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Christina Pribichevich-Zoric’s English translation of Zlata Filipovic’s diary, entitled Zlata’s Diary: A Child’s Life in Sarajevo (1994), is a work that describes eleven-year-old Bosnian-Croat Filipovic’s experience of the war in Bosnia from 1991-1993. Through its translation, the subjective narrative of a young girl becomes accessible to English-speaking readers, and becomes a historical source with the potential to enrich the global comprehension of the complex conflict in the former Yugoslavia. Existing literary reviews and scholarship constitute the prevalent, primarily pedagogical reception of the English translation, one that universalizes the themes of the text at the expense of the local and national context it describes. The Anglo-American readership receives the text according to the dictates of its marketers and publishers: as “the young Anne Frank of Sarajevo,” (Smith 137), who speaks to universal aspects of the “human spirit” (Buckman, Chance and Lesesne 61). By comparing two case studies of the employment of Zlata’s Diary in the American classroom, I consider two modes of pedagogical appropriation, both of which employ the translation as a ‘universal text’ to varying degrees in an attempt to reconcile cultural, racial and linguistic difference in the target language culture. Such a consideration seeks to define the theoretical notion of the universal text and to determine whether such a literary classification exists in practice.

According to Lawrence Venuti, the translation of a foreign literary text challenges its target audience, not only in its linguistic difference, but also because it presents structures of thought, writing and cultural interaction that may not correspond to the native literature of the target language. He refers to this challenge as “an act of violence” (177), where the foreign literary text potentially poses a threat to a nation’s homogenous self-perception by presenting linguistic and cultural differences. To subdue this threat, the target language culture often emphasizes the “universal spirit” of the text, a concept Venuti borrows from Victor Hugo (177): “an essentialist concept of humanity that transcends boundaries of class and nation” (179). Emphasis on the universal qualities of the translated work allows the text to contribute to the target language literature in a less-
threatening manner, but also risks the loss of the local context in its suppression of linguistic and cultural differences.

Rebecca Walkowitz (2007) provides further insight into the supposed universal text, arguing that the prevalence of translation as a necessary practice within the new world literature leads to “texts that exist from the beginning in several places” (218). The new world literature functions independently from the western literary canon, striving to establish a “network” rather than the canonized binary of “literary masterpieces and literary underdogs (books produced outside of western Europe and US)” (217). Some authors are beginning to write with the consciousness that their work will be translated, a process which leads to the pre-translated, inherently global text, by “avoid[ing] vernacular references and linguistic complexity” (216). Walkowitz stresses the underlying structure of “the disciplinary protocols of English literary studies” (218); while the new world literature partially subverts the centrality of English literature, the latter continues to haunt the production and reception of literature on the global scale (218-219). According to this argument, while literary texts are becoming increasingly “global,” they continue to operate within the western Anglicized literary paradigm. Does the universal text necessarily contain embedded structures, patterns and values that correspond to the Anglicized, western body of literature? Further, does the term ‘universal’ essentially refer to the English-speaking west? The emphasis of the “universal spirit” brings its own form of violence to bear on the pre-translated text and the local context in which it is produced. In examining the Anglo-American pedagogical appropriation of Zlata’s Diary, I draw out both Venuti’s and Walkowitz’ theorized instances of violence in the reception of the English translation.

Zlata’s Diary, as a historical document, offers unique and privileged insight into the local context of the Bosnian conflict (1992-1996); yet its Anglo-American reception has seen it primarily appropriated as a pedagogical tool. Michael Biggins, in his review of Zlata’s Diary (1995), predicts the text will function primarily as “a document of one particular tortured time and place” (545) in contrast to the categorization of Anne Frank’s diary as a “classic;” however, the subsequent pedagogical appropriation of the diary has instead highlighted its universal applicability much in accordance with the precedent set by The Diary of Anne Frank. Publishers have encouraged the parallel between the diaries
in promotional materials (545), deliberately situating Zlata’s Diary within the framework of the commercial success of The Diary of Anne Frank and emphasizing the connection that Filipovic herself acknowledges (29). Target language readership, lacking understanding of the local context the diary describes, instead emphasizes the shared “human spirit” (Buckman et al 61) of the text – that of lost childhood (Smith 144), and maintaining one’s goals in the face of hardship and struggle (Buckman et al, 71). The majority of target language readers do not approach the text in order to learn about the conflict in Sarajevo and the effects on its citizens; rather, the text has been incorporated into North American language arts and English curriculum to the extent that it is primarily taken as an English-language publication (Kent 1087), its status as a translation often unrecognized.

Susan Bassnett acknowledges the problematic appropriation of translated texts in the American classroom: “Conflicting attitudes toward translation in the English-speaking world can be drawn from the way in which educational systems have come to rely increasingly on the use of translated texts in teaching, without ever attempting to study the processes of translation (14). This phenomenon contrasts with the way Zlata’s Diary has been employed in its local context. Janine Clark reports on the education system of Bosnia-Hercegovina (2010) as a significant impediment to ethnic reconciliation in the aftermath of the conflict. The “two schools under one roof” policy allows schools to segregate students according to ethnicity in order to teach separate curricula in separate languages, according to the ethnicity of majority (Clark 346). The curricula call for different textbooks, which, according to Clark, teach varying and contradictory truths: the Serbian textbook emphasizes the victimization of Serbs during the conflict, while the Croatian textbook in turn highlights the victimization of Croats (348). Clark cites Zlata’s Diary not as a curricular text, which is how it would be included in a study of the American education system, but as a historical document—it is employed to support the argument that civilians in Bosnia-Hercegovina were aware of the approaching war before it occurred in 1992 (358). Despite similarities in racial and ethnic struggles in the American and Bosnian education systems, only the American system appropriates the foreign translation in order to overcome ethnic difference in the classroom, while in its local context Zlata’s Diary functions as a historical document.
One can locate the pedagogical appeal of Zlata’s Diary in the text itself—the diary appeals to a young readership by emphasizing the traumatic war experience of the child. Filipovic distinguishes between children and others: “It’s horrible in Sarajevo today. Shells falling, people and children getting killed, shooting” (my italics 38). Children occupy a unique position in the diary in contrast to “grown-ups” (103) and “ordinary folk” (200), and while this is to be expected given that its author is a child herself and is very much confined within her own subjectivity, it does partially explain why this text appeals to American teachers and students. The repeated image of the child of war as expressed through the simple form and grammatical structure of Filipovic’s writing constitutes a structure that is readily applicable to American pedagogy. The authentic child’s voice is inevitably lost to an extent in the adult translator Pribichevich-Zoric’s English, yet she maintains simple vocabulary and syntax. Further, Pribichevich-Zoric reproduces Filipovic’s unconventional grammar in instances such as, “… Grandma and Granddad, and sooooo many other good people” (148), as well as frequent and arbitrary capitalization for emphasis (32). The trope of the child of war is used to a greater extent in the dynamic between civilians and “politicians.” The term “kids” is parenthetically identified as “a popular term for politicians” (28), and throughout the diary Filipovic plays with the metaphor of war as a game to entertain the “kids” (129). The “kids’” game of war ironically deprives Sarajevan children of their childhood. This example demonstrates the applicability of this text in the American Language Arts classroom: a simple metaphor expresses war more generally in terms of the child’s experience, rather than situating the experience of war within the detailed local context of the conflict in Bosnia.

In addition to having been cited by multiple literary reviews as a pedagogically applicable text with universal values and appearing in the front matter of The English Journal in 1994 and 2000 as a suggested curricular text, Zlata’s Diary has played a more active pedagogical role in American classrooms. I employ two examples as case studies in order to examine the manner in which Zlata’s Diary has been pedagogically appropriated. The first is embodied by the publication The Freedom Writers Diary: How a Teacher and 150 Teens Used Writing to Change Themselves and the World Around Them (1999). Erin Gruwell, teacher at Wilson High School in Long Beach, California,
assigned her students *The Diary of Anne Frank* in 1994 to teach them about the Holocaust after a racial incident occurred in the classroom (The Freedom Writers and Gruwell 2-3). Having encountered *Zlata’s Diary* in a *Newsweek* article, she insists, “This has to be the next book that follows in the footsteps of Anne Frank” (Fairsoulfilms). Upon reading these texts the students were inspired to write their own experiences of violence and trauma, and the diary entries collectively compose *The Freedom Writers Diary*.

Gruwell’s recognition of the relationship between *Zlata’s Diary* and *The Diary of Anne Frank* is not surprising, as Filipovic herself makes the connection explicit in her diary; Filipovic’s consciousness of her diary’s participation in existing discourses influences her writing, thereby increasing its readability in the global context. The first shift occurs on page 29 of the text, when Filipovic situates her diary within the tradition of *The Diary of Anne Frank*. Initially, Filipovic records the everyday trivialities one expects to find in a young girl’s diary, and does not address her diary. However, as the diary progresses, the entries begin to document the war and the extent to which it affects daily life; in conjunction with this shift, Filipovic begins to enter into dialogue with her diary, addressing it as a friend, and even naming it. She writes, “Hey diary! You know what I think? Since Anne Frank called her diary kitty, maybe I could give you a name too” (29). The reference to Anne Frank proves significant in two ways. First, Filipovic compares her experience of the war in Sarajevo to Anne Frank’s experience of World War II, which she does more explicitly when she writes, “November 14, 1992 is a day Sarajevo will remember. It reminded me of the movies I saw about the Jews in the Second World War” (101). Filipovic’s comparison of her experience of the Yugoslav war to her knowledge about World War II situates the conflict in Sarajevo within historical discourse. This parallel makes war-torn Sarajevo accessible to western readers, as they are able to compare it to their knowledge of World War II as a common point of reference; on the other hand, it reduces the conflict to its universal elements, those that correspond to other historical ethnic conflicts. Further, Filipovic enters her diary into the “Anne Frank” discourse of young people’s war narratives, influencing the way in which it will be received by critics and reviewers in the global context. Following her resolution to name her diary, she begins to habitually address the diary, “Dear Mimmy.”
Significantly, she uses the English word, “Dear” in the original, instead of the Croat equivalent (*Zlatin dnevnik* 35). This indicates that Filipovic herself situates her diary within an Anglicized genre of diary writing, further contributing to the fluidity of the English translation.

Just as Anne Frank was aware of and anticipated the potential publication of her diary and embarked on a detailed process of “auto-editing” (Lefevere 60), one of a series of edits the diary underwent prior to its publication, so too Filipovic’s awareness that UNICEF will publish her diary leads to a significant shift in style and content. Sidonie Smith argues that Filipovic’s consciousness of potential publication affects the content of the diary:

[Zlata] begins to reflect on the situation in Sarajevo in rather poignant ways. Zlata's self-consciousness about her celebrity and her recognition of her role as representative child of Sarajevo emphasizing the tragedy of "lost childhood" (a discourse that comes from the journalists and advocates who take up her story) undoes the truth effect of "innocent child" and the "child's-eye view" otherwise produced through the diary (144).

Filipovic’s awareness of the international recognition of her diary influences her writing; as Smith argues, she is influenced by the international journalistic reading of her work as a “tragedy of ‘lost childhood.’” The majority of the journalists approaching Filipovic at this time, as recorded in her diary, are from Western countries such as France, Canada and Great Britain (194, 196). Western readership not only determines the dominant reception of the diary, but also influenced the writing of the work itself.

In addition, Filipovic here exemplifies the phenomenon of writing for translation, what Walkowitz identifies as a response to the increasing need for translation in the discipline of the new world literature. She describes this act as the composition of literary texts “with the knowledge that they will be published in several languages almost simultaneously” (219). Walkowitz assumes that the awareness of future translation informs the author’s writing, making it in a sense pre-translated. In a similar way, Filipovic becomes aware of UNICEF’s pending publication of her diary; Filipovic’s recognition of UNICEF [United Nations International Children’s Fund] as an international organization likely influenced her to write for a global readership (120), thereby increasing the text’s readability in the English-speaking context.
While an innovative pedagogical approach and a noble attempt to assist students in overcoming racial difference through reading and writing, *The Freedom Writers* employment of *Zlata’s Diary* in the Anglo-American context implicitly assumes the universal content of the diary and neglects the local context; American students relate Filipovic’s account of war-torn Sarajevo to their experiences of the streets of Long Beach as a “war zone” (The Freedom Writers and Gruwell 289). To relate the American and Bosnian contexts is to reduce *Zlata’s Diary* to its “universal.” In its global context, the diary becomes a mouthpiece for the expression of Anglo-American suffering to the extent that this compilation has been sensationalized, and the narratives of suffering commercialized, in the Hollywood film, *The Freedom Writers* (Lagravenese 2007), in which the Hollywood actress Hilary Swank plays Erin Gruwell. *Zlata’s Diary*, which Gruwell cites as an integral component to the inception of *The Freedom Writers Diary*, is absent from the film. By excluding Zlata Filipovic and her diary, and featuring *The Diary of Anne Frank*, the film essentially equates Anne Frank and Zlata Filipovic under the designation of child of wartime. The film’s central conflict of racial segregation and violence, perpetuated by students, parents, teachers and administrators, is countered by Gruwell’s students’ domesticating belief that “Anne Frank understands our situation, my situation.” Here, Anne Frank is appropriated for the purpose of healing American cultural and racial struggles and is severed from her cultural-historical context.

Despite this critical stance on the interpretation of *Zlata’s Diary* as universal, I acknowledge the textual basis for such an interpretation; in accordance with Walkowitz’ consideration that pre-translated texts tend to contain western English literary structures, *Zlata’s Diary* in some ways lends itself to western appropriation. Filipovic’s familiarity with and reference to global, and primarily western, popular culture (Smith 146) tempers the challenge or “act of violence” (Venuti 177) of the text. Filipovic expresses herself using the language of *The Fresh Prince of Bel Air*, “YO BABY YO” (Filipovic 20), therein adopting the televised language of the stereotypical contemporary African-American youth; she narrates a dream about her desire for Michael Jackson’s autograph (23); and she expresses excitement about a class trip to the cinema to see *White Fang*, based on the novel by Jack London (20), revealing not only the prevalence of Western
influence on popular culture in Bosnia-Herzegovina, but also that children are reading western literature and watching western films in the classroom.

In several of the photos included in the published diary, Zlata appears wearing a Levi Strauss sweatshirt, emblazoned with the slogan, “Born and Worn in America” (50). The association of Filipovic, as a spokeschild of children’s suffering of ethnic and national conflict in the former Yugoslavia (Smith 138), with North American origins creates an ironic effect. The prevalence of western influence and culture in Zlata’s Diary, and the situation of its author within western culture, makes the translation particularly readable in North America.

The presence of western popular culture in Zlata’s Diary draws attention to a complex, and perhaps one-sided, relationship between Bosnia-Herzegovina and the “west,” and in particular North America. The diary, originally published in Croat by UNICEF in 1993 and entitled Zlatin dnevnik, was subsequently published in French as Le Journal de Zlata later in 1993 and in English in 1994 (Smith 137). While the English and French translations are widely available in North America, particularly in school libraries, the original Croat version is relatively inaccessible. While one cannot expect a demand for original Croat literary texts in a predominantly English-speaking continent, the lack of access grants the translation an extensive amount of freedom in terms of taking on new and possibly different meaning in the global context. David Damrosch considers the extent to which target language reception alters the life of a literary text in its global context in his essay, “Death in Translation,” in which he engages critically with Serbian Milorad Pavic’s novel Dictionary of the Khazars, arguing that the process of being translated and read by the international community lessens the novel’s implications in the local and national context and produces new meaning in the global context.

The inaccessibility of the original Croat Zlatin dnevnik reveals the distance between the west and what is considered the east in certain contexts, a distance that does not extend in a reciprocal fashion. Filipovic writes about her dual awareness of local current events and international cultural fashions: “Since yesterday people have been inside the B-H parliament. Some of them are standing outside, in front of it. We’ve moved my television set into the living room, so I watch Channel 1 on one TV and ‘Good Vibrations’ on the other” (33)—“Good Vibrations” having earlier been identified as a
channel that plays Western music like the *Top Gun* soundtrack. This passage suggests Filipovic’s simultaneous participation in both “eastern” and “western” cultures. While the young Bosnian Croat is exposed to and knowledgeable about global and western culture, the familiarity of most North American readers with Bosnian culture and context is substantially more limited, and some approach *Zlata’s Diary* as a means to learn about the conflict in Bosnia-Herzegovina; the function of the diary as a cultural document, which is not how it has been primarily received by its target audience, fails in certain respects as it often points readers back in the direction of Western popular culture.

In contrast to *The Freedom Writers’* response to *Zlata’s Diary* is the employment of the diary as a mode of “cultural sensitivity training” in the second case study, “*Stvaranje Prijatelja*/Making Friends: Multimodal Literacy Activities as Bridges to Intercultural Friendship and Understanding” (2003). This article presents an attempt by an ESL teacher, a language-arts/social studies teacher and a university professor of family literacy, motivation and multicultural education to facilitate bridge-building between twenty-six Bosnian immigrant students and twenty-one American students in Iowa, U.S.A., through literacy as a manifestation of intercultural communication (506-7). The study functions partly in response to instances of cultural stereotyping and inter-group hostility as a result of the segregation of Bosnian immigrant ESL students in Iowa schools (506). In attempting to reconcile conflict caused by racial and cultural differentiation, the teachers aim to provide students with the “general purpose of education – to bring our humanness to full flower” (506-7). This statement echoes Victor Hugo’s definition of the universal spirit as “an essentialist concept of humanity that transcends boundaries of class and nation” (Venuti 179). However, “Making Friends” differs from the previously discussed example of *The Freedom Writers Diary* in that it seeks to educate students about cultural and linguistic differences in order to establish common ground and shared elements, rather than to erase difference altogether in service of establishing the universal.

Participating American students were educated specifically with regard to the cultural and linguistic realities of the Bosnian immigrant students. Their reading of *Zlata’s Diary* was part of a series of activities, including listening to “Song for Sarajevo;” watching the film *Molly’s Pilgrim,* which portrays the experience of a Russian immigrant
student in the classroom; participation in second-language simulations; and hearing guest speakers from Bosnia (508). While the extent to which the American students comprehend the experience of the Bosnian immigrant students is necessarily limited, it is made more accessible by the sincere attempt to experience the culture and language on Bosnian terms. In this context Zlata’s Diary is read in order to learn about Bosnia, its culture, its people, and their experiences of the Yugoslav conflict as it manifested in Sarajevo; readers learn by identifying and acknowledging the foreign elements of the text—tempered as they are by Filipovic’s references to western popular culture and by her description of the conflict through the general experience of child of war—rather than erasing such difference.

While The Freedom Writers emphasize sameness over difference, “Making Friends” acknowledges difference while searching for commonalities and points of reference among individual accounts of culturally- and linguistically-determined experience. The latter approach to the text reveals that despite western cultural and linguistic influences, Zlata’s Diary contains foreign elements that confront and challenge English readers, thereby inflicting violence upon its target language readership. The subjective account of the conflict in Sarajevo offers limited insight to any reader lacking prior knowledge of the conflict, and thus certain foreign aspects of the diary are not easily translatable. Michael Biggins concedes that the diary “makes the subject [of the Yugoslav war] accessible, if not understandable” (544). Without prior contextual knowledge, target language readers likely miss cultural nuances of the text, such as the function of names to indicate ethnic background: “The circle of Zlata’s and her parents’ friends includes members of all three major Bosnian ethnic groups – Serbs, Croats and Muslims – a fact which is evident only from their names as Zlata writes about them, never from any overt categorizations” (545). Names prove to be problematic in the translation of a foreign literary text, and Biggins’ example demonstrates what Andre Lefevere identifies as the difficulty of translating the “illocutionary power” (17) of an original – in this case the potential literary or historical significance of the name. In some instances translators may replace the names of the original with corresponding names in the target language, that is, names that function to convey equivalent meaning in the target language culture (39). The nature of Zlata’s Diary as an autobiographical piece that treats a particular socio-
historical situation limits translator Christina Pribichevich-Zoric in this regard; she maintains the foreignizing element of names despite the risk of target language readers’ misunderstanding or neglect. While this foreignizing element is meant to maintain the significance of the text with regard to its local and national context, potential ignorance of the conflict on the part of target language readership causes readers to gloss over these elements, losing the reference to the local context.

Occasionally Pribichevich-Zoric provides footnotes to clarify a foreign and untranslatable element of the text. For example, Filipovic recounts, “Apart from the letters, we leafed through the Bosnian language dictionary. I don’t know what to say, Mimmy. Perhaps an excess of the letter “h,” which until now was looked on as a spelling mistake” (144-145). Under the governance of Tito, the former Yugoslavia spoke a single language, Serbo-Croatian, which was disassembled into three separate yet strikingly similar languages during the conflict: Serbian, Croatian and Bosnian (Clark 350). Thus, the reissuing of the dictionary serves to institutionalize the division of the languages and as such constitutes a political act. Without contextual knowledge of the significant role of language as a designation of ethnicity, the reader merely notes that a recent change has occurred in Bosnian grammatical regulations. Pribichevich-Zoric’s footnote reads: “This may be referring to the “h” once given to certain local Turkish and other words and pronunciation, and later dropped from usage” (145). While clarifying the structural function of the change within the Bosnian language, the footnote fails to situate Filipovic’s comment within the wider context of the war, and uninformed target language readers may miss the crucial aspect of language war in the Bosnian conflict. Filipovic herself recognizes the potential lack of adequate translation of her experience in the global context. She wonders, “Can that outside world see the darkness I see? Just as I can’t see myself on TV tonight, so the rest of the world probably can’t see the darkness I’m looking at. We’re at two ends of the world. Our lives are so different. Theirs is a bright light. Ours is darkness” (168). In contrast to the presence of western cultural and linguistic structures, the limited translatability of the foreign elements of the text draws attention to the target language readers’ lack of access to the local context.

However, the maintenance of certain foreign elements does not negate the fact that Zlata’s Diary contains western structures of language and culture that perhaps encourage
its universalization. Filipovic herself, now nineteen, endorses *The Freedom Writers* response to her diary, writing the Foreword to the compilation (xvii). Significantly, Filipovic writes the Foreword in English, having lived in Dublin since 1995 (fairsoulfilms) – her own involvement in the project is Anglicized, just as is the reception of her translated diary. Although Filipovic briefly reflects on the impact of her experience in Bosnia, personal rather than political, she emphasizes the shared qualities of her diary and *The Freedom Writers Diary*: “I see a parallel between the Freedom Writers and myself … Sometimes we suffer because of many things over which we have no control: the color of our skin, poverty, our religion, our family situation, war” (xiv). Her use of the personal pronoun “we” and possessive pronoun “our” denotes the inclusivity and plurality of the universal. The “therapeutic” (xiv) and “humane” (xvii) aspects of writing universal human experience surpass the significance of cultural, ethnic and linguistic realities of the local context. Here, the English translation is incorporated into Anglo-American pedagogical practice and curriculum in order to reconcile American students’ experiences of cultural, racial and linguistic difference. The text is domesticated for the purpose of solving a local problem of the target language culture.

Just as Zlata’s Diary played an integral role in inspiring the writing of *The Freedom Writers Diary*, and in this sense became creatively generative in Anglo-American culture, so too it partially inspired further autobiographical writing in the “Making Friends” study. After the preliminary “cultural sensitivity training,” the two groups of students were introduced using their respective languages with the help of translators and interpreters (508). This study resists Anglicization through providing the support needed to allow the Bosnian immigrant students to speak and write in their native language. The object of the study was to create a collection of the students’ stories. The American students wrote in English, while the Bosnian students wrote initially in Bosnian and then translated their stories into English with assistance from the translators and American students (508). The majority of Bosnian students wrote about their wartime experiences. Thus, this instance of interlingual and intercultural exchange results in an emphasis and celebration of difference. While “Making Friends” approaches the text by emphasizing its foreign elements, a foreignizing approach, it ultimately employs the text as a means to the reconciliation of a local problem in the American classroom, and as such it parallels *The
Freedom Writers’ domestication of the translation.

Although “Making Friends” provides an alternative mode of reading in contrast to The Freedom Writers Diary, one that requires the reader’s engagement with and willingness to learn about the Bosnian conflict, the primary Anglo-American reception of Zlata Filipovic’s Zlata’s Diary is one of universalization through pedagogical appropriation; cultural and linguistic difference is subordinated to textual aspects that correspond to Anglo-American values and experiences in order to reconcile American cultural and linguistic difference. The experience of the Bosnian conflict, as narrated from the child’s perspective, is largely interpreted as an account of universal human experience of hardship, and the endurance and “spirit” (Buckman et al 61) involved in overcoming such hardship. The majority of scholarship and literary reviews of Zlata’s Diary do not acknowledge the ways in which the text appeals to the west and by extension the ‘universal’ through its implicit western linguistic and cultural structures. Zlata’s Diary as a work “written for translation” (Walkowitz 219) subverts the proposed existence of the universal text, demonstrating that writing for an international readership implies an adherence to underlying and “absent” English literary structures: Walkowitz argues not that the “global work eludes this kind of ‘absent structure;’” on the contrary, I will propose that it invokes absent structures over and over again” (219). While not universal, the text’s western literary structures and influences allow it to fulfill a particular need in the target language culture, that of racial and ethnic reconciliation.
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