

Worlding Sinophone Malaysian Literature

Towards a Paradigm of the Global South

E. K. TAN

Stony Brook University

The Global South is everywhere, but it is also always somewhere, and that somewhere, located at the intersection of entangled political geographies of dispossession and repossession, has to be mapped with persistent geographical responsibility. . .

—— Matthew Sparke, “Everywhere but Always Somewhere: Critical Geographies of the Global South” (117)

SINOPHONE studies is an interdisciplinary and multi-methodological field. It directs its intellectual attention to reflect on the local expressions of Sinophone communities across the globe. For these expressions to emerge, Sinophone studies invests in parsing hierarchies of power relations often defined by neo-colonialism, imperialism, and nationalism. As the world becomes increasingly globalized and neoliberal policies begin breaking down national boundaries from within and without, the Global South has evolved as a new way to reconsider a world system that would allow societies in the South to continue resist Euro-American political, economic and cultural hegemony. In academia, scholars in social sciences and humanities have jumped on the bandwagon over the past decade and a half to participate in conversations regarding the potential of the Global South as a concept in furthering debates on the impact of globalization in

Received: December 1, 2020 / Accepted: May 20, 2021

Sun Yat-sen Journal of Humanities, no.51 (July 2021): 129-154

§ E.K. Tan received his Ph.D. from the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign in 2007. He is currently an associate professor in the Department of English and the Chair for Asian & Asian American Studies at Stony Brook University.

Email: EngKiong.Tan@stonybrook.edu

their respective fields and beyond. Where is Sinophone studies in such conversations? As the description of this special issue highlighted, there is limited scholarship in Sinophone studies that directly engages with the concept of the Global South. So, what can the Global South do for Sinophone studies, or more specifically, how can the Global South further the study of Sinophone communities in articulating the significance of their local expressions?

This article explores the potential of a Sinophone Global South paradigm by first adopting the concept of “worlding” literature to deconstruct and reconstruct how marginal literature or literature from the periphery negotiates its status within a system of recognition in the production and circulation of knowledge that has for too long been dominated by a western epistemology. Using the works of Sinophone Malaysian writer Chang Kuei-hsing [Zhang Guixing], I fold this rethinking of Sinophone Malaysian literature through an act of literary cartographic design into the current debates of the Global South. By thinking Sinophone literature through the lens of the Global South, I examine the viability of a Sinophone Global South paradigm that could offer insights to how issues of global capitalism and indigenous sovereignty can be cogently discussed instead of being treated simply as plotlines to elevate the identity politics of Sinophone communities. It is in this way that Sinophone studies reinforces its critical vitality in identifying, addressing and critiquing the multiple axes of power operating as origins of oppression and exploitation.

Worldling Literature as Decolonial Practice

BEFORE exploring the viability or generative value of worlding Sinophone Malaysian literature through the lens of a Global South paradigm, I turn to the general conception of “worlding” literature to reflect on the evolution of the Global South as concept succeeding prior worldviews relating to Third Worldism and Postcolonialism.

As early as in 1985, Spivak published an essay titled “Three Women’s Texts and a Critique of Imperialism.” In this essay, she argues that what we called “Third World literature” is nothing more than the very product of a worlding circumscribed by European colonial discourse. This discourse continues to colonize the way the Third World subjects think and act through the production and circulation of knowledge. Hence, Spivak begins her essay with a reminder and a caution: “It should not be possible to read nineteenth-century British literature without remembering that imperialism, understood as England’s social mission, was a crucial part of the cultural representation of England to the English. The role of literature in the production of cultural representation should not be ignored” (1985: 243). Spivak reminds us of the extent of influence

imperialism casts on its colonies in their production of knowledge and culture even decades after most colonies are liberated. She also cautions that by disregarding the ideologies that structure and shape cultural representations of the Third World, we will continue to live in the shadows of European imperialism. Spivak further unpacks the interpellation of a concept such as “The Third World” to emphasize the urgency of her warning especially to academics like us. She says, “To consider the Third World as distant cultures, exploited but with rich intact literary heritages waiting to be recovered, interpreted, and curricularized in English translation fosters the emergence of ‘the Third World’ as a signifier that allows us to forget that ‘worlding,’ even as it expands the empire of the literary discipline” (1985: 243). In other words, the very concept of the Third World perpetuates the imperialist exploitative narrative of seeing the non-West as having abundant resources waiting to be rescued from neglect and ruins. Moreover, English translation is not the solution to the appropriation of literary significance of the Third World precisely because it assumes that Third World literature can only have a voice through an agent, such as a translator. I understand that the question of translation is a much more complex one, and translation can be mutually beneficial when it comes to the question of global circulation of literary works. However, when discussing the question of literary canon and the worlding of knowledge in the case of literary production, translation at times performs the task of a collaborator servicing imperialist needs and desires. So, how do these impact our understanding of Spivak’s theorization of worlding? Spivak believes that each literary tradition has its own process of coming into being.^[1] Instead of allowing European imperialist powers to perform the “worlding of the world on uninscribed earth,” she proposes that we rethink the practice of representation by unlearning colonial knowledge structures to “world” literary traditions from the non-West into its own being.

So, how does Spivak suggest the Third World perform its own worlding? She proposes that in order to perform a worlding that appropriately represents the realities of (post)colonial spaces, (post)colonial subjects have to first unworld these colonial spaces, both physical and literary ones. She argues that if “we concentrated on documenting and theorizing the itinerary of the consolidation of Europe as sovereign subject, indeed sovereign and subject, then we would produce an alternative historical narrative of the ‘worlding’ of what is today called ‘the Third World’” (1985a: 247). To unworld, one must first see through the inner mechanisms of the Eurocentric practice of worlding. In other words, one must be able to reject, and more than that, to unlearn the Eurocentric knowledge structure. Though she does not specifically point out the parallel between unlearning and unworlding (also in the form of relearning and reworlding). We can deduce a close connection between the two pairs of

processes when we read “Three Women’s Texts and a Critique of Imperialism” back-to-back with her essay “Can the Subaltern Speak?”^[2]

Building on Spivak’s ideas, I want to rethink how this proposal to unworld and reworld Third World literature beyond the construct of Eurocentrism allows us to engage with the unfinished business of decolonization in postcolonial societies. We, the postcolonial people, have over the past half a century been too eager to move beyond our colonial past in order to chant independent victories into anthems of nation building. As a result, we neglect the important self-reckoning process of decolonization to purge our nations of internalized structures of subjugation. Spivak’s critique of colonial worlding is no doubt important, but I want to emphasize that it is more important for us to build on this critique to explore how we can unworld and reworld the Third World and Third World literature. The recent development of the concept of the Global South could offer some insights. The introduction of the Global South as a concept for literary studies brings into question the viability of categories such as the Third World and Third World literature. Spivak’s use of these categories with quotation marks in her work, reveals a discomfort with them due to their affinity to a world system predominantly structured around a European reality. The currency of a concept like the Global South seems to lie in its potential to shift the postcolonial conversations or contemporary world politics away from the East vs. West focus to address the remnants and reincarnations of imperialism in the various forms of global relations (and exploitations) such as neoliberalism. Most importantly, it allows us to reimagine a world that is not exclusively nation-centered, and one that allows for marginal and minor forms of movements, circulation and exchange of people, objects and idea to mean something in the age of globalization. I will return shortly to expand on this connection between postcolonial worlding and the Global South.

In 2016, Pheng Cheah offers his perspective on rethinking world literature by “worlding” postcolonial narratives in his monograph *What is a World?: On Postcolonial Literature as World Literature*. Among the more recent publications by scholars in literary studies who build their works around Heidegger’s concept, Cheah’s latest monograph follows Heidegger’s theorization of worlding rather closely. His attempt at reconceiving the meaning of the world in the field of world literature offers not just a postcolonial perspectives, but more importantly, proposes a certain decolonial methodology to disavow the Eurocentric inclination of world literature as a field. In *What is a World*, Cheah begins his argument by claiming that scholars have misunderstood Heidegger’s concept of the world by uncritically assuming that the world exist as a spatial concept. Because geographies, borders and territories, despite their metaphysical connotations, are concepts with tangible existence, when used to define what

constitutes a world, they collectively contribute to the circumscription of the world in spatial terms. Addressing this misconception in his study of world literature, Cheah explains:

Theories of world literature take the concept of world for granted in a different way. They equate the world with circulatory movements that cut across national-territorial borders. They are primarily concerned with the impact of these spatial movements on the production, reception, and interpretation of literary texts instead of a world literature's impact qua literature on the world. As I will show, they reduce the world literature's normative force to the barest minimum (3).

Borders invite crossing, and territories are marked and remarked by politics and the movement of people. These are just some characteristics of globalization and global movements which Cheah claims as the conditions of literary production and circulation. To Cheah, the primary focus of world literature and its theorization based on spatial movements fail to examine and put into use the purpose of world literature as a normative force. By normative force of world literature, Cheah means world literature's "power or efficacy to change the world according to a normative ethico-political horizon. . ." (6). The privileging of spatial relations in the theorization of world literature according to Cheah has diluted or even displaced this potential of literature to impact the world we live in. As a corrective, Cheah introduces a temporal dimension to our understanding of the world:

The mapping of the world by temporal calculations is premised on a conceptualization of the world as a spatial category, namely, an object of the greatest possible spatial extension that can be divided into zones of quantitatively measurable time. World, however, is originally a temporal category. Before the world can appear as an object, it must first be. A world only is and we are only worldly beings if there is already time. The unity and permanence of a world are thus premised on the persistence of time. (2)

By introducing the concept of time as intervention to the spatial configuration of the world, Cheah proposes that the worlding of a world is made possible by the coming into existence of the world as a concept. He argues that for the world to become a spatial concept, it has to first acquire a temporal dimension. Only when the world has extended from being to becoming, then will the spatial concept evolve. Though Cheah throughout *What is a World?* privileges temporality as the condition for worlding, he is in fact agreeable to the notion of the world as a

spatial-temporal concept. His emphasis on the temporal aspect of the world is to rescue “time” from being neglected in the configuration of the theory of worlding.

I want to return to what Cheah calls the normative force of literature to consider its transformative potential in the act of worlding. Cheah explains that “Literature does not merely reflect social forces. It is itself an important force in contesting existing hierarchies in the struggle to remake the unequal world created by capitalist globalization” (58). In delineating his approach to reading postcolonial novels such as Amitav Ghosh’s *The Hungry Tide*, Cheah argues that worlding literature can help us realize that “the world is constituted by different histories and temporalities,” and it can also allow literature to “articulate alternative teleologies so that peoples who have been left out of Eurocentric world history can emerge, be heard and recognized, achieve self-determination, and improve their place in the world” (58). While this potential of world literature is conceptually empowering or at the very least generative, the framework of a postcolonial approach can be limiting. The focus on colonial resistance, national liberation, nation building, and national identity often ends up containing postcolonial literature within the grand narratives of the nation states. What remains is the question of how we address the impact of phenomena such as global capitalism and neoliberalism on individuals and communities that experience such phenomena beyond the rhetoric of the nation states. More importantly, how do these individuals and communities respond to the negative impact on their everyday life to actively participate in “improv[ing] their place in the world.” This is where I think the concept of Global South as critical category can be useful.

Paradigmatic Potential of the Global South

The global South has its roots in earlier Third World visions of liberation, and those visions still have an important role to play in restoring human ends to development, so long as they do not become blinders against recognition of a changed world situation.
—— Arif Dirlik, “Global South: Predicament and Promise” (2007: 22)

The “Global South” is not an existing entity to be described by different disciplines, but an entity that has been invented in the struggle and conflicts between imperial global domination and emancipatory and decolonial forces that do not acquiesce with global designs...
—— Levander and Mignolo “Introduction: The Global South and World Dis/Order” (3)

THE recent turn to the Global South as a new world order points to a need to reimagining global politics and economy beyond the post-World War II, Cold War configuration of the southern hemisphere. The concept of the “Third World” first evolved around 1952.^[3] Its initial usage was to describe postcolonial societies that were on the path to independence and modernity. The geographical category of the Third World offered an alternative path for Third World societies to the two dominant world systems of capitalism and socialism. This third path to modernity was conceived at the Bandung Conference in 1955 as an option of which Third World societies could channel their energy and resources toward their respective national liberation movements.^[4] During the 1960s, the Third World as alternative took on a revolutionary significance with the explosion of worldwide revolutions and student movements in response to the global imperialism that continued to permeate postcolonial societies.

While the Third World as a political concept served the nations of the South well for decades, a historical shift in the 1990s^[5] triggered by the phenomenon of globalization took Third World societies beyond the confines of the nation-states. This shift allowed societies in the South to participate in a world order that had adopted global economy as its structural and operative centerpiece. With the introduction of a global developmentalism where governmental aid to Third World nations transformed into a marketization process defined solely by the discourse of globalization, societies in the South had to invent themselves into active participants of a growing capitalist economy. This shift engendered the Global South into an empirical and political entity.^[6] The rise of the global South enables the imagination of a developmentalism no longer centered around national agendas. However, this new global system seems to benefit only “those sectors of the economy and population that can participate successfully in the global economy usually in urban networks that are components of a global network society” (Dirlik 2007: 15). Regardless, it does suggest how the South could pursue development without relying on a global economic system that privileges a capitalist economy circumscribed by the North and the leading nations in the West. A major development happened in 2003 when the United Nations Development Programme declared December 19 as the United Nations Day for South-South Cooperation. The first UN SSC Day was celebrated in the following year, officially shifting the language of Third World developmentalism to that of the Global South, emphasizing South-South Cooperation as the vision for the future of the Global South.^[7]

This political and economic development of the concept of the Global South has it bearing on academia. In a similar fashion, the growing interest in the Global South as a critical category has seemingly replaced that of the postcolonial. Yet, to see the former as a substitute for the latter underscores a failure to consider the

intrinsic relationship between the two. While postcolonial studies as a field tends to look inward at issues relating to national liberation and nation building, the Global South looks outward at the impact of globalization on communities that are not all together bounded by their national allegiance. In a sense, the Global South builds on and extends the scope of postcolonial studies by observing what could be deemed as blind spots to the latter.

In the introductory article to the inaugural issue of *The Global South*, “Introduction: The (Post)global South,” Alfred J. López adopts a rather peculiar argument in his discussion of the Global South and its intellectual currency. López contends that the Global South conveys a post*global* discourse because it critically exposes the failure of globalization as a hegemonic influence around the world driven by its privileging of the global market and capital. The failure, as Mario Deaglio suggests, is marked by significant historical moments such as the 1997–1998 economic crisis in Asia, the cessation of the stock market boom in the US at the turn of the millennium, the 9/11 attacks and rise of the global war against terrorism in early 2000s, etc. (quoted in López 6). López’s use of the prefix “post” to describe the Global South is strategic rather than temporal. By underscoring the grand narrative of globalization as a letdown to those who had believed that the phenomenon would deliver to them a positive development within and beyond their national boundaries, López’s postglobal South turns our attention to “the mutual recognition among the world’s subalterns of their shared condition at the margins of the brave new neoliberal world of globalization” (3). This, regardless of whether we choose to adopt López’s concept of the postglobal or not, allows us to infuse the Global South with a critical potential to reflect on and address the disenfranchisement of what López calls “the world’s subalterns”—the underrepresented, the minority and the indigenous communities. Furthermore, the attempt to think beyond an empirical notion of the concept of the Global South does not undermine the significance of its geographical formulation. Matthew Sparke stresses the cartographic significance of the Global South as “a form of reterritorialization articulated in the interests of *repossession*” (119). I argue that this dyad process of reterritorialization and repossession resonates with the kind of postcolonial tactics of unlearning and reworlding Spivak advocates as discussed earlier. More importantly, this process continues the unfinished business of postcolonial studies in promoting decolonial practices to unearth marginalized subjectivities and agencies from being co-opted into narratives of national development and/or subsumed under discourses of globalization and neoliberalism. The process of worlding the South requires the South to actively imagine and invent ways of engaging with its own “economic alternatives to neoliberalism if it is to achieve autonomous development within the confines of global capitalism, which is about the only

option available on the horizon presently” (Dirlik 2007: 16).

In their introduction to the special issue, “The Global South and World Dis/Order,” for *The Global South*, Caroline Levander and Walter D. Mignolo examine the potential and impediments of the Global South as “conceptual apparatus” in academia (1-2). For the Global South to emerge as an alternative methodology to Euro-American modes of knowledge making, it needs to acknowledge and reject the negative impact of dominant discourses that treat the South as known subjects to be co-opted and exploited under the guise of global capital and free market; more importantly, it has to decolonize a western epistemology of knowledge production to free the South from the burden of an imperialist structure of thinking to world its own history, realities, and body of scholarship. A sustainable model of alterity where global subalterns and marginal communities evolve as autonomous and empowered requires processes of decolonization to avoid replicating imperialist mentality and systems of power; “[w]ithout this decolonization, all theories or pedagogies of alterity serve as mere academic dogmas and orthodoxies” (Figueira 144). I aver that a decolonial approach to the study of the Global South advocated by the scholars discussed in this article coincides with the theoretical and ideological leanings of Sinophone studies as a critical methodology. It allows us scholars to continue to build on scholarship surrounding the concepts of Third Worldism and postcolonialism in order to investigate the impact of phenomena such as global marketization and neoliberalism on local communities of the South.

While thinking through the usefulness of the Global South as a concept to Sinophone studies at large, I ask the following questions: How does the Global South as a rethinking of world politics lend itself to the study of Sinophone cultures as alternative to older paradigms of knowledge making of the Third or Postcolonial Worlds? What are some currently under-examined areas in Sinophone literature does the reworlding of a Third World theory or postcolonial theory open us to? To address the above questions, I turn to Sinophone Malaysian literature, more specifically, the writing of Taiwanese Malaysian writer Chang Kuei-hsing.

Towards a Paradigm of the Global South via Chang Kuei-hsing’s Writing

IN his overview essay, “Sinophone Malaysian Literature,” Tee Kim Tong explains that the term “Sinophone Malaysian literature”

denotes Malaysian writings in Chinese, suggesting, on the one hand, the existence of Malaysian literatures written in languages other than Chinese, namely Malay, English, and Tamil. On the other hand, it is

also possible to talk about “Malaysian Sinophone literature,” which implies the existence of global writings in Chinese produced in other places outside China—for example, Singaporean Sinophone literature, Indonesian Sinophone literature, and so forth. Both Sinophone Malaysian literature and Malaysian Sinophone literature refer to the same object or body of literature, which is generally categorized as *Ma Hua wenxue*, but the discursive contexts differ” (2013: 304).

Though Tee’s definition regards the term as more or less a literary category produced by writers from Malaysia or of Malaysian national origins, his essay departs from this opening paragraph to provide an overview of the shifting meaning of Sinophone Malaysian literature from the early twentieth century via the general concept of *Mahua wenxue*.^[8] From the introduction of Nanyang literature with the intent to localize Sinophone literature in the late 1920s to its mutation into *Mahua wenxue*, Sinophone Malay(si)an literature has adopted a geographically and culturally specific definition. As a subset of what is known as “Sojourning Chinese literature” (*Huaqiao wenxue* or *qiaomin wenxue*), *Mahua wenxue* was conveniently subsumed under the larger category of Chinese literature to address efforts of resistance against the Japanese invasion of China. The post-WWII independence period of Malaya saw an attempt among Sinophone Malayan writers’ return to localism as the defining feature of Sinophone Malaysian literature. This was due to the region’s suppression of communism and the suspicion of individuals with ties to the newly established Communist China (2013: 307–308). As a result, Sinophone Malayan literature in the Federation period had already begun to align itself with a Malay national consciousness (2013: 309). As students from Malaya began to study abroad in Taiwan, the concept of “overseas Chinese” returned as a viable designator within the general category of *Mahua wenxue* (Malaiya Huaqiao wenxue), which aligned with a cultural identity promoted by the Republic of China, Taiwan. This development contributed to the rise of a groups of Malaysian writers who reside in Taiwan while continuing to write about their homeland in Malaysia with vivid depictions of the tropical rainforest, rubber plantations, and historical events such as the Malayan Emergency.^[9]

While this overview of what constitute the term and concept of Sinophone Malaysian literature is important, it resonates with how Tee understands the concept of Sinophone Malaysian literature in an earlier essay: “[t]he (re)mapping, (re)locating, (re)positioning of Sinophone literature is but an act of naming and categorizing” (2010: 89). My contention with this statement has to do with its lack in acknowledging the critical potential of Sinophone Malaysian literature in exposing and challenging the multiple axes of power that constitute

the complexities of the Sinophone Malaysian experience. Alison M. Groppé sees the potential of Sinophone Malaysian literature as being able to help us “tune into the nuances and complexities that inevitably and continually confront one in studying literature as both an aesthetic and cultural practice and an art form based in language, emerging from and interacting with myriad contexts—national, political, cultural, local, and translocal, and so on” (19). Following the same line of thoughts while pushing her claim further, I regard Sinophone Malaysian literature as having the potential to invite critiques of postcoloniality and global capitalism via methodological focuses common in postcolonial studies and Sinophone studies. This is where I see the critical potential of *Sinophone* Malaysian literature embedded in the descriptor “Sinophone” and overlapping with issues of concerns in the Global South.

Shih Shu-mei introduces Sinophone studies as a field of study in 2007 with the publication of her pioneering work *Visuality and Identity: Sinophone Articulations Across the Pacific*. She defines Sinophone as “a network of places of cultural production outside China and on the margins of China and Chineseness, where a historical process of heterogenizing and localizing of continental Chinese culture has been taking place for several centuries” (2007: 4). Aside from its relational and comparative characteristics, the Sinophone adopts a critical approach in aggressively intervening and rupturing the incalitrance of essentialism embodied by the myth of homogenous Han-centric Chinese identity and Chineseness. By “foregrounding the value of difficulty, difference, and heterogeneity” (2007: 5), the Sinophone denatures the looming presence of Chineseness to facilitate the suturing of complex networks and relations among diverse Sinophone communities. More importantly, Shih’s theoretical conception of the Sinophone includes a broader critique of the origins of violence, exploitation and oppression enacted by power actors (for example, those acting in the name of imperialism or statism) across various axes of power. It is in this broad sense that Sinophone studies proffers an approach to evaluate and reflect on the discourses and materiality which constitute Sinophone subjectivities. This critical approach promotes a rethinking and resituating of Sinophone communities in their relative historical processes and affinities to each other, and to the local communities in which they are a part of. This article focuses on exploring the latter by examining the role Sinophone Malaysian literature play in the depiction of the relationship between Chinese settler community and the indigenous communities in Borneo.

In the same vein of Brian Bernards’s theorization of postcolonial ecocriticism in his discussion of Sinophone Malaysian literature, I depart from the conventions of postcolonial studies to focus on social and cultural impact of colonial legacy on postcolonial societies. The intersecting politics of this article

with Bernards' work is underscored in my attempt to expand the kind of focus on the "social cultural exchange/domination" of colonial legacy and Chinese settler history in Malaysia on "occupied landscape, environments, and ecologies by industrialized capitalism" (2015: 111) in order to critique the effects of global capitalism and neoliberalism. My focus on indigeneity seeks to redirect the discussion of Sinophone Malaysia away from the common characterization of the indigenous communities as markers of difference, primitive cultures or threat to political and social stability of the region. Instead, it connects the representation of these communities to larger issues of global concerns and uneven power relations. It is in this anti-imperial and decolonial approach that the concept of the Sinophone intersects with the kind of postcolonial and Global South methodologies.

To analyze Chang's work in this section of the article, I want to consider two thematic focuses under the larger paradigm of the Global South as methodology: (1) the critique of global capitalism in the form of colonial practices; (2) the response of indigenous, marginal and under-represented communities to the failure of globalization and its promise to support and elevate them beyond the confines of the nation states. I contend that a Global South approach to Sinophone Malaysian literature, in the case of Chang's writing, allows us to incorporate and think through Gayatri Spivak and Pheng Cheah's proposals of worlding literature, be it a process of unlearning/unworlding and relearning/reworlding, or a worlding that underscores the significance of literature to unearth a decolonial meaning making process of minor literatures and marginal cultures. Such an approach launches the Global South from an empirical category into a methodology that extends the limits of Third World and postcolonial studies to examine the implications and impediments of globalization in the study of minor, minority and marginal literatures.

Set in the rainforest of Sarawak, Borneo, Chang Kuei-hsing's *Elephant Herd* [*Qunxiang*] tells the story of the Shi and Yu families and how their family histories intertwine with the Sarawak communist party and its demise. The novel follows the protagonist's journey into the rainforest in search of the remains of his maternal uncle, a leader of the Sarawak communist party who has gone missing in the rainforest for ages. The narrative documents the protagonist's physical journey as it pieces together a family history of the Yu family using an array of intertexts such as myths, rumors, personal accounts, journal entries, etc.; it leads to a revelation of a settler community history that interweaves war, colonialism, racial tension, national liberation, and communism into one.

Scholars such as Andrea Bachner, Brian Bernards, Yu-ting Huang, E.K. Tan, Jing Tsu, David Der-wei Wang, have examined Chang's work in their respective research. Wang's analysis of Chang's work suggests that Chang's rainforest is a

manifestation of linguistic and narrative heteroglossia. This is exemplified in the double entendre of “rainforest”[yulin] vs. “word forest”[yulin] (2001). Tsu maintains that Chang’s writing takes into consideration the linguistic alliances and conflicts to “[restage] linguistic multitude as the internal ecology of the monolingual [Sinitic] script” in order to examine the complexities of multiethnicism, history and language in Sinophone Malaysian literature (205). Bachner and Tan discuss Chang’s use of metanarrative and the Chinese script as mediation for history rewriting in Sinophone Malaysian literature (Bachner 2010; Tan 2013). Bernards focuses on the framework of eco-criticism to explore Chang’s use of plantation and rainforest as literary tropes to depict interethnic relations and Chinese settler history (Bernards 2013). Focusing on the history of Sinophone Malaysians as a settler community, Huang describes Chang’s experimentation with the Sinitic script and language as the product of the Sinophone community’s settler anxiety within an ecosystem of the indigenous communities in Borneo (2019). My article aligns with Huang’s book chapter in the way she examines Chang treatment of Sinophone settler history and its intersection with the indigenous lifeworlds in his writing.

My purpose in this article is to stress the importance of rewriting history from the point of view of the postcolonial subjects with an anti-colonial stance. Such an approach is a necessary first step to processing a viable and sustainable decolonial methodology. History rewriting requires what Spivak suggests, the unlearning of a western-centered knowledge making system that has been for too long colonizing the minds of the Third World subjects in the age of postcolonial national liberation. It is in this sense that Chang’s use of metanarratives as literary style offers a postcolonial condition in writing to engender the worlding of Sinophone Malaysian experience. This condition allows Sinophone Malaysians to construct their narratives and pluralistic histories unmediated by a colonial mentality that continues to haunt postcolonial societies. Chang’s metafiction is not simply a literary aesthetics but a cartographic inscription that shifts the paradigm of knowledge production to those whose relationship to the land is marked by their daily encounters with the land.

With the trope of history rewriting as a foundation to continue exploring decolonial knowledge making for societies in the South in literary studies, I want to turn to anti-colonial narratives in Chang’s work to accentuate the kind of critique of how global capitalism is embedded in the history of colonial exploitations. It is in these anti-colonial narratives that a reading practice involving processes of unlearning and relearning is made possible. Chang begins *The Elephant Herd* with a detailed description of how the business practice of a British trader named Christian epitomizes the colonial structure of the British Empire across the globe. Despite the fact that prior to the British’s arrival in the

Malay Peninsula, Malaya had seen colonial influences by other European powers such as the Dutch and the Portuguese, the British Empire's control over the region was broader in scope and was integrated into a large web of colonial projects they maintained across the globe. Even though Chang's depiction of Christian is fictional, it does echo a colonial reality of how the British Empire had functioned with a capitalist mode of colonial expansion via the British East India Company. In *The Elephant Herd*, the narrator describes Christian's trading activities as follows:

Christian, the English trader, bought elephant husks, rhinoceros horns, hornbill bones, animal skins, exotic animals, and the Chinese antiques from the Tang, Song, and Ming Dynasties found in the native terrace houses at low prices. He then shipped them to Europe and the Americas. Rumors claimed that he had traded Negroes in the South of the United States when he was younger. This Englishman had recently received an order from a European Medical Association to buy one hundred Asian skulls for experiments. Christian had already collected eighty-three skulls (1998: 7).

Regardless of whether Christian is directly connected to the British colonial government, he is a colonial opportunist who seizes the rhetoric of the white man's burden as justification for his trading activities in the region. What makes this passage significant is its attempt to link the British colonial enterprise via the trading practice of a British subject to a global capitalist system in the form of colonialism. Christian's profession as a trader does not simply benefit himself or his home country; it helps sustain a Euro-American expansionism that engenders the poaching of resources, such as goods, artifacts, and labor, from "less civilized" societies through the act of colonialization and the practice of slave trades. Despite being rumors, the implications of Christian's past involvement in trading Negroes in the American South point to a similar shady atmosphere surrounding Christian's business activities in Malaya. What is the most ironic about this opening scene in *The Elephant Herd* is the uncanny mirroring of the colonialist's crime of trading the skulls of Asians to Europe with the indigenous Dayaks in the novel who are often described as primitive head-hunting cannibals. The perverse parallel of the local primitivism with capitalist globalism opens up much space for us to critique not just the character Christian but expose the violence of exploitations of the non-west by global imperialist powers; it lays bare the injustice embedded in the world system of capitalist globalization to the time period of European colonialism.

To take the critique of global capitalism in postcolonial narratives such as Chang's work a step further, Sinophone Malaysian literature with its focus on

Chinese settler community and their influence in Malaya lends to such critique of a different dimension. In his second installment to the *Rain Forest Trilogy*,^[10] *Monkey Cup [Houbei]*, Chang indirectly calls out Chinese settlers in Malaya for their involvement in the European colonial enterprise by profiting off the natural resources and the land they have stolen from indigenous people. As Zhi the protagonist enters the rainforest and arrives at the Dayak village, members of the tribe introduce Zhi to the native hospitality. After an evening of feasting and drinking, recollections of his family history begin to flash through his mind:

Zhi remembered Great Grandfather's coffee and tobacco farms. The sky was blue like the color of crab shell, the clouds curled like the crab belly, the grasshopper grabbed the sparrow, the praying mantis captured the frog. A white cowboy from the cigarette commercial shown in the movie theatre rode his horse to survey the tobacco farm. Tobacco plants spreaded out all over in abundance, like a swarm of grasshoppers followed by a swarm of praying mantises, wandering in the Northeast monsoon. Sticking out from an axillary bud was a packet of imported cigarette printed with English alphabets and wrapped in cellophane, the bejeweled nectar of the food source for the gods from East and West. While dry mouth and fogginess overcame him, from the story told by Grandfather, Zhi pictured Great Grandfather bringing home a team of patrolmen to hunt down the Dayaks who had burnt down his tobacco and poppy farms, and to kill them with every shot fired. . . .(2000: 130)

It is important to note that Zhi's recollection of this episode of his family history is mediated through another memory of his encounter with an underage social escort. Before his trip back to Sarawak, Zhi goes out for a drink with his colleague from the Taiwanese high school he teaches at. At the bar, he encounters the underage social escort. While searching for his underage sister who has gone missing in the rainforest after giving birth to a stillborn baby, Zhi first arrives at the Dayak village with the help of Badu, a Dayak. Following a feast of indigenous cuisine and rice wine hosted by the Dayaks, Zhi's mind starts to run wild. It is here where his memory of the encounter with the social escort collapse with his family history. In a Marcel Proust like manner, Zhi's mind tunnels down his memory lane. When remembering the underage social escort offering him a Hilton cigarette brought to the bar by two Americans, the well-known American brand cigarette triggers Zhi's screen memory. Highly affected by the alcohol he has consumed at the Dayak feast, Zhi recalls what his grandfather has told him about his great grandfather's business dealing. Despite the style of magical realism permeating his recollection, we learn that Zhi's great grandfather is the

owner of tobacco and opium farms in Sarawak. Based on what his grandfather has told him, he gathers (as he “imagines”) that due to harassments by the Dayaks who attempt to burn down the farms, Great Grandfather has brought a team of patrolmen to hunt down and assassinate the Dayaks. We only find out later that the Dayaks’ motivation to destroy the farms is driven by the desire to reclaim their land stolen by Chinese settlers like Zhi’s great grandfather. This act of occupying the land of the indigenous for personal use and profit aligns Chinese settlers with the British as their prosperity in the area hinges on their colonial practice of property and resource appropriation often without the consent of the indigenous people. The peculiar line in the passage is none other than the following: “A white cowboy from the cigarette commercial shown in the movie theatre rides his horse to survey the tobacco farm.” Though seemingly out of place, the sentence sticks out to foreshadow the global dimension of Great Grandfather’s farming business as Zhi continues to reveal more about his family history:

The foreign cigarettes Great Grandfather smoked were in fact the product from his own tobacco farm. He sold the tobacco to the colonial government and the colonial government shipped them back to the Great Britain. Britain then used the newest technology and high productivity packaging to manufacture them into filtered cigarettes to be sold to the entire world and their colonies. . . .(2000: 135)

This episode in *Monkey Cup* offers us an entry point to examine the role of Chinese settlers in Sarawak who have adopted settler colonial practices. The settlers’ occupying of and benefiting off indigenous land would not have been possible if they had not aligned themselves with the colonial government. The above passage makes clear the meaning of the cowboy imagery in the cigarette commercial described in the previously quoted passage. The seemingly out of place imagery underscores the myth behind the end product, the name brand American cigarette, punctuated by the colonialist figure of the American cowboy surveying a tobacco farm. Though Zhi’s great grandfather is no American cowboy, the colonial resonance in the imagery and his ownership of the farms is not subtle. Nevertheless, the connection is not simply a metaphorical one. By growing a business out of occupied land, Great Grandfather participates in a network of global operation that has facilitated the market transactions and production of goods—he supplies the international tobacco and opium trade with the produce from his farm. Even though the concept of free market is not common to the colonial era, it seems fitting in describing this collaborative relationship between Chinese settlers and the British colonial government in the context of Zhi’s family. It is this relationship that makes the commercialization

of both the American cigarette as symbol of status (the American cowboy) and the worldwide distribution of the final product as a merchandize of Western lifestyle possible.

What I try to do with the above examples from *The Elephant Herd* and *Monkey Cup* is to bring to light the potential of the novels to allow for not simply an anti-colonial reading of the realities of British occupation of Malaya but also to further unpack and reveal the often-overlooked conditions and factors that had facilitated the colonial control over the region. More importantly, I hope to uncover how local colonial realities are part and parcel of European colonial history as an enterprise driven by a systemic form of global capitalism involving different forms of colonial practices from European expansionism to settler colonialism. This offers a perspective that requires the unlearning of Euro-American-centric discourse of history in order to relearn an appreciation for the articulations of the communities of the South.

The reference to the Chinese-Dayak conflict in modern Malayan history in the second example offers an entry point to discuss the second thematic focus of this article. Building on the first focus of the critique of global capitalism in the form of colonial practices, I turn to an important narrative surrounding the setting in Chang's *Monkey Cup*— the Dayak habitat rooted in the rainforest. My reading of Chang's representation of the Dayaks resists the rhetoric of primitivism as literary imaginary of viewing the indigenous people as observer of tradition. Instead, I argue that Chang's attention to the Dayaks offers a peek into how indigenous communities such as the Dayaks in postcolonial Malaysia are increasingly aware of "the impact of globalization, its aftermath, and how those [like themselves] on the bottom are surviving it. . ." (López 2). More importantly the shift from the discourses of Third World and Postcolonial worldviews to that of the Global South spawns a potential route for the Dayaks to imagine and invent themselves as belonging to a network of global subalterns whose autonomy depends on their creative negotiation between nationalism and global capitalism, in the following example from *Monkey Cup*.

Prior to the episode discussed above, the novel invests dozens of pages describing Zhi's encounter with the Dayak community on his way to find his sister Limei. Fearing that Zhi might lose his way in the rainforest, Yanini, the Dayak girl Zhi becomes friends with at the hospital, introduces Zhi to Badu, the Dayak youth mentioned earlier. Badu works at the Longhouse resort owned by Yanini's family and tribe as an indigenous tour guide. Having led groups of white folks on tours along the Baran River in the fourth province of Sarawak, Yanini believes that Badu will be able to protect Zhi across the unpredictable terrains of the rainforest. On their way trekking deep into the rainforest, the narrative presents the typical perception of the rainforest as mysterious and illusionary

through the eyes of Zhi. Badu's crude and hostile attitude towards Zhi also falls in line with the kind of ethnic imaginary embedded in Zhi's perception (and most probably that of readers like us) of the indigenous people as primitive and lacking hospitality. Yet, upon arriving at the first longhouse in the Dayak village, Zhi and the readers are introduced to an indigenous community that has been impacted by global tourism.

The morning sunlight dropped like incendiary bombs. This was a modernized sample longhouse used to host prominent guests and tourists. It was built with materials of the highest quality, fully equipped with water and electricity. Farm animals were reared on the ground floor for show while traditional tools and utensils were on display along the corridor. As the tourists arrive, the indigenous staff rushed to hide the TVs and audio equipment as if hiding convicts from the authority and changed from their jeans and dresses into thongs and sarong. They pretended to look languid as if suffering from brain herniation while standing side by side to welcome the guests who arrived in vehicles of different sizes. With a little money, tourists could take photos with the staff, enjoy coming of age rituals, harvest festival and head sacrifice dance. Under the state's vigorous investment in tourism, the group of Dayak staff were like timid suckling pigs trapped in the pigsty. There was barely any Dayak spirit left to display except from the patterned animal hide worn by the staff and the carvings on artifacts. It was as if these artifacts such as bottles, basket, knives and arrows were packed full of native Dayak essence and representations. . . .(2000: 113)

This passage marks Zhi's initial encounter with the Dayak community in their "natural" habitat, the longhouse. No doubt there is nothing natural about the setting in this first longhouse in the village. It is fully equipped with modern facilities such as water and electricity, and is after all a show house for foreign tourists. What is important to note is Zhi's position in his encounter with the Dayak community. Occupying an ethnographic position different from that of the tourists who travel from around the world to consume the indigenous culture of the Dayaks, Zhi is presented with a privileged perspective to observe how indigenous tourism is performed in this particular site in Sarawak. The narrative description and tone in the passage imply a lamentation for the erosion of the Dayak culture due to modernization. Furthermore, the attempt to preserve culture for the purpose of embracing tourism as a form of survival for the community ends up depleting the meanings of artifacts and cultural practices, hence, weakening the ethnic spirit and pride of the Dayaks. More importantly, this

passage allows us to take a critical stance to illuminate the contradicting internal logic of indigenous tourism. This contradiction lies in the industry's production and sustaining of a "tourist gaze" that embodies the desire to experience an "authentic" indigenous culture. It is this desire for authenticity that contradicts the understanding of all cultures transforming over time. As a result, the obsession with authenticity in indigenous cultures leads to the assumption of these cultures as static and engenders the objectification of these cultures for consumption.

While Zhi's initial point of view in the above passage strategically deconstructs our view of the indigenous people and indigeneity as belonging to a primitive time and space, the depiction of an indigenous village that has embraced globalization for survival does not necessarily free the people and their community from primitive time and space. If anything, indigenous tourism which is centered around the performativity of ethnic cultures perpetuates the myth of indigenous cultures as backwards and static. However, Chang's portrayal of the Dayaks is much more complex than this initial encounter. As Zhi follows his guide Badu further into the indigenous site, he notices that the site becomes less touristy; the deeper he travels, the closer he is to the habitat of the Dayak tribe where their daily rituals reside.

Badu traveled passed three such longhouses. The deeper he went inland, the longhouses appeared to be much less extravagantly furnished; yet they exposed a much stronger sense of the Dayak spirit across with young and old generations living in them. The Dayak language was the main language used among the inhabitants of these longhouses; it revealed the pride and dignity of the indigenous tribe. They did not have to mix Chinese or English in their speech; they did not have to kiss up to the English language or allow Chinese languages to exploit or mistreat them simply to please their tourists. Regardless, the area was after all a tourist site, a group of tourists could be seen gathering in a circle outside the third longhouse watching cockfight and betting with US dollars. (114)

From the passage, it seems that tourist activities are limited to the exterior of the third longhouse where spectator sports such as cockfighting is held for international tourists. The irony here lies in the fact that the third longhouse where the daily life of the Dayaks can be found with a prominent presence of the Dayak spirit translated through the uniform use of the Dayak language is not accessible to the tourist gaze. It is as if the concrete lives of the Dayaks remain in the backstage in contrast to the staginess of the frontstage where the tourist gaze looms. Such partitioning of the tourist versus indigenous space does not

hold one against the other; it does, however, allow the indigenous community to actively engage in a global mode of capitalist practice while sustaining its sovereignty to negotiate and resist global consumption and cooptation of their culture. In fact, I suggest reading this coexistence of a commercialized and local cultural space as the foundation of a third space that could empower the Dayaks in negotiating their tribal autonomy with both state and global forces. In its own complex logic, the forces of globalization have enabled global subalterns to imagine and invent themselves beyond national boundaries for such autonomy. Here, I borrow what transnational indigenous epistemologist Doreen E. Martinez calls the “intelligence of participation”^[11] of indigenous communities in “actively and intelligently negotiating” their agency and representation when participating in a global enterprise such as indigenous tourism (563). Quoting Kevin Bruyneel from *The Third Space of Sovereignty*,^[12] Martinez recognizes that the third space for indigenous people and communities is “a space of sovereignty and/or citizenship that is inassimilable to the modern liberal democratic settler-state and nation” and one that “refuses to accommodate itself to the political choices framed by the imperial binary: assimilation or secession, inside or outside, modern or traditional” (563). Recognizing the potential of the third space in physical and conceptual terms, indigenous political actors involved in the maintenance of indigenous tourism, exploits the overlapping developments of state neoliberal policies. These are policies that promote global capitalism in local communities^[13] and support the global market economy which indigenous tourism is a part of. The convergence of these different realities is no doubt the outcome of an increasingly globalized world where national borders have become porous. By embracing the phenomenon of globalization as tactics to transform ethnic traditions into cultural currency, indigenous communities seize cultural tourism as a trade based off a different ecology of existence that mimics a global capitalist structure to simultaneously resist state censorship and global cooptation for their innovative forms of survivance, sustainability and indigeneity. Chang’s depiction of the Dayak community in *Monkey Cup* interestingly epitomes the overlapping composite “worlds” whereby “relational communities and cosmologies are sustained by “concrete lives led [by ordinary people] in specific circuits between the global and local” (Clifford 482).

Conclusion

WITH my analysis of episodes from Chang’s *The Elephant Herd* and *Monkey Cup*, I have laid out how the Global South as methodology engenders the analytical focus on the possibilities and impediments of globalization as a modern phenomenon. From colonial exploitation to settler colonial violence to

the survivance of the Dayak tribe, I argue that a turn to the Global in the context of the societies from the South can further academic standstill of scholarship such as those of postcolonial studies that have often inescapably trapped in discourses of national liberation and nation building. Furthermore, a Global South methodology urges us to extend beyond the complacency of engaging in easy criticism of globalization, the global market economy and neoliberal policies; it encourages and facilitates the examination of how communities of the South, especially those belonging to immigrant, indigenous, marginal and minority groups cope, resist, negotiate and exploit the impact of globalization and its failure to live up to its promises for those who experience it from the bottom.

As the first half of this article shows that such a decolonial approach of the Global South would not have been theoretically and methodologically viable without an attempt to map out a historiography of how anti-colonial and anti-imperialist discourses have pathed the way for the imagination and invention of an equitable status of minority and marginal communities in the increasingly globalized world tainted by complex and messy political and economic connections. Without Spivak's stout advocacy for the unlearning and unworlding of the epistemology of western knowledge production and dissemination to relearn and reworld a knowledge system based on Third World realities, and Pheng Cheah's rethinking of the world as a temporal concept not exclusively defined by its spatial dimension to deconstruct the western hegemony of knowledge making, a Global South methodology will inevitably end up lacking in context and historical significance. Both Spivak's and Cheah's proposals are tied to a rethinking of what literature can do for humanity beyond the celebration of aesthetics and great storylines. Though Spivak does not articulate that overtly in her essay, she does so by using literary examples of subaltern women and their experience through her translation and analysis of the plight of subaltern women from South Asia. Cheah reintroduces us to the role literature plays in transforming our world. With these as foundation, the conceptualization of a Global South paradigm to literary studies will not fall short in simply being concepts and ideas that are out of touch with reality.

Global South as methodology can also promote lateral relations and comparisons instead of sustaining vertical ones defined by hierarchical binaries such as East versus West, North versus South, Third versus First World, etc. Following the UNDP motto "South-South Cooperation" for their Global South resolution, a Global South methodology turns our attention from parsing vertical power relations to exploring lateral relational growth. Under such premise, a Sinophone Global South paradigm that I propose and describe in this article with attention to Sinophone Malaysian literature, can perhaps be useful to scholars working on Sinophone Taiwanese literature and culture to, for example, examine

the effects of settler colonial history in Taiwan on its indigenous populations. I believe that by broadening our attention from exposing the disenfranchisement of global subalterns by local governments and global institutions to explore the inventive potential of global subalterns to work the systems for community empowerment, we can engage a Global South methodology to consider similar Sinophone issues such as racial tensions and conflicts in Malaysia and Indonesia, and Southeast Asian foreign workers' rights in Sinophone societies, etc. There is much potential to be explored in a paradigm that could help us "conceptualize practices of subaltern region-making, realities invisible to more world systemic, center-periphery models of globalization and locality" (Clifford 476) in the Sinophone World.

Notes

1. Spivak admits that her use of the concept of "worlding" is loosely based on Heidegger's. She appropriates the concept to critically question the violence of cartographic mapping of colonial conquerors.
2. See Spivak (1988), 271–313.
3. In "Trois mondes, une planète," published on 14 August 1952 in the French magazine, *L'Observateur*, Alfred Sauvy coined the term "Triers-monde" (Third World) to mark the distinction between post- and neo-colonial societies from capitalist and socialist ones. For discussion on the political and economic development of the Third World, see Escobar (2011).
4. In the 1960s, the term evolved into a concept that embodies the ideology of the radical left. The adoption of a revolutionary potential offers societies of the South the option of a socio-political structure other than the dominant systems of capitalism and socialism. For more on the meaning of the Third World in the 1960s, see Arif Dirlik (2012), vii–ix and Kuhn (2012), 69–98.
5. The dissolution of the Soviet Union between 1988–1991 led to a cartographic rethinking of the Third World structure.
6. The introduction of a set of ten economic policies by the IMF, World Bank, and U.S. to support emerging-market economies known as the Washington Consensus contributed to the rise of the Global South as a replacement for the Third World to describe developing societies of the South. The term Washington Consensus is first introduced by economist John Williamson in his article "What Washington Means by Policy Reform," (1989), 7–20.
7. See UNDP's 2004 publication *Forging a Global South: United Nation Days for South-South Cooperation* for details of this initiative.
8. I use the common transcription of the term "Mahua wenzue" instead of "Ma Hua wenzue" used in Tee's essay.
9. Brian Bernards attributes this development of Postcolonial Sinophone Malaysian literature as an attempt to go "transnational" via Taiwan, and an outcome of the Malay state's minoritization of Sinophone communities and cultures. Bernards cites events such as the 1969 ethnic riots in Kuala Lumpur

and the implementation of the National Cultural Policy (Dasar Kebudayaan Kebangsaan) as reasons for the influx of Sinophone Malaysians pursuing tertiary education in Taiwan. The policy declares Malay literature and Sinophone literature as ethnic literature. See Bernards (2015), 82–83, 87–88. In a sense, Taiwan functions as a site of recuperation for Sinophone Malaysian writers' who continue to search for the myth of "cultural return" with the loss of mainland China to communism and the anti-communism rhetoric in Asia.

10. Chang's Rain Forest Trilogy includes *The Elephant Herd* (1998), *Monkey Cup* (2000) and *My South Sea Sleeping Beauty* (2001).
11. In her specific study on indigenous tourism, Martinez claims that for indigenous "artists, performers, and entrepreneurs . . . the intelligence of participation demonstrates a sophistication, adaptability, and consciousness of multiple worldviews and the commercial negotiation these active participants complete" (2012: 555).
12. For more on Bruyneel (2007).
13. Alexis Celeste Buntun claims in "More Like Ourselves: Indigenous Capitalism through Tourism" that "Most Indigenous tourism venues are . . . made possible largely through increased communications technology, the rapid expansion of the international tourism industry, and neoliberal government policies aimed to boost national economies through international visitorship and to rectify multigenerational trauma resulting from past colonial engagements, assimilationist policies, genocide, and slavery . . ." (2010: 285–286). It is the national state's recognition of the importance of tourism to national economies that opens up the potential for indigenous communities to negotiate for indigenous sovereignty.

WORKS CITED

- Bachner, Andrea (2010) "Reinventing Chinese Writing: Zhang Guixing's Sinographic Translations." Wang & Tsu (eds.): 177–196.
- Bernards, Brian (2013) "Plantation and Rainforest: Chang Kuei-hsing and a South Seas Discourse of Coloniality and Nature." Shih, Tsai & Bernards (eds.): 325–338.
- Bernards, Brian (2015) *Writing the South Seas: Imagining the Nanyang in Chinese and Southeast Asian Postcolonial Literature* (Seattle: University of Washington Press).
- Bruyneel, Kevin (2007) *The Third Space of Sovereignty: The Post-colonial Politics of U.S.-Indigenous Relations*. (Minnesota: University of Minnesota Press).
- Buntun, Alexis Celeste (2010) "More like Ourselves: Indigenous Capitalism through Tourism." *The American Indian Quarterly* 34.3: 285–311.
- Chang Kuei-hsing [Zhang Guixing] (1998) *Qunxiang [The Elephant Herd]* (Taipei: China Times Publishing Co.).

- Chang Kuei-hsing [Zhang Guixing] (2000) *Houbei [Monkey Cup]* (Taipei: UNITAS Publishing Co.).
- Chang Kuei-hsing [Zhang Guixing] (2001) *Wo sinian de changmian zhong de Nanguo gongzhu [My South Seas Sleeping Beauty]* (Taipei: Rye Field Publishing Co.).
- Cheah, Pheng (2016) *What is a World? On Postcolonial Literature as World Literature*. (Durham: Duke University Press).
- Christiansen, Samantha & Zachary A. Scarlett (eds.) (2012) *The Third World in the Global 1960s* (New York: Berghahn Books).
- Clifford, James (2001) "Indigenous Articulations." *The Contemporary Pacific* 13.2: 467–490.
- Dirlik, Arif (2007) "Global South: Predicament and Promise." *The Global South* 1.1 & 2: 12–23.
- Dirlik, Arif (2012) "Foreword: The Third World in 1968." Christiansen & Scarlett (eds.): vii–ix.
- Escobar, Arturo (2001) *Encountering Development: The Making and Unmaking of the Third World* (Princeton: Princeton University Press).
- Figueira, Dorothy (2007) "'The Global South': Yet Another Attempt to Engage the Other." *The Global South* 1.1 & 2: 144–152.
- Groppe, Alison M. (2013) *Sinophone Malaysian Literature: Not Made in China* (Amherst: Cambria Press).
- Huang, Yu-ting (2018) "The Settler Baroque: Decay and Creolization in Chang Kuei-hsing's Borneo Rainforest Novels." Huang Yu-ting & Rebecca Weaver-Hightower (eds.): *Archiving Settler Colonialism* (New York: Routledge), 238–253.
- Kuhn, Konrad J. (2012) "Liberation Struggle and Humanitarian Aid: International Solidarity Movements and the 'Third World' in the 1960s." Christiansen & Scarlett (eds.): 69–98.
- Levander, Caroline & Walter Mignolo (2011) "Introduction: The Global South and World Dis/Order." *The Global South* 5.1: 1–11.
- López, Alfred J. (2007) "Introduction: The (Post)global South." *The Global South* 1.1–2: 1–11.
- Martinez, Doreen E (2012) "Wrong Directions and New Maps of Voice, Representation, and Engagement: Theorizing Cultural Tourism, Indigenous Commodities, and the Intelligence of Participation." *The American Indian Quarterly* 36.4: 545–573.
- Sauvy, Alfred (1952) "Trois Mondes, Une Planète." *L'Observateur* Aug. 14: 14. (www.homme-moderne.org/societe/demo/sauvy/3mondes.html).
- Shih, Shu-mei (2007) *Visuality and Identity: Sinophone Articulations Across the Pacific* (Los Angeles: University of California Press), 1–39.
- Shih, Shu-mei (2013) "Against Diaspora: Sinophone as Places of Cultural Production." Shih, Tsai & Bernards (eds.): 25–42.

- Shih Shu-mei, Tsai Chien-hsin & Brian Bernards (eds.) (2013) *Sinophone Studies: A Critical Reader* (New York: Columbia University Press).
- Sparke, Matthew (2007) "Everywhere but Always Somewhere: Critical Geographies of the Global South." *The Global South* 1.1–2: 117–126.
- Spivak, Gayatri Chakravorty (1985) "Three Women's Texts and a Critique of Imperialism." *Critical Inquiry* 12.1: 243–261.
- Spivak, Gayatri Chakravorty (1985a) "The Rani of Sirmur: An Essay in Reading the Archives." *History and Theory* 24.3: 247–272.
- Spivak, Gayatri Chakravorty (1988) "Can the Subaltern Speak?" Cary Nelson & Lawrence Grossberg (eds.): *Marxism and the Interpretation of Culture* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press), 271–313.
- Tan, E.K. (2013) *Rethinking Chineseness: Translational Sinophone Identities in the Nanyang Literary World* (Amherst: Cambria Press).
- Tee Kim Tong (2010) "(Re)Mapping Sinophone Literature." Wang & Tsu (eds.): 77–91.
- Tee Kim Tong (2013) "Sinophone Malaysian Literature: An Overview." Shih, Tsai & Bernards (eds.): 304–314.
- Tsu, Jing (2010) *Sound and Script in Chinese Diaspora* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press).
- United Nations Development Programme (2004) *Forging a Global South: United Nation Days for South-South Cooperation*. 19 Dec..
- Wang, David Der-wei (2001) "Zai qunxiang yu houdang de jiaxiang: Zhang Guixing de Mahua gushi" [In the Home Land of Elephant Herds and Monkey Gangs: Chang Kuei-hsing's Sinophone Malaysian Stories]. Chang Kuei-hsing 2001: 9–38.
- Wang, David Der-wei & Jing Tsu (eds.) (2010) *Global Chinese Literature: Critical Essays* (Leiden: Brill Publishers).
- Williamson, John (1989) "What Washington Means by Policy Reform." John Williamson (ed.): *Latin American Readjustment: How Much has Happened* (Washington: Institute for International Economics), 7–20.

ABSTRACT

This article explores the potential of a Sinophone Global South paradigm by first adopting the concept of "worlding" literature to deconstruct and reconstruct how marginal literature or literature from the periphery negotiates its status within a system of recognition in the production and circulation of knowledge. This existing system of knowledge has for too long been dominated by a western epistemology. Using the works of Sinophone Malaysian writer Chang Kuei-hsing [Zhang Guixing], the article then folds this rethinking of Sinophone Malaysian literature through an act

of literary cartographic design into the current debates of the Global South. By thinking Sinophone literature through the lens of the Global South, the article examines the viability of a Sinophone Global South paradigm that could offer insights to how issues of global capitalism and indigenous sovereignty are cogently discussed. This prevents indigenous representations from being treated simply as plotlines to elevate the identity politics of Sinophone communities. It is through this paradigm that Sinophone studies reinforces its critical vitality in identifying, addressing, and critiquing the multiple axes of power operating as origins of oppression and exploitation.

KEYWORDS: Dayak, Global capitalism, Global South, indigenous, Malaysia, postcolonial, worlding, Sinophone

世界化的馬華文學 邁向全球南方化的範式

陳榮強
石溪大學

摘 要

這篇論文探討華語語系全球南方化作為研究範式的潛力。首先採用文學「世界化」的概念來解構和重構邊緣文學或來自邊緣的文學如何在知識生產和流通中的認可體系裏協商其地位。這種現有的知識體系長期以來一直受西方認識論的支配。本文接著通過馬華作家張貴興的作品，以文學勘繪方式重新思考馬華文學，將之植入全球南方化的辯論中。本文從全球南方化的視角來思考華語語系文學，並藉由全球南方化範式來洞察全球資本主義和原住民主權的問題。在這範式的影響下華語語系研究可以更具體地辨識、處理和批判霸權對弱勢族群的壓迫和剝削。

關鍵詞：達雅克、全球資本主義、全球南方化、原住民、馬來西亞、後殖民、世界化、華語語系