a superior Chinese culture*. Paper presented at the Television, Power and Ideology in Postsocialist China Conference.

Gries, P. H. (2005). *China's new nationalism: Pride, politics, and diplomacy*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Gries, P. H. (2006). China and Chinese nationalism. In G. Delanty & K. Kumar (Eds.), *The SAGE Handbook of nations and nationalism* (pp. 488-499). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications Inc.

Hall, E. (2010). Identity and young children's drawings: Power, agency, control and transformation. In P. Broadhead, J. Howard & E. Wood (Eds.), *Play and learning in the early years:* (pp. 95-112). London: Sage Publications Ltd.

Holliday, A. (2013). *Understanding intercultural communication*. Abingdon and New York: Routledge.

Johnson, E. P. (2003). *Appropriating blackness: Performance and the politics of authenticity* Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Kiesling, S. F. (2006). Hegemonic identity-making in narrative. In A. de Fina, D. Schiffrin & M. Bamberg (Eds.), *Discourse and identity* (pp. 261-287). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kristeva, J. (1977). *About Chinese women* (A. Barrows, Trans.). London: M Boyars.

Kubota, R., & Lin, A. (2006). Race And TESOL: Introduction to Concepts and Theories. *TESOL Quarterly, 40*, 471-493.

Kubota, R., & Lin, A. (Eds.). (2009). *Race, culture, and identities in second langauge education*. New York: Routledge.

Lewis, V. (2009). Peforming translatinidad: Miriam the Mexican transsexual reality show star and the tropicalization of difference in Anglo-Australian media. *Sexualities, 12*(2), 225-250.

Lorenzi-Cioldi, F., Chatard, A., Marques, J. M., Selimbegović, L., Konan, P., & Faniko, K. (2011). What do drawings reveal about people's attitudes toward countries and their citizens? *Social Psychology, 42*(3), 231-240.

Lott, T. L. (1999). *The invention of race*. Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Martin, D. C. (1995). The choices of identity. *Social Identities, 1*(1), 5-20.

McDonald, E. (2011). *Learning Chinese, turning Chinese: Challenges to becoming sinophone in a globalised world*. Abingdon, Oxfordshire: Routledge.

Miller, M. (2000). The myth of Bousiris: Ethnicity and art. In B. Cohen (Ed.), *Not the classical ideal: Athens and the construction of the other in Greek art* (pp. 413-442). Leiden: Brill.

Moodie, M. (2013). *Drawing the divide: The nature of Athenian identity as reflected in the depiction of the "other" in Attic red-figure vase painting in the fifth century BCE*. Stellenbosch University, Stellenbosch, South Africa.

Museum of Contemporary Photography; Chicago. (2005-2009). Projects 1997-2001. *Nikki S Lee: permanent collection* Retrieved 8 September 2009, from http://www.mocp.org/collections/permanent/lee_nikki_s.php

Niño-Murcia, M. (2003). "English is like the dollar": Hard currency ideology and the status of English in Peru. *World Englishes, 22*(3), 121-142.

Romney, M. (2010). The colour of English. In A. Mahboob (Ed.), *The NNEST lens* (pp. 18-34). Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

Root, M. (2007). Race in the social sciences. In S. P. Turner & M. W. Risjord (Eds.), *Philosophy of Anthropology and Sociology* (pp. 735-753). Amsterdam: Elsevier.

Rübeling, H., Keller, H., Yovsi, R. D., Lenk, M., Schwarzer, S., & Kühne, N. (2011). Children's Drawings of the Self as an Expression of Cultural Conceptions of the Self. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 42*(3), 406-424

Said, E. W. (1979). *Orientalism*. New York: Vintage Books.

Said, E. W. (1986). Orientalism reconsidered. In F. Barker, P. Hulme, M. Iversen & D. Loxley (Eds.), *Literature, politics, and theory* (pp. 210-229). London: Methuen.

Said, E. W. (1993). *Culture and imperialism*. London: Chatto and Windus.

Sautman, B. (1997). Racial nationalism and China's external behavior. *World Affairs, 160*(2), 78-95.

Searle, J. R. (1996). *The construction of social reality*. London: Penguin Books.

Stanley, P. (2013). *A critical ethnography of 'Westerners' teaching English in China: Shanghaied in Shanghai*. Abingdon and New York: Routledge.

Steinbeck, J. (1962). *Travels with Charley: In search of America*. New York: Penguin Books USA Inc.

Suzuki, S. (2007). The importance of 'Othering' in China's national identity: Sino-Japanese relations as a stage of identity conflicts. *The Pacific Review, 20*(1), 23-47.

Taylor, C. (2004). On social imaginary. *Contemporary Sociological Theory*. Retrieved from http://web.archive.org/web/20041019043656/http://www.nyu.edu/classes/calhoun/Theory/Taylor-on-si.htm

The Meta Picture. (2014). 21 brilliant British people problems. from http://themetapicture.com/british-people-problems/

Yin, J. (2008). Constructing the Other: A critical reading of *The Joy Luck Club*. In M. K. Asante, Y. Miike & J. Yin (Eds.), *The global intercultural communication reader* (pp. 123-141). New York: Routledge.

Yu, S. (2002). Reconstructing Western female subjectivity: Between Orientalism and feminism in Julia Kristeva's about Chinese women. *Jouvert: A Journal of Postcolonial Studies, 7*(1). Retrieved from http://english.chass.ncsu.edu/jouvert/v7is1/con71.htm