Dyal Singh Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences (DSJHSS)
Vol. 4, No. 1, 2026, pp. 13-22
ISSN (P): 3006-6522
ISSN (E): 3006-6530

Along the Grain of One's Own Diary: A 2005 Field Journal as an Archive of Elite–Rural Encounter in Southern Punjab

Muhammad Mahboob Ahmad[1]
Adnan Tariq[2]

Abstract

Received: 12-02-26

Reviewed: 14-04-26

Accepted: 10-05-26

Published: 30-06-26

This article reads a five-day field diary—kept by an undergraduate during a 2005 social-sciences village study in the Khanewal district of southern Punjab—as an archival document rather than a resource for personal recollection. Adopting Ann Laura Stoler's practice of reading "along the grain" and drawing on life-writing theory's distinction between the narrating and the narrated self, it treats the diary as an unusual archive: one whose archivist and subject are the same person, separated by two decades. It mines the text for the affective texture and unspoken assumptions of a particular class and generation: English-medium, faintly Marxist, post-9/11 metropolitan Pakistani youth of the Musharraf years. Through four movements—the pastoral gaze, the media-saturated "untouched" village, the politics of naming, and the ethics of the fieldwork encounter—the article argues that the diary at once deploys and dismantles an internal-Orientalist optic, and that its very contradictions are legible as what Raymond Williams calls a structure of feeling. A concluding section turns the same analytic suspicion on the present reading. The aim is neither confession nor nostalgia, but a method: reading one's own past text as a historical source.

Keywords: field diary, autoethnography, structure of feeling, rural Punjab, travel writing, archive, Musharraf era, internal Orientalism

This is an open access article distributed under the terms of CC-BY-4.0, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, reproduction, and adaptation in any medium and for any purpose with proper attribution to the original author(s), title, journal, and URL.

[1] Institute of English Language and Literature, GC University, Lahore
[2] Institute of Global and Historical Studies, GC University, Lahore.

ISSN (P): 3006-6522
ISSN (E): 3006-6530

1. INTRODUCTION: DIARY AS DOCUMENT

In late August 2005, a group of undergraduates from an elite, English-medium university in Lahore travelled south to the villages surrounding Khanewal for a short field study in the social sciences. Each was asked to keep a journal. Over five days, they recorded arrivals and departures, the interiors of rest houses and the layout of village lanes, conversations with cultivators and cobblers and a rural cleric, and—almost as often—the diarist's own reactions to what he saw. The present study takes one such diary, *The Khanewal Chronicles* (Ahmad, 2005), as its primary source. It does not read the diary as a memoir or attempt to recover the events behind the text through present-day memory. Instead, it reads the diary as a fixed archival object and asks what a historian of the recent past might learn from it.

This paper argues that the document is most valuable precisely where it is least reliable as reportage: in its assumptions, enthusiasms, and recurring embarrassments. The diarist is a self-conscious observer. He repeatedly catches his own gaze in the act—"I wish I could look at people as humans, rather than whatever they symbolize"; "Maybe, I'm as coloured as the people I criticize" (Ahmad, 2005, August 24 & 26 entries). These moments of arrested self-suspicion are not incidental; they are the seam along which this article works. The diary deploys an inherited optic—part travel writing, part participant observation, part pastoral longing—and, within the same entries, repeatedly dismantles it. That double movement, rather than any single observation about rural Punjab, is what makes the document worth reading twenty years later.

The occasion of the diary is worth pausing over because it shapes everything the document can and cannot see. The village field study was, by the mid-2000s, an established genre of elite Pakistani social-science pedagogy: the metropolitan university dispatching its students to "the village" for a few days of structured immersion, in the expectation that direct contact with rural poverty would supply what the seminar room could not. The form has a long lineage in the discipline's own history, descending from the colonial village survey and the settlement report (see Ali, 1988), and it carries assumptions inherited from both—that the rural is a discrete object of knowledge, that it can be visited and read, and that the visiting party arrives already equipped to interpret it. The diary is thus not a private travelogue but the by-product of an institutional exercise in knowing the countryside, and its reflexive discomforts are, in part, the discomforts produced when that exercise becomes visible to one of its participants.

The analysis proceeds in four movements. The first section explores the pastoral gaze and its underlying material concerns. The second delves into the paradox of a "virgin" village already saturated with media. The third examines the politics of naming and the distinctly Musharraf-era liberalism reflected in the diary's voice. Finally, the fourth section addresses the ethical boundaries of fieldwork when observed subjects refuse to be observed. A concluding section gathers these under Williams's (1977) concept of the structure of feeling and then turns the same critical attention on the reading offered here. Throughout, the theoretical frameworks are applied to the diary as an object of analysis; the authors' interior lives are not the subject.

2. METHOD: THE SELF AS ARCHIVE

To read one's own diary as a source requires a method that keeps two figures distinct: the person who wrote in 2005 and the person who reads now. Life-writing theory supplies the vocabulary. Lejeune's (1989) account of the autobiographical pact and Eakin's (1999) analysis of how a remembering self continually composes a narrated self remind us that the "I" of the diary is a construction, not a transparent window, and that the later reader has no privileged access to it. Here, that gap is used deliberately. The diarist is treated in the third person—"the diarist," "the 2005 observer"—not as an evasion but as a methodological discipline: doing so prevents the

ISSN (P): 3006-6522
ISSN (E): 3006-6530

analysis from collapsing into the confessional first person and keeps the young author available as an object of study rather than as a proxy for the present writer.

The document is treated as an archive. It is a dated, material trace consigned to the future, and, following Derrida (1995/1996), an archive is always oriented toward a reader it cannot foresee. What makes this archive unusual is that its archivist and its subject are the same person, separated by two decades. That condition does not disqualify the reading; it specifies its method. The most productive approach is the one Stoler (2009) develops for colonial archives: reading along the grain rather than only against it. This entails attending to the document's affective register, its anxieties, its confident classifications, and the strain beneath them, and treating these as evidence of a governing sensibility rather than as errors to be corrected. Applied to a personal diary, reading along the grain means asking what the 2005 text registered affectively but could not yet name, and treating its structure of feeling, rather than its facts, as the object of analysis.

Reading one's own field diary also sharpens a problem the discipline already knows under the name of reflexivity. Bourdieu (1977) insists that the observer's own position—the distance of the literate, credentialed outsider from the practical logic of those observed—is not a nuisance to be minimized but a relation to be objectified, since it structures what the observer is able to perceive at all. The archival distance of twenty years supplies retrospectively what Bourdieu urges prospectively: the 2005 observer's *habitus*—his Anglophone education, his urban ease, his faintly radical politics—is now itself available for objectification, precisely because the present reader no longer fully inhabits it. The dual "I" is, in this sense, a methodological resource rather than an embarrassment. It converts the participant into an object of the very analysis he was trained to direct at others.

This places the article within the autoethnographic tradition (Reed-Danahay, 1997). It uses a personal document as data, but it declines the confessional mode. The personal text is an artifact to be historicized, not an occasion for present disclosure. Two necessary methodological moves follow from this. First, the diary is quoted in its original wording throughout, preserving the 2005 idiom, since the period voice—its judgments and enthusiasms alike—is precisely what carries its historicity; obvious slips of the pen have been silently corrected, and no substantive phrasing has been altered. Second, for reasons set out below, the analysis holds itself to the same suspicion it directs at the source.

3. POSITIONALITY AND ETHICS

The diary examined here was kept by the lead author during a five-day undergraduate field study in August 2005; we read it at deliberate analytic distance, treating the twenty-year-old text as a fixed primary source rather than as a resource for present recollection. The names of private individuals have been replaced in quoted passages by role descriptors in square brackets (for example, "[the instructor]," "[an elderly farmer]"), a convention that preserves the character of the surrounding text while protecting those who cannot consent.

4. MOVEMENT 1: THE PASTORAL GAZE

In retrospect, the diary's most lyrical passages are also its most ideologically loaded. The archive can therefore also be read as a literary document. On the second evening, the diarist writes:

> For me, the highlight of the day was sitting under a '*shehtoot*' tree, with nothing but the most beautiful, cooling and soothing wind blowing through the fields on the right, and the sound of the tube well's water providing music. A dog lay next to our '*charpai*,' waving flies with its tail. … Yes, in another lifetime, I want to be a part of this perfect harmony with nature. (Ahmad, 2005, August 25 entry)

ISSN (P): 3006-6522
ISSN (E): 3006-6530

This is pastoral in Raymond Williams's (1973) precise sense: the countryside is apprehended as repose, harmony, and a life the observer might have led. Williams's argument is that such idealization is not a description of rural life but a structure of urban feeling—a retrospective longing that systematically obscures the labour and property relations on which agrarian life actually rests. The diary supplies its own refutation within pages. Within the same villages, it records incomes of "Rs. 50 or 60 a day," landholdings too small to yield a return on what is invested in them, government subsidies that "never reach their hands," and pesticides so adulterated that "people actually drink whole liters of these sprays and nothing happens to them" (Ahmad, 2005, August 25 & 27 entries). The harmony under the *shehtoot* (mulberry) tree and the arithmetic of rural poverty sit in the same document, and the diarist registers both without reconciling them.

The tension sharpens into something like theory in the diarist's account of a village cobbler. Confronted by the man's evident contentment amid poverty, the 2005 observer reaches, self-consciously, for an explanation: "As a Social Sciences student, here is my theorization of why this poverty still manages to bring happiness: the poor village cobbler does not watch television!" (Ahmad, 2005, August 26 entry)

The joke does serious ideological work. It is a compressed version of the "happy poor" topos that Williams traces across centuries of writing about the country: the poor are content because they are innocent of what they lack. What the diarist offers as a wry field hypothesis is, when read along the grain, the pastoral's core consolation—one that converts material deprivation into a kind of moral advantage and, not incidentally, relieves the urban observer of responsibility for it. In travel-writing terms, the panoramic evening scene—in which the diarist surveys men, women, animals, and "a hot sun … starting its return journey" (Ahmad, 2005, August 25 entry)—occupies the posture Pratt (1992) calls the seeing-man's "anti-conquest," the innocent, self-effacing gaze that nonetheless commands the scene it describes. Here, however, the framework applies to the object of study rather than governing the argument: the diary is an instance of the anti-conquest, and one that half-knows it.

The persistence of this consolation across the diary is itself Williams's point. He describes the idealization of a lost rural order as an escalator that recedes endlessly into the past: every generation locates the authentic countryside just over the horizon of its own childhood, so that the pastoral is always already vanishing and always being mourned. The 2005 diarist stands on that escalator. His nostalgia is not for a village he knew but for one assembled from earlier mediations: childhood visits to Sahiwal, the vanished rural smell once found even in Lahore's *Gawalmandi*, and a television-furnished image of rural authenticity. His longing to belong to "this perfect harmony" is a longing to occupy a position the pastoral has always defined as just out of reach. That the "happy poor" who anchor the fantasy are, in the same pages, drinking adulterated pesticide for want of anything better is the contradiction Williams teaches us to expect: the pastoral does not so much fail to see rural suffering as convert it, in the seeing, into its own melancholy charm.

What keeps this from being simple false consciousness is the diary's temporality. Its longing is explicitly for "another lifetime" and is braided with a personal nostalgia—childhood Eids on a *baan charpai*, the mourned disappearance of the transistor radio. In Boym's (2001) terms, this is reflective rather than restorative nostalgia: it does not seek to rebuild the lost world but dwells, knowingly and a little ironically, in the ache of its loss. The diarist's pastoral is thus already belated at the moment of writing—a longing that knows itself to be a longing—which is precisely why it reads, two decades later, less as naivety than as a documented sensibility.

ISSN (P): 3006-6522
ISSN (E): 3006-6530

5. MOVEMENT 2: THE MEDIA-SATURATED "*UNTOUCHED*" VILLAGE

If the first movement shows the diary romanticizing the village, the second shows it refuting its own premise with its own evidence. The diarist arrives expecting an authentic, unmediated rural world and repeatedly notices that the world is nothing of the kind. His own perception, he admits, is pre-scripted by the media: "The image may be simply stolen from a PTV drama or may be the extension of an overactive and intelligent imagination" (Ahmad, 2005, August 25 entry).

The confession that the "authentic" village may be borrowed from state television is more revealing than the diarist lets on. It concedes that there is no pre-media village to be found—that the observer's very capacity to recognize "village life" has been furnished by the mediascape he imagines himself to be escaping. Appadurai's (1996) account of mediascapes and socially imagined worlds suggests that the rural is not a place outside representation but a site thoroughly worked over by it, for the observer and the observed alike. The 2005 diarist can thus be read as encountering, outside the mediascape, a rural world that the mediascape had already taught him to imagine.

The village settings confirm this at every turn. The diarist notes "a surprisingly large number of video shops," stocked with Pakistani and Indian films and songs; a snooker club where a VCD of the film star Reema plays in the corner; and a young man who has returned from Dubai and refuses to go back except on his own terms after his "exposure to the lifestyle" abroad (Ahmad, 2005, August 26 entry). Popular cinema is not absent but differently canonized: "the youth do not idolize the Shahrukh Khans of the world, but the Sultan Rahis" (Ahmad, 2005, August 26 entry). This is not an untouched periphery; it is a distinct node in a transnational circulation of images, with its own hierarchy of stars.

The returnee from Dubai is worth dwelling on because he condenses the movement's argument in a single figure. He is not a sign of the village's isolation but of its insertion into a Gulf labour circuit that had, by 2005, reorganized both the economy and the imagination of rural Punjab. In Appadurai's (1996) vocabulary, he belongs to an ethnoscape as much as a mediascape: the person who has moved and whose movement carries images and expectations home. The diary registers the disturbance he causes—his refusal to return except on new terms—without fully registering that the "untouched" village it came to find is, in fact, a place people leave and return to, remitting money and carrying altered horizons with them. The migrant unsettles the pastoral premise more thoroughly than any video shop because he is living proof that the village's horizon is not the village.

Yet the diarist's explicit thesis contradicts everything he has catalogued:

> Most of these people cannot afford access to the media, and they live blissfully unaware of the glamorous world that TV dramas have managed to make part of the social fabric. That is why they're happy and content despite their poor living condition… Ignorance is a relative bliss. (Ahmad, 2005, August 26 entry)

The document, read along the grain, is at war with itself: a page of observed media saturation followed by a theory of media absence. The contradiction is the finding. It reveals how strongly the pastoral premise resists its own disconfirmation—how the observer will theorize the villagers' contentment as innocence of media even while recording the video shops that surround him. There is, finally, an accidental archival value here that the diarist could not have intended. The VCD stalls, the transistor radios, the Lollywood-versus-Bollywood hierarchy, the PTV drama

ISSN (P): 3006-6522
ISSN (E): 3006-6530

as the template of rural authenticity—this entire media ecology has since been dissolved by the smartphone. The diary is, inadvertently, a record of a vanished infrastructure of the imagination.

6. MOVEMENT 3: THE POLITICS OF NAMING AND THE MUSHARRAF MOMENT

The third movement historicizes the diary's own liberalism. In a village whose name has been changed from *Hanumangarh* to the "*Islamized*" *Rehmangarh*, the diarist mounts his most sustained argument:

> Its new, Islamized name is *"Rehmangarh*." We are a people that are cruel to their own history and sense of identity. … The other atrocity that we have managed to commit against history in our post-Zia Islamization fever is our tendency to replace old, historic names with new Muslim names. … For me, there will be no Lahore without a Dev Samaj Road, or Sant Nagar, Krishan Nagar, or *Budhhu ka Aawa*. (Ahmad, 2005, August 26 entry)

The passage laments the erasure of a plural, pre-Partition toponymy and reads that erasure as a wound to national identity: "I can never understand why we are so insecure of our identity" (Ahmad, 2005, August 26 entry). Read as evidence rather than as argument, it is a document of a specific sensibility: a secular-liberal, Sufi-inflected nationalism that mourns lost pluralism and locates the culprit in the Zia-era Islamization of the 1980s. That sensibility is not timeless; it belongs to a particular moment. The diary elsewhere invokes, without irony, General Pervez Musharraf's doctrine of "enlightened moderation" (*roshan khayali*), the state's signature post-9/11 self-description, publicly elaborated in 2004. When the diarist praises a green-turbaned village cleric who "mocked the idea of 'jinns' and '*saaya*'" and "advocated the medical cure" for afflictions, noting that "the term 'enlightened moderation' has probably not reached the backward district of Khanewal" (Ahmad, 2005, August 26 entry), he is measuring the countryside against a state slogan and finding an unexpected ally in the cleric. The optic here is what might be called internal Orientalism, an application of the structure Said (1978) described to a relation internal to the nation: the metropolitan subject appraising the rural interior according to its distance from an enlightenment defined in the city and by the state.

The politics of naming extends, in the diary, from place-names to the names people give themselves. In one of its most self-implicating passages, the diarist finds his own inherited caste identity unexpectedly activated by the field: "for the first time in my life, my Rajput ancestry is making sense to me," he writes, noting the villagers' fierce pride in *biraderi* and their refusal to marry outside it (Ahmad, 2005, August 25 entry). The metropolitan observer who arrived intending to study rural kinship discovers that he is himself positioned within its grammar. The diary treats this as a curiosity; read along the grain, it is the moment the surveying gaze is caught inside the field it presumed to survey. Endogamy, which the diarist elsewhere frames as an object of feminist critique—daughters married only within the clan, other clans' daughters taken in—turns out to name a structure to which he too belongs, however faintly.

A second classification runs beneath the first. The villagers, the diary reports, "call themselves 'immigrants,'" distinguish themselves sharply from those they term "local"—a word that, in their usage, means "low-class," unveiled, without honour—and are "more comfortable speaking '*Rajputi*'" among themselves (Ahmad, 2005, August 26 entry). This is the sedimented social geography of the canal colonies, the tracts of western Punjab that the colonial state irrigated and settled from the 1880s onward, allotting land to selected "agricultural castes" brought in from elsewhere and ranking them above the populations already present (Ali, 1988). The very addresses of the villages the party visits—"3A/H," "Chak 166"—are artifacts of that engineered settlement, the numbered grid of a state that remade the region as a plantation of loyal cultivators. The

ISSN (P): 3006-6522
ISSN (E): 3006-6530

"immigrant"/"local" distinction the diarist hears in 2005 is the afterlife of that colonial sorting, and the pride in migration he finds so striking is the descendants' memory of their forebears having been the state's favoured imports. The diary records the distinction without its history; the archival reading restores the history the distinction has forgotten.

The diary's reflection on communal violence belongs to the same moment. Recounting an official's narration of "the incident of Shantinagar"—the 1997 destruction of the Christian settlement of Shanti Nagar in the Khanewal district—the diarist asks why "religious fervour always finds ways to motivate people who may have no religious beliefs whatsoever," and pictures the attackers as "unemployed youngsters" led by "*Moulvi*-types" (Ahmad, 2005, August 24 entry). The analysis of mob mobilization is not without insight, but its confident sociological typing—the manipulable poor, the cynical clergy—is itself a signature of the period: the anxious, minority-conscious liberalism of a post-9/11 Pakistani elite reading its own society. What the passage cannot see, and what the later reader can, is that its diagnosis is also a self-portrait of a class explaining violence in terms that exempt that class. This is the payoff of the archival frame: the entry's toponymic mourning is legible, in retrospect, as the germ of a whole later intellectual programme—Partition memory, the recovery of erased place-names, the study of nostalgia—carried unknowingly in a student's field diary.

7. MOVEMENT 4: THE ETHICS OF THE ENCOUNTER

The final movement concerns the fieldwork encounter itself, and here the diary reaches the limit of its own method. Its most revealing episodes are those in which the people observed decline to be observed. The village children, gathered to be interviewed, do not perform on cue:

> They were reluctant to tell us which classes they studied in, what they could read or write, etc. … They were still unwilling to commit themselves when [the Marxist instructor] decided to gather them around him in the haveli's small lawn. A few of them ran away but a few stayed. (Ahmad, 2005, August 25 entry)

The reluctance is not an absence of data; it is itself data. It marks the point where the subaltern, in Spivak's (1988) sense, is not available to the researcher's methodology—where the very apparatus of the informal interview cannot secure the speech it seeks to record. The diary registers a related refusal in an older idiom. When the children are finally coaxed into performance, one recites a *mahia*, a Punjabi folk verse, and the verse turns on "the '*thanedar's sister*'" (Ahmad, 2005, August 25 entry). The mockery of the police in a scripted folk form is exactly what Scott (1990) calls a hidden transcript: a socially sanctioned and deniable channel through which the dominated sections of society voice their resentment of authority. The young men who ridicule the *mussalis* and dispute their own elders' account of hard times (Ahmad, 2005, August 25 entry) represent small acts of insubordination, legible only if the researcher is not the one being addressed.

Against the extractive grammar of the interview, the diary also records the villagers' own economy of obligation, and the contrast is instructive. The *daera or baithak*—the open sitting-place maintained by a better-off farmer—is described as "open to everyone," a place where travellers and even strangers are lodged and fed, and where, "if the traveler needs bus-fare, the village elders contribute to give him money" (Ahmad, 2005, August 25 entry). This is the moral economy described by Scott (1976): a dense web of reciprocal obligation that secures subsistence and hospitality below the level of the market, binding richer and poorer into a single order of mutual claim. The researchers' interview practice violates precisely this order: they arrive asking questions and offering nothing. The old man who leaves once he learns "this was an informal

ISSN (P): 3006-6522
ISSN (E): 3006-6530

learning session … and we were not paying him to talk" (Ahmad, 2005, August 27 entry) is not being obtuse; he is applying the *daera's* logic to a transaction that does not recognize it. The party that came to study the villagers' communal generosity fails to recognize the underlying logic at the very moment that generosity is both extended and withheld.

The encounter's ethical crisis arrives in what the diarist calls a "freak incident." An instructor from the same regional background as the villagers presses a group of men and asks directly whether they beat their wives. An older man, who joins late, is enraged and turns "real personal" with this instructor. The diarist's response is unusually clear-eyed:

> To begin with, I think [the instructor]'s method was flawed. No one would like being asked personal questions so directly. … Simply because you live in a city and are well-educated and well-placed does not mean that you can get away with saying anything to anyone, and when the other person hits back you felt hurt. Hypocrisy, I call it. (Ahmad, 2005, August 27 entry)

This is the diary already articulating the critique one might otherwise make of it. The 2005 observer already names the extractive violence of the encounter—the presumption that class and education license intrusion—and implicates his own party in it. The point of the archival reading is therefore not to convict the diarist of blindness to a problem he had already recognized, but to notice that his reflexivity, however genuine, could not lift him out of the structure he could see. He critiques the method and remains inside it; he distrusts the gaze and keeps looking. That is not a personal failing but the condition that Clifford and Marcus (1986) diagnosed as the predicament of ethnographic writing as such: its truths are partial, positioned, and complicit in the authority they narrate. The old man who "excuse[s] himself" and leaves once he learns that there is no payment for the interview (Ahmad, 2005, August 27 entry) closes the account with the plainest possible statement of the terms the researchers had tried not to name.

8. CODA: A STRUCTURE OF FEELING, AND A TURN ON THE PRESENT

Gathered together, the four movements describe less a set of opinions than a sensibility—a way of feeling the world that precedes and exceeds any single judgment. This is what Williams (1977) named a structure of feeling: the lived, still-inarticulate experience of a historical moment, apprehended before it settles into formal ideology. The diary is an ideal specimen of the concept because, as a genre, it catches such feeling in situ, in the present tense, before hindsight tidies it. What *The Khanewal Chronicles* records is the structure of feeling of a particular formation: English-medium, university-educated, faintly Marxist, minority-conscious, secular-nationalist, post-9/11 metropolitan Pakistani youth in the Musharraf years—a formation that romanticized the rural even as it catalogued rural poverty, that measured the countryside against a state doctrine of enlightenment, and that could name the violence of its own gaze without escaping it.

Read this way, the diary also becomes legible as an emotional document, and the analytic vocabulary of the history of emotions applies to it without strain. The coach on which the party travels and the state-owned rest house where they stay function as an emotional community in Rosenwein's (2006) sense—a group bound by shared norms of feeling and expression, within which the diarist learns "to make friends with strangers" and to "exist with people whom I don't know" (Ahmad, 2005, August 28 entry). Indeed, the diarist concludes that whatever he learned about communal living, he learned "within the bus, and within our rest house," not from the villagers at all (Ahmad, 2005, August 28 entry)—an admission that the true site of the trip's affective education was the observing party itself. The translation of feeling across the urban–rural

ISSN (P): 3006-6522
ISSN (E): 3006-6530

line, and its frequent failure, is precisely the kind of "emotional translation" that Pernau and Rajamani (2016) place at the centre of a conceptual history attentive to affect.

There is a quiet irony here that the diary almost states as a thesis. The trip was organized to educate its participants about the rural poor; what it educated them about, the diarist concedes, was one another. The affective work—the singing on the bus, the shared rooms, the learning to make friends with strangers—happened within the observing party, among a set of young people from the same city and class who did not know each other at the outset and became a community over five days. The villagers functioned less as the objects of that education than as its occasion and its backdrop. Read as a document in the history of emotions, the diary thus records the formation of an emotional community in the very act of failing to translate feeling across the line it had travelled to cross. The emotional translation the trip attempted—metropolitan sympathy reaching rural experience—largely failed; the emotional community it produced, among the translators, succeeded almost without their noticing.

However, this method of reading the archive has one obvious counterpoint. If the diary's blind spots are historical, so are the present reading's. The impulse to read one's own past text for a structure of feeling is not innocent; it belongs to a moment in the academy that rewards reflexive autoethnography, prizes the researcher's positioned voice, and can convert even one's youthful embarrassments into scholarly capital. Reading along the grain of the 2005 diary should include reading along the grain of the present essay: asking what its own confident historicizations exempt from scrutiny, what a later reader will catch it failing to see, and what incentives make "the self as archive" an attractive frame just now. The two "I"s, past and present, do not represent the opposing positions of being in error in the past and being enlightened in retrospect. They are two positioned readings, each caught in a structure of feeling it can only partly see. The value of the diary is not that its author has at last understood it, but that, held at the right distance, it can be made to testify against the certainties of every reader it will have—including this one.

REFERENCES

Ahmad, M. M. (2005). *The Khanewal chronicles* [Unpublished field diary, August 24–28]. Institute of English Language and Literature, GC University, Lahore.

Ali, I. (1988). *The Punjab under imperialism, 1885–1947*. Princeton University Press.

Appadurai, A. (1996). *Modernity at large: Cultural dimensions of globalization*. University of Minnesota Press.

Bourdieu, P. (1977). *Outline of a theory of practice* (R. Nice, Trans.). Cambridge University Press.

Boym, S. (2001). *The future of nostalgia*. Basic Books.

Clifford, J., & Marcus, G. E. (Eds.). (1986). *Writing culture: The poetics and politics of ethnography*. University of California Press.

Derrida, J. (1996). *Archive fever: A Freudian impression* (E. Prenowitz, Trans.). University of Chicago Press. (Original work published 1995)

Eakin, P. J. (1999). *How our lives become stories: Making selves*. Cornell University Press.

Lejeune, P. (1989). *On autobiography* (P. J. Eakin, Ed.; K. Leary, Trans.). University of Minnesota Press.

Pernau, M., & Rajamani, I. (2016). Emotional translations: Conceptual history beyond language. *History and Theory, 55*(1), 46–65. https://doi.org/10.1111/hith.10787

Pratt, M. L. (1992). *Imperial eyes: Travel writing and transculturation*. Routledge.

Reed-Danahay, D. (Ed.). (1997). *Auto/ethnography: Rewriting the self and the social*. Berg.

ISSN (P): 3006-6522
ISSN (E): 3006-6530

Rosenwein, B. H. (2006). *Emotional communities in the early Middle Ages*. Cornell University Press.

Said, E. W. (1978). *Orientalism*. Pantheon Books.

Scott, J. C. (1976). *The moral economy of the peasant: Rebellion and subsistence in Southeast Asia*. Yale University Press.

Scott, J. C. (1990). *Domination and the arts of resistance: Hidden transcripts*. Yale University Press.

Spivak, G. C. (1988). Can the subaltern speak? In C. Nelson & L. Grossberg (Eds.), *Marxism and the interpretation of culture* (pp. 271–313). University of Illinois Press.

Stoler, A. L. (2009). *Along the archival grain: Epistemic anxieties and colonial common sense*. Princeton University Press.

Williams, R. (1973). *The country and the city*. Oxford University Press.

Williams, R. (1977). *Marxism and literature*. Oxford University Press.