

UC Santa Barbara

UC Santa Barbara Previously Published Works

Title

Author's Response to Empire's Mobius Strip Forum

Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/3kr548j8>

Journal

CRITICAL ETHNIC STUDIES, 6(2)

ISSN

2373-5031

Author

Hom, Stephanie Malia

Publication Date

2020

DOI

10.2307/48629295

Copyright Information

This work is made available under the terms of a Creative Commons Attribution License, available at <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>

Peer reviewed

Introduction to the Book Forum

Camilla Hawthorne and Jennifer Lynn Kelly

In *Empire's Mobius Strip: Historical Echoes in Italy's Crisis of Migration and Detention*, Stephanie Malia Hom situates the current refugee emergency at Europe's southern shores as the most recent episode in a much longer historical durée of practices by which the Italian state has regulated the mobility of colonized and otherwise racially subjugated populations. *Empire's Mobius Strip* was recently awarded the American Association for Italian Studies 2020 Best Book prize for the “20th and 21st Centuries” category. In the book's three lyrical essays, Hom considers the various sites within which Italy's imperial power over mobility has been historically sedimented, tracking the connections between colonial concentration camps in Africa, carceral islands in the Mediterranean, and migrant detention centers and government “villages” for forcibly displaced Roma and Sinti communities within the Italian peninsula. *Empire's Mobius Strip* builds upon a burgeoning literature in Italian colonial history and postcolonial studies while simultaneously challenging the overwhelming presentism that characterizes many engagements with the ongoing Mediterranean refugee crisis.

Empire's Mobius Strip represents a culmination of Hom's many personal and professional engagements with questions of mobility and empire. Hom grew up in Hawai'i—a site of US empire and settler colonialism where militarism and tourism collide and intertwine. Pacific poet and scholar Teresia Teaiwa has named this phenomenon in Hawai'i “militourism,” where “military or paramilitary force ensures the running of a tourist industry, and that same tourist industry masks the military force behind it.”¹ But, as Hom explained to writer George Di Stefano of *La Voce di New York*, her childhood immersion in the Pacific World led her, perhaps ironically, to view *Italy* as a site of “fascinating Otherness.”² Hom's first book, *The Beautiful Country: Tourism and the Impossible State of Destination Italy*, is a work of critical tourism studies that explores the romantic imaginary of Italy as an ideal site of leisure and pleasure, and the entanglement of this *bel paese* with the rise of the global mass tourism industry.

It was this glossier side of mobility—tourism—that ultimately led Hom to the themes of *Empire's Mobius Strip*. The contradictions and disparities of a stratified regime of international mobility come to a head on the tiny island of Lampedusa, which is geopolitically a part of Italy but geographically closer to Africa than to Europe. The island is both a playground for summer beachgoers and a point of arrival for hundreds of thousands of migrants who have crossed the Mediterranean Sea from Africa to Europe. On Lampedusa, Hom writes in *Empire's Mobius Strip*, “Boutique hotels, seafood restaurants, and a modernized airport aimed at [luxury tourists who are drawn to its sunshine and pristine beaches] run up against the coast guard ships, emergency field officers, and detention facilities intended for migrants” (9). As she explains in the book's introduction, this jarring collision of differentiated mobilities inspired her to begin questioning who gets to move, and why. By the end of the book, Hom arrives at the powerful conclusion that “the control of mobility is the fulcrum of empire. The power over mobility equates to power over people” (182).

Why have we selected this book for our special issue of *Critical Ethnic Studies*? Why look to the Mediterranean and the discipline of Italian studies in particular? The goal of this special issue is to think across geographically distinct borderland sites and to look to spaces that are often overlooked in critical ethnic studies. With this book forum, we hope to bring European/Mediterranean refugee studies, critical ethnic studies, critical refugee studies, and Black geographies into the same analytical frame. We also see Hom's book as deeply engaged, in form if not by name, with both critical tourism studies and carceral studies. These fields have traditionally engaged with different sites, communities, and bodies of literature—but what can be learned when we put them into dialogue, with questions of *empire* and *mobility* guiding our analyses?

The forum's place in our special issue allows us to ask, for example, what can we learn from reading Hom's analysis of the restricted mobility and temporary permanence of the camp alongside that of refugee camps

elsewhere, as in Palestine. How can we read Hom's book with and against analyses of other spaces, like Greece, where tourists and migrants converge? What does Hom's analysis provide for texts that take critical refugee studies as their point of departure, even and especially when those sites are as ostensibly disparate as Laos, Burma, or the Philippines? How do we collectively understand statelessness, and how states manufacture and reproduce that statelessness via their own colonial amnesia—an amnesia shared by imperial state formations across the globe? What is the relationship between (im)mobility and indigeneity that animates the colonial present shared by so many settler borderland regimes? And what does it mean to do fieldwork across these sites, when this movement, too, is either made possible or circumscribed by imperial formations?

To answer these questions as they relate to the racialized present of Italian colonialism, we reached out to three advanced graduate students—Xafsa Ciise, Ampson Hagan, and Torin Jones—whose research addresses sub-Saharan African migration, as well as the legacies of Italian colonialism in the Horn of Africa. We asked them not simply to review *Empire's Mobius Strip* but to reflect on what the book might offer—conceptually, methodologically, archivally, and otherwise—in relation to their own projects. In their commentaries, they help put the book into conversation with Black and ethnic studies on a broader scale. For instance, as new work in the field of Black geographies has demonstrated, anti-Blackness is a fundamentally *geographical process* that works by spatializing Black folk either as hopelessly trapped within (degraded) place or, alternatively, as endlessly rootless, mobile, and displaced. In response, Hom outlined some possible future directions for research on mobility and empire. What emerged was a rich, wide-ranging, and interdisciplinary dialogue about the politics of representation (ethnographic and otherwise), agency and political subjectivity, and continuities and differences across different imperial formations.

Notes

1. Teresia Teaiwa, "Reading Paul Gauguin's *Noa Noa* with Epeli Hau'ofa's *Kisses in the Nederends: Militourism, Feminism, and the 'Polynesian' Body*," in *Inside Out: Literature, Cultural Politics, and Identity in the New Pacific*, ed. Vilsoni Hereniko and Rob Wilson (Oxford, UK: Rowman & Littlefield, 1999), 251. About the genealogy of the term *militourism*, Teaiwa writes,

Louis Owens, the late literary scholar and novelist of Choctaw, Cherokee, and Irish American descent, was on the Qualifying Essay committee for my PhD in history of consciousness at the University of California, Santa Cruz. After several conversations with me in his office at Porter College about my dual interest in militarism and tourism, the two terms had begun to blur and blend together for him. When Louis offered me the neologism *militourism*, I ran with it. I ran with it for a good couple of years—it shaped my Qualifying Essay and two of the published articles that flowed out of it.

She continued to reflect on both the potential and the limitations of the blurring of militarism and tourism, both what it allowed her to see and what it made impossible to see. In the end, she writes, "When Louis helped me conceive of militourism some twenty-five years ago, we could not have imagined how many variations of military tourism had already preceded our own observations, what kinds of tourisms built on militarization were to come, or just how formidable the critical descriptions and analyses of these phenomena could be." Teresia Teaiwa, "Reflections on Militourism, US Imperialism, and American Studies," *American Quarterly* 68, no. 3 (September 2016): 850–51.

[Return to note reference.](#)

2. George De Stefano, "Empire's Mobius Strip: Italy's Migrant Crisis Today and Its Colonial Past," *La Voce di New York*, November 14, 2019, <https://www.lavocedineويورك.com/en/arts/2019/11/14/empires-mobius-strip-italys-migrant-crisis-today-and-its-colonial-past/>.

[Return to note reference.](#)

Book Forum

Review of Stephanie Malia Hom's *Empire's Mobius Strip: Historical Echoes in Italy's Crisis of Migration and Detention*

Xafsa Ciise

The Mobius strip—a twisted surface with only one side and one boundary—is known in the field of mathematics for its nonorientability. In *Empire's Mobius Strip*, Stephanie Malia Hom thinks with this mathematical object as a guiding spatial metaphor as she maps the connections between Italy's current crisis of migration and detention and its colonial histories on the African continent. This work is part of the growing literature in Italian postcolonial studies that challenges Italy's amnesic national imaginary—one that obscures the way in which Italy's brutal settler-colonial projects in North and East Africa in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries are constitutive to its contemporary biopolitical governance regime. Drawing on archival sources and ethnographic materials, Hom challenges Italy's presentist discourse around migration and detention by documenting how the *longue durée* of Italy's colonial regime in Libya continues to structure its contemporary anxieties about mobility. Written in an essay form that is meant to "mirror the Mobius strip by tracing out Italian imperial formations across time and space,"¹ Hom draws our attention to the ways in which the organizing logics of mobility function and materialize across three key sites: the island, the camp, and the village.

Lampedusa island, which connects Africa and Italy, is known across the world as the "epicenter of the migrant tragedy in the Mediterranean Sea."² In the first essay, Hom argues not only that Lampedusa's detention center exemplifies the space of exception but that the "temporary permanence" that detainees experience in this space marks empire's power over people through the control of mobility. Describing the journey that African migrants make to Lampedusa as beginning in sub-Saharan Africa, Hom's anthropological genre of writing shores up a reading of these subjects as always already flattened into the abstract category of "migrant" when they arrive on the island. The argument here is that the island not only enacts spatial and temporal suspension but also collapses the "distinctions between person and nonperson, human and animal."³ More revealing and more persuasive in this first essay is the work of one of the scholars that Hom cites: specifically, Rutvica Andrijasevic argues that Lampedusa should not be viewed as an *abstract* space of exception but rather the processes of detention *and* deportation that occur there should be examined in relationship to the role the island plays in "transforming European space, the constitution of its citizenship, and the organization of its labor markets."⁴ Andrijasevic also emphasizes the necessity of thinking about mobility in relationship to the capitalist mode of production and the "capturing of living labor."⁵

The second essay maps out the history of the colonial Libyan concentration camps as a way to understand the structures of contemporary detention centers in Italy (like the Ponte Galeria). The detention center, which Hom argues fits into the logic of Agamben's camp, is a "nonplace inhabited by juridical nonsubjects."⁶ This theoretical orientation is intriguing when considered alongside the author's reiteration of the unique critique that Italian studies scholars have been able to leverage against Agamben's theories of *homo sacer*: that his work, produced within the context of Italy's amnesia about its colonial histories in North and East Africa, fails to take into account the space of the colonial camp. The question for the reader, then, is, What is (or continues to be) productive in using this theory to conceptualize the workings of the colonial concentration camps to which indigenous Libyan people were forcibly relocated? Perhaps the better question is: what do the concentration camps in Italian colonial Libya *unsettle* in Agamben's theorizations of the camp and, more broadly, the state of exception?

The third essay focuses on the village as the key site of analysis and for Hom, the village is the "spatial aftereffect of the camp." The villages analyzed in this essay range from agricultural villages in Italian colonial Libya in the 1930s, to the Villaggio Santa Caterina near Turin which began housing national refugees in the

1950s, to contemporary villages such as the *villaggio attrezzato* at La Barbuta near Rome. After the dissolution of concentration camps in colonial Libya, indigenous communities were forcibly resettled in agricultural villages. Hom details how this relocation was, at its core, about transforming these individuals into productive (agricultural) labor for the colonial economy. In contrast to the camp, however, Hom argues that the village is both a zone of indistinction and a space that “thickens and reinforces distinctions so that the Italian state can stamp its mark on its subjects, and that mark is either the recognition or the refusal of citizenship.”⁷ Through the amplification of racial differences among Libyan subjects by differentially selecting them for *cittadinanza italiana speciale* (special Italian citizenship), the function of the village was to encourage the psychological and material assimilation into the Italian colonial regime. Critically, access to special Italian citizenship meant that indigenous Libyans had to be willing to give up any rights under Islamic law, which adjudicated on all matters relating to marriage, property, and inheritance. Ultimately, however, this special citizenship was a “minor citizenship, that is, something less than before the law (*minoris iuris*).”⁸ This is the juridical process that Hom connects back to the conditions that migrants face in Italy today.

At the close of this third essay, one is left with a set of questions about the way in which the analyses of these three key sites work to flatten specific power relations. That is, while the relational links that Hom is making between different sites and people across multiple spaces and time periods are thought provoking, one wonders about the implications of the equivalences that crop up in the work. For example, what power relations are concealed when poor southern Italians who were resettled in the *villaggi* in colonial Libya and the indigenous Libyans who were forcibly relocated to Muslim villages are “*all* colonial subjects, albeit to different degrees”?⁹ In this theoretical move, how do we account for the specific racial and religious-based violences that indigenous Libyans were subjected to by Italy?

Overall, the spatial and temporal “palimpsests” that Hom traces continuously return to the metaphor that the book opened with. What is meant to be a guiding metaphor produces a sense of conceptual disorientation for the reader. As one moves across and between the three sites outlined in the book, the coherence of the spatial metaphor of the Mobius strip loses its analytical purchase. In the introduction, the author articulates a conceptualization of empire as operating “unevenly and contentiously between times, spaces, scales, and spheres to reinforce gradations of sovereignty that oppress those less powerful.”¹⁰ However, the promise of examining these “gradations of sovereignty” is, for me, significantly undercut by a spatial metaphor that seems to rely heavily on an understanding of empire as infinite and—as Michael Hardt and Antonio Negri signal—as having “no boundaries . . . no limits.”¹¹ This uncomplicated spatial metaphor, which shapes Hom’s methodological approach to mobility, deeply informs Hom’s reading of the African migrant subject in this text. Specifically, this metaphor—which the author uses to cohere an analysis of empire that is characterized by fluidity, smoothness, and never-endingness—forecloses any deeper examination of the political subjectivity of the African migrant subject, which is precisely what shows us the cracks of empire.

In the first essay, for example, Hom describes the migrants who arrive on the island beginning “their journey into abstraction and categorization at the gates of the CPT.” These migrants, who move from “actual to abstract,” are “immobilized as well as unmade” upon entering the detention center. The “regime of temporary permanence” that the author is describing and theorizing in this essay has little room for the briefly described revolts by the detainees in 2009 and 2011. So how do we reconcile Hom’s reading of African migrants—whose subjectivities are seemingly evacuated of desire and political will upon entering the detention center—with these revolts? This question never arrives. Instead, the analytical focus is reserved for thinking about how the detention center was rebuilt and how it had “become mobile.” This question never arrives, I suspect, because the spatial metaphor-as-method works against the author’s conceptual framework at various points throughout the text; rather than showing us “gradations of sovereignty,” the historical and contemporary reading that is offered is one where Italy’s carceral and death-producing governance of its (post)colonial and migrant subjects is a totalizing force that renders these subjects as abstract, as nonexistent, as “nonpeople.”¹² While one could argue that this

metaphor is meant to pose necessary questions about the colonial present, it is, in my reading, a metaphor that dangerously slips into forms of flattening at various points in the book.

I appreciate the wealth of historical knowledge across different spaces and times in this text. The historical analysis prompted me to think about how Italy's colonization of southern Somalia can be put in productive conversation with Hom's analysis of the problem of mobility in Italian colonial Libya. In 1957, Cornelius Jaenen published an article in *African Affairs* titled "The Somali Problem," in which he describes Somalis as "wandering pastoralists, unwilling to settle in villages or towns, unable to govern themselves, yet intolerant of foreign domination, [who] do not live at peace among themselves or with their neighbours."¹³ Jaenen goes on to detail the nature of this "Somali problem" and, unsurprisingly, much of this discourse echoes Italy's descriptions of the Bedouin people in colonial Libya. In reading these colonial archival materials, what has been striking to me is how the "nomad" gets taken up as *the* (metaphorical) figure whose movements were considered dangerous to colonial powers in Africa and, interestingly, how the roles of racialization, religion, and labor continue to be on the periphery. In colonial Somalia, as in colonial Libya, the nomad *as* a racialized Muslim figure presented a problem of labor to the Italian empire. After selectively abolishing slavery in Somalia, the Italian administration was faced with the problem of establishing some form of labor discipline in the colony. To pacify the slave-owning Somali clans, the colonial administration adopted a process of gradualism whereby freed slaves were encouraged to come to an agreement with their former masters, in this case, in the form of domestic servitude. As Lee Cassenelli notes, this was because the Italians believed that the free Somalis would abandon agricultural labor altogether; according to one colonial administrator, "to free all the slaves at once would force the free Somalis, unaccustomed to working their own field, to abandon them and resume the pastoral way of life . . . and for reasons of public security as well as for commercial ones, it is preferable that the nomadic tribes become sedentary rather than the reverse."¹⁴

Further compounding this "problem" for the Italians were independent farming settlements, which included Islamic farming settlements, called *jamaacooyin*, where freed slaves and other fugitives were welcome. This historical analysis shows how mobility came to be construed not only as a racialized religious problem but also as a labor problem. That is, the production of this category of "mobility" was *also* inextricably linked to anxieties about the valorization of agricultural labor and the colonial economy at large. Hom's book encouraged me to think about the configurations of this power relationship and its material expression in the colonial present. Finally, anthropological material about Somalia during this time also shows that the movement of the "nomadic" Somali figure is one that has always necessarily been in tension with place(ment). As I thought about the analytic of mobility in *Empire's Mobius Strip*, I wondered how one could account for this spatial tension—one that is characterized by multiple forms of relationalities (e.g., to other Somalis, to animals, to the land).

The critical questions that came to mind as I read *Empire's Mobius Strip* have been very generative for my own research. Although my work does not take up mobility as a primary object of analysis, the question of mobility is unavoidable. Over the last decade, Somali Muslims in the United States have been routinely convicted of providing material support to al-Shabaab, a Somali militia group that was designated a foreign terrorist organization in 2008. Taking two legal cases in the United States as an entry point, my work examines how the Somali Muslim figure continues to be put to "work" vis-à-vis the categories of "terrorist," "migrant/refugee," and "pirate." I came to this research question because I wanted to know how the law could designate the physical, political, and economic *movements* of Somali Muslim subjects as particularly risky and therefore in need of carceral management. How might taking up this question—in a way that problematizes the dominant discourses about the African diaspora and the African postcolony—allow us to think differently about the law's relationship to humans and to notions of sovereignty? As I begin to track the ways in which juridical ideas about Somalia and Somalis circulate in national and transnational imaginaries, there are two fundamental and related questions that I am continuing to grapple with. If, as V. Y. Mudimbe teaches us, Africa continues to be construed as an exceptional space, one that is both an "empirical fact, yet by definition . . . perceived, experienced and promoted as the sign of the *absolute* otherness,"¹⁵ how does one orient their work so that Africa does not continue to appear as an exemplar of "absolute otherness"? Within this necessarily difficult theoretical

and political terrain, how do we write about and think with African postcolonial subjects, particularly in light of discourses that offer either the “abject” nonperson (e.g., refugees and migrants) or the violent and anarchist subject (e.g., terrorist, pirate, warlord)? One of the ways I am responding to these critical questions is by centering how Africans continue to challenge the ideological and material violences of these kinds of overdetermining narratives. In the current moment, the question of an African political subjectivity—and indeed, of African sovereignty—is even more pressing as Africans on the continent are subjected to the horrific and compounding violence of the long “war on terror” and the global climate crisis.

Xafsa Ciise is a PhD student in the History of Consciousness program at the University of California, Santa Cruz. Her work examines how the Somali Muslim figure continues to be put to “work”—domestically and globally—vis-à-vis the categories of “terrorist,” “migrant/refugee,” and “pirate.” Taking two legal cases in the United States as an entry point, her project documents the historical and contemporary management of the racialized Somali Muslim figure in order to think differently about the spatialization of risk within global governance logics. Central to this work is how the Somali Muslim community—in the diaspora and on the African continent—responds to and decenters these logics. She came to this research through community organizing in her home neighborhood of City Heights, San Diego.

Notes

1. Stephanie Malia Hom, *Empire’s Mobius Strip: Historical Echoes in Italy’s Crisis of Migration and Detention* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2019), 7.
[Return to note reference.](#)
2. Maria Michaela D’alessandro, “Inside Lampedusa, the Front Line of Europe’s Migration Crisis,” *GlobePost*, September 13, 2019, <https://theglobepost.com/2019/09/11/lampedusa-italy-migration/>.
[Return to note reference.](#)
3. Hom, *Empire’s Mobius Strip*, 30.
[Return to note reference.](#)
4. Rutvica Andrijasevic, “From Exception to Excess: Detention and Deportation across the Mediterranean Space,” in *The Deportation Regime: Sovereignty, Space, and the Freedom of Movement*, ed. Nicholas De Genova and Nathalie Puetz (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2010), 149.
[Return to note reference.](#)
5. Andrijasevic, 165.
[Return to note reference.](#)
6. Hom, *Empire’s Mobius Strip*, 68.
[Return to note reference.](#)
7. Hom, 121.
[Return to note reference.](#)
8. Hom, 165.

[Return to note reference.](#)

9. Hom, 123.

[Return to note reference.](#)

10. Hom, 7.

[Return to note reference.](#)

11. Hom, 189.

[Return to note reference.](#)

12. Hom, 30–31.

[Return to note reference.](#)

13. Cornelius J. Jaenen, "The Somali Problem," *African Affairs* 56 (1957): 147.

[Return to note reference.](#)

14. Lee V. Cassanelli, "The End of Slavery and the 'Problem' of Farm Labor," in *The Proceedings of the Third International Congress of Somali Studies*, ed. Annarita Puglielli (Rome: Pensiero Scientifico Editore, 1988), 273.

[Return to note reference.](#)

15. Valentin Y. Mubimbe, "Which Idea of Africa? Herskovits's Cultural Relativism," *October* 55 (1990): 93.

[Return to note reference.](#)

Book Forum

Review of Stephanie Malia Hom’s *Empire’s Mobius Strip: Historical Echoes in Italy’s Crisis of Migration and Detention*

Ampson Hagan

Reproducing the West

Imperial formations iterate the historicity of the past, affecting human relations with institutions, materiality, and other beings. I want to speak to some of the relations that have been reconfigured and the relations being renegotiated right now regarding imperial creep and migrants within Europe. Empire shapes the narratives that produce and the facts of the past and have led to the willful forgetting of the brutal and extensive colonial and imperial work of the Italian nation-state. However, the reproduction of the West and the peopling of that cultural-epistemological domain demand specific maintenance that is critical to the sociopolitical and economic expansion of the West. Critical to the devastating lurch of empire that Hom traces in *Empire’s Mobius Strip* is the reproduction of the West and its imperialist reasons, recast as common sense in all the many quotidian actions of daily life as well as in the sensibilities of the political community.¹ The commonsense notions of what liberal society and the market demand reaffirm not only the centrality of empire to the current liberal political episteme, the wet-nurse of the West, but the sociohistorical domination of the West and its ideology that requires empire, demonstrating the Mobius strip of empire.

Michel-Rolph Trouillot has noted the inherent contradictions within liberalism and the notions of a market society in a world suffering and straining under the current precepts of globalization. The market economy itself prevents the rise of the market society—a frighteningly totalizing permutation of the “market” that has long been on the horizon—because people have nonmarket goals and desires, resulting in refusals of the market society. Considering these goals, Trouillot explains, “These goals and the moral values, cultural codes, and social ideals that sustain them ensure that the effects of economic processes can never be reduced to the economic sphere.”² Inasmuch as globalization revolves around the market, forcing misaligned and inequitable relationships between those with power and opportunity and those without, the capitalist, neoliberal market world order does not generate or rely on an “agreement on the long-term meanings of social life.”³ Such ambivalences about how to live a social life—the inherent contradictions within liberalism—represent profoundly mundane and quotidian battles in society.

Similar to the Turco-Napolitano law that criminalized immigration in Italy, paving the way for the detention centers known as Centri di Permanenza Temporanea (CPT) and their most recent iteration in Lampedusa (the Center for First Aid and Welcome), Niger passed a law in 2015 criminalizing all human trafficking, including the harboring of unauthorized and undocumented migrants in the country. The EU, through incredibly uneven bilateral agreements with Niger, was able to push a weak country under an opportunistic leader, President Mahamadou Issoufou, to police its own borders against the migrants from other Black African nations traveling through Niger to work in North Africa and beyond. Niger is not an imperial nation or even one considered to have emerged from a unified imperial past; however, the EU and Niger’s former colonial ruler, France, do continue to extend their imperial domains via their relations with postcolonial states such as Niger. A different iteration of Hom’s Mobius strip at work, European pressure on resource-strapped postcolonial states like Niger to stem the movement of Black Africans northward to Europe is an echo of previous colonial engagements of exploitation. Today, the European empire is solidifying its borders by fiat within its own territory and within the territories of other nations, and such suzerainties are the new spectacularly mundane politics of this relatively recent normal.

Many European nations, including Italy, have vacillated between deploying outwardly xenophobic and racist migration policies and rhetoric, and more subtle antimigrant machinations that are Trojan-horsed by criminal justice ideology and immigration reform doublespeak. Denise Ferreira da Silva has indicated how some of these xenophobic “arguments” against allowing the Others of Europe *into* Europe have been used as “social scientific projects guided by the concept of the cultural.”⁴ Such social scientific projects include the racist, social Darwinist, and eugenicist IQ testing and phrenological studies used to claim that Africans were biologically inferior to Europeans and their movement as (post)colonial subjects should be managed and limited by Europe. Hom pointed out that Italian colonial administrators and Italian journalists documenting the conditions and plight that both Libyan and Italian (im)migrants experienced gave racist accounts of Italian imperial subjects that continue to reverberate into the present, as experienced by the Roma and Sinti groups and the rest of Italy’s Italian *others*.⁵

Empire’s Mobius Strip and Empire’s Reprise

Why is so much of society so comfortable with the precepts of empire making and even with the idea of restricting the movement of others? The repackaging and reformulation of imperial spaces and their histories, such as the camp, the village, and even the plantation, are essential to the continued devastating linkages of the ribbon of empire—the Mobius strip in which we are all constrained and to which we are confined. These echoes of empire force us to reprise past roles as new ones. It is important to see empire as a reproduction and simulacrum of itself and of its past selves. It evolves with incredible speed and devastating totality.

When we think of “fascist creep,” or even the steady retrenchment of states away from socialist and communitarian principles and toward nationalist fascism, we need to consider the organization of the actors and political calculations that comprise this slow crawl. In fact, we need to consider this as a movement toward empire—a stronger embrace of imperial dreams that manifests in imperial expansion and a simultaneously tightening grip on society, historicity, and spatiality. This “creep” of the liberal market ideology has exacerbated the wealth gap under the guise of globalization and market “competition,” enabling capitalist expansion throughout the Global South while simultaneously enforcing xenophobic immigration policies rebranded in liberal doubletalk as “trade protectionism.” In doing so, this creeping nature of empire of the twenty-first century has exposed more people to ill health, limited economic possibilities, and increasingly severe forms of surveillance and securitization, including the state’s right to control the movement of subjects, a sovereignty over the body enshrined in law and put to use in (im)migration policy.

What does this look like in resource-strapped countries—those who experienced empire from the bottom? How does empire reinvent itself to work in countries like Niger? Humanitarianism via migration control is a co-optation of humanist ideals in the service of antimigration and *antimigrant* policies. Humanitarianism and the health it offers to many in Niger are co-opted for imperial use. NGOs and development organizations work to repatriate Black Africans and keep them within Black Africa (because they are not allowed in North Africa either). They rely on the antimigration apparatus to offer care that is contingent upon repatriation—that is, the reversal of movement, the *correction* of wayward mobility. This is not the first time humanitarianism has been intimately implicated in the subjugation and occupation of Africans and Europe’s Others; empire reprised the role of humanitarianism as the handmaiden of imperialism, and in this remake, humanitarian benevolence is facilitating the migration control that is part and parcel of present-day iterations of empire.

That migration has been “taken up” as a quasi-humanitarian issue is no surprise, as the alignment of NGOs and humanitarian reason with liberal logics of border security, individual responsibility, entrepreneurial solutions, and personal property has been decades in the making. The European Union has relied on the International Organization for Migration (IOM)—a United Nations (UN) agency, reflecting an endorsement of the UN that itself emerged from the aftermath of World War II alongside human rights discourse on which many of its actions rely—to manage not migration in the West, but migrants within postcolonial, sovereign nations. In Niger, IOM repatriates migrants to their home countries in a procedure it calls “Assisted Voluntary Return and

Reintegration" that garners the label of "humanitarian aid" and, according to the Niger Chief of Mission Barbara Rijks, offers migrants a "dignified return."⁶ However, IOM, along with the UN High Commissioner for Refugees (HCR), organized a system for identifying and referring to UNHCR persons likely to fall under the Geneva Convention category of asylum, in which IOM staff in IOM transit centers would screen migrants against protocols IOM and UNHCR have developed in order to determine refugee status. Thus the offer of return assistance serves as a filter for access to the asylum process, the latter being synonymous with "problematic return."⁷ As asylum becomes even more impossible to achieve, involving more arcane rules and requirements that increasingly raise the bar for what one has to endure and prove in order to even have a good case for asylum, more and more migrants decide to discontinue or forgo the asylum process altogether. IOM's repatriation assistance program presents itself as the next viable option, producing Europe's desired effect: shunting migrants into humanitarianized protocols for repatriation keeps Africans "in place" and also provides political cover for Europe as repatriation happens under the veil of a sanitized, humanitarian UN banner. Voluntary return, humanitarian cover, and entrepreneurial (market) "solutions" are ways in which imperial liberal ideologies have hijacked humanitarian principles and attendant sentiments in order to both shepherd and launder racist and xenophobic neoliberal politics. Hom's tracing of the continuities of Italian empire through time is instructive, showing how empire never really goes away; it reconstitutes itself and rebrands its tactics, redefining all that it encounters in its telos of global domination, such that all aspects of society are understood and negotiated through the prism of empire.

Empire's Mobius Strip reflects fundamental concerns about Black African *presence* in the imaginary of the Italian nation-state and in Western (Christendom) imperial imaginaries. Does the African exist, beyond mere presence? The failure to articulate African political will in their protests of ill treatment by the Italian state puts forth the problem that African being holds for (post)colonial empire and its onto-epistemological offspring, Western modernity. *Empire's Mobius Strip* noticeably sidesteps African political subjectivity in reaction to the interminable grind of Italian empire, and how this elision actually perpetuates negative descriptions of Africans. It is notable that during Italian occupation of Libya and Somalia, Italian colonial administrators, governmental officials, and journalists described Africans in terms similar to how the current Italian state demonizes the Romani. In this preservation of contemptuous description of Africans, Hom demonstrates yet another way that empire smooths categories and descriptions of humans across space and time. Subjectivity for Africans is continually denied, and this disavowal of certain beings from the realm of ontological significance—and by extension, the political community—is part and parcel of the mundane but wanton violence that is simultaneously empire's method and effect. Such an insistence on the nonbeing of Africans in terms of political agency and subjecthood is empire working, specifically against Africans living under the yoke of European (neo)colonialism in Africa.

This lack of engagement with African political subjectivity on the part of the African migrant subject quietly asks, What sort of political possibility can we expect from those still considered as objects by a system that is designed to *not* recognize them as subjectival actors? Such a claim assumes that full recognition of Africans' subjectivity can be realized and respected within empire—however, empire makes no space for such a dream. Empire's horizon of expectations has circumscribed rights around white Man, a product of the Western cultural logic of social categories in which biology provides the rational organization for the social world, or what Oyèrónké Oyěwùmí calls "bio-logics."⁸ Black Africans and other former colonized peoples who are outside the bio-logics of white Man are incongruous with the imagined political entity that is endowed with rights of Man, and inclusion within a political community that is antithetical to Black being is an impossibility.

It is African presence that reveals the aporia within the Italian imperial state and its characterization of African mobility specifically that African migrants are abject mobile subjects. This speaks to the ontological threat that Africans—especially *mobile* Africans—pose to Europe, the cultural-geographical area of the former colonial rulers of African peoples. Europe and its empire represent an ontological, epistemological, and material system of domination and physical-cultural accumulation that enriches the cultural and historical episteme through which Europe derived its notions of self and the West; however, the dominion over bodies and their movement is

paramount to the integrity of the empire. When Africans—both colonial subjects and postcolonial “migrants”—can move anywhere and without permission, the entire ontological premise of Europe/empire is undermined. Italy considering African migrants (noncitizens) as subjects who have been collapsed under the rubric of the universal without being subject to any of its benefits (namely, the undisputed and unabridged rights of Man) is the aporia at the heart of the unending and devastating logics of empire, and the threat to empire—simultaneous African mobility and European dominion of African subjects—is built in the imperial fabric.

Protests and destruction of detention centers render objects visible within the framework of optimism that is inherent to positive humanism. In a world of “negative liberties” that comprise the normative, legal, and humanist framework for “universal” humanitarian action, positive liberties—which include social and political freedoms—are unattainable for these African migrants, and therefore Africans’ “political will” has no foundation in liberal ethics and politics. The field of negative liberties enables the thin humanitarianism that Italy invokes in order to defend human rights, resulting in provisions of “care” without social solidarity, political redress, and bureaucratically obfuscated social welfare programs. These Africans are not proper subjects in the eyes of Italy or the West. Therefore, the question of whether their political will and subjectivity are being ignored is one that we cannot ask, because it assumes a universal subjectivity for Africans for which there is no basis of truth in the Western onto-epistemological tradition. Again, *this*—along with Hom’s assiduous research of the history of Italian colonialism of Libya and Somalia she is trying to recover from the oblivion resulting from historical amnesia—is another feature of empire at work: the persistent framing of African nonbeing despite the reframing of everything else that structures African presence in the West, including the historicity of Italian empire itself.

Ampson Hagan is a PhD candidate in anthropology at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill. His work explores the inherent contradictions within humanitarianism and its goal to rescue Africans and how those contradictions impose limits on how Africans can participate within a liberal, humanist, anti-Black world.

Notes

1. Pierre Bourdieu and Loïc Wacquant, “On the Cunning of Imperialist Reason,” *Theory, Culture & Society* 16, no. 1 (1999): 43–44.
[Return to note reference.](#)
2. Michel-Rolph Trouillot, *Global Transformations: Anthropology and the Modern World* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003), 61.
[Return to note reference.](#)
3. Michel-Rolph Trouillot, *Global Transformations*, 61.
[Return to note reference.](#)
4. Denise Ferreira da Silva, *Toward a Global Idea of Race*, *Borderlines* 27 (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2007), 151.
[Return to note reference.](#)
5. Stephanie Malia Hom, *Empire's Mobius Strip: Historical Echoes in Italy's Crisis of Migration and Detention* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2019), 121.
[Return to note reference.](#)

6. "Over 40,000 Migrants Assisted with Voluntary Return and Reintegration from Niger since 2015," IOM UN Migration press release, November 8, 2019, <https://www.iom.int/news/over-40000-migrants-assisted-voluntary-return-and-reintegration-niger-2015>.

[Return to note reference.](#)

7. Florence Boyer and Pascaline Chappart, "Les enjeux de la protection au Niger: Les nouvelles impasses politique du «transit»?," *Mouvements*, June 30, 2018, <http://mouvements.info/les-enjeux-de-la-protection-au-niger/>.

[Return to note reference.](#)

8. Oyèrónké Oyěwùmí, *The Invention of Women: Making an African Sense of Western Gender Discourses* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1997), 5.

[Return to note reference.](#)

Book Forum

Review of Stephanie Malia Hom's *Empire's Mobius Strip: Historical Echoes in Italy's Crisis of Migration and Detention*

Torin Jones

Unaccompanied Foreign Minors: Where State Care Meets Migrant Agencies

Maurizio Albahari offers a damning critique of the illegal border pushback (*rispingimento*) policies in Italy and the European Union's Frontex program more broadly.¹ With case study after case study, Albahari outlines the systematic ways that Europeans have allowed and increased the likelihood of migrant deaths in the Mediterranean. Years earlier, Iain Chambers presented a dramatically different view of the Sea—one highlighting centuries of African and European exchange that live on in present nuances of food, music, migration, and more.² Readers of these two fascinating monographs could easily question how to reconcile views of the Mediterranean as a place of both extreme European violence and boundless human mobility.

Stephanie Malia Hom's *Empire's Mobius Strip: Historical Echoes in Italy's Crisis of Migration and Detention* intervenes exactly into this tension, provocatively analyzing human mobility in relationship to Italian state making and empire building.³ A compelling framework of "imperial formations" allows Hom to explore how counternomadic concentration camps in colonial Libya, for example, reflect state logics still at play in camps for detained African migrants and relocated Romani in Rome's polluted peripheries. While drawing inspiration from Giorgio Agamben's theorization of camps as sites par excellence for the unbonding and exclusion of certain populations from social relations, Hom also participates fruitfully in a body of literature that routinely questions intimate relationships between racial-spatial control in colonies and corresponding metropolises.⁴

I come to Hom's work with a very particular lens. I have spent the last five years conducting research among unaccompanied foreign minors (*minori stranieri non accompagnati*, or MSNA) from West Africa who are living in Italian migrant centers. Although widespread use of the MSNA moniker dates back nearly a decade, only National Law 47/2017 (known as the Legge Zampa) formalized this category. Under National Law 176/1991 (and now National Law 47/2017), Italy must accommodate MSNA within the territory and provide them with state care. Italy must serve their "best interests." Many migrants, therefore, present falsely young ages at the Mediterranean border. They achieve what so many others cannot: entry into the EU. As a result of ethnographic research among this population, I am left with generative questions after reading Hom's compelling work. First, how does Italy's genocidal colonial violence in North Africa and sedentarizing policies for Romani relate to (highly mitigated) forms of care in youth migrant centers? Second, how might we account for African agencies?

Along with those considered victims of trafficking, MSNA receive some of the most solicitous state care in Italy.⁵ As wards of the state with legal statuses similar to that of Italian orphans, MSNA do not quite constitute juridical foreigners. Protected status does not indicate that life for MSNA is simple. Scandals of embezzlement and inhumane conditions have long bedeviled MSNA centers. Lampedusa's migrant center uprising was by no means singular.⁶ What I have found in many centers are underpaid, unpaid, ill-equipped, and untrained staff members attempting to care for migrants. Many Sicilian employees lament an ongoing lack of payment while sometimes creating their own Italian lessons and bringing resources from home in an attempt to ensure that life is not simply miserable for the young Africans residing in "welcome centers," or *centri di accoglienza*.

It took me a long time to appreciate the complexity of Italian-African relationships in migrant centers. I was filled with anger the very first time I entered a youth migrant center in 2015. *Where were the staff?* The question repeated inside me. I found bored-looking young men sitting around and doing nothing. They could not tell me where the staff hid. "Maybe over there," some directed me noncommittally. I searched corridors and rooms. *Where were the staff?* I was livid. *How could migrant care and integration look like this? Is this legal—*young

men draped across fraying and broken furniture? I searched bathrooms and peered outside, naively scandalized by the apparent abandonment of unaccompanied foreign minors on the outskirts of a small town in eastern central Sicily. I found the staff, smoking, chatting, and playing cards.

After years of research, conflicting emotions—appreciation, pity, rage, and frustration—trouble my memories and judgments of migrant center staff. Many express racist and Islamophobic viewpoints, and others arrive daily only to smoke on the balcony and chat with other staff. Sometimes I told myself they would not abdicate their duties if salaries arrived regularly. I do not know this. Many volunteer workers attempted to fill the gaps of state funding and stretched themselves—their emotional and financial resources—while working with migrants who, in my opinion, justly resented low levels of care. Staff goodwill prevented many MSNA from going to bed hungry some nights and prevented the complete absence of state services. Some brought toys and clothes from home to help migrants sleep a little better. Others expressed frank racism and xenophobia. With what standards might one evaluate the work of unpaid employees who expect pay? Did staff hold some sort of baseline human responsibility to MSNA? What ethics should guide unwitting almost-volunteers with virtually no resources? I do not know.

Hom raises urgent questions regarding space, race, otherness, and power in Italy. I reflect upon lived experiences in MSNA centers because I wonder how such spaces may fit into Hom's illuminating exploration of imperial formations. Migrants, for example, have routinely protested—primarily with civil disobedience—substandard living conditions, a lack of legal aid, and persistent discrimination in migrant centers. In addition, many unaccompanied foreign minors leave migrant centers at night, often heading toward Germany and becoming “undocumented” in the process. My point is not to uncritically celebrate the ways that some Africans negotiate highly suspect apparatuses of state care and surveillance. Instead, I posit that modes of Black protest and Black escape unfurl, reknit, and morph just as much as Italian imperial formations. Hom cultivates ample space to examine Black geographies in relation to Italian empire, and to see their overlap.

As a cultural anthropologist, I have quite predictably questioned the interpersonal textures of Hom's temporal and geographic framework. Above, I have gestured toward messy relationships among migrants and Italians in migrant centers. I have also gestured toward African agencies, specifically pointing to age fluidity, protest, and refusals of state wardship. In both cases, I hope to have underscored the unpredictable lifeways that may simultaneously uphold and refute imperial formations. My doctoral dissertation, *Black Boy Feelings: Race and the Erotics of Migrant Governance in Sicily*, seeks to understand the emotional life of Blackness in Italy. I especially consider the role of sadness within modes of migrant self-making that often subvert local discourses of African youth as “future Italians.” Studies of youth in myriad African contexts repeatedly underscore ingenuity, creativity, and entrepreneurship.⁷ I am excited to further question how these literatures may interact with Hom's historical-ethnographic analyses and complicate understandings of African life making in Italy.

Torin Jones is a doctoral candidate in the anthropology department at Stanford University. Torin conducts research among young West Africans seeking asylum in Italy while investigating the intersections of migration, humanitarianism, race, and emotion.

Notes

1. Maurizio Albahari, “Europe's Refugee Crisis,” *Anthropology Today* 31, no. 5 (2015), <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-8322.12196>.

[Return to note reference.](#)

2. Iain Chambers, *Mediterranean Crossings: The Politics of an Interrupted Modernity* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2008).

[Return to note reference.](#)

3. Stephanie Malia Hom, *Empire's Mobius Strip: Historical Echoes in Italy's Crisis of Migration and Detention* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2019).

[Return to note reference.](#)

4. See Frantz Fanon, *Black Skin, White Masks* (New York: Grove Press, 2008); Michel Foucault, *Society Must Be Defended* (New York: Picador, 2003); and Anne McClintock, *Imperial Leather: Race, Gender, and Sexuality in the Imperial Contest* (New York: Routledge, 1995).

[Return to note reference.](#)

5. Cristiana Giordano, *Migrants in Translation: Caring and the Logics of Difference in Contemporary Italy* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2014).

[Return to note reference.](#)

6. Hom, *Empire's Mobius Strip*, 58.

[Return to note reference.](#)

7. See Karen Tranberg Hansen, "Getting Stuck in the Compound: Some Odds against Social Adulthood in Lusaka, Zambia," *Africa Today* 51, no. 4 (2005): 3–16; Mark Hunter, *Love in the Time of AIDS: Inequality, Gender, and Rights in South Africa* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2010); Janet Roitman, *Fiscal Disobedience: An Anthropology of Economic Regulation in Central Africa* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2005); and Vinh-Kim Nguyen, "Uses and Pleasures: Sexual Modernity, HIV/AIDS, and Confessional Technologies in a West African Metropolis," in *Sex in Development: Science, Sexuality, and Morality in Global Perspective*, ed. Stacy Leigh Pigg and Vincanne Adams (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2005), 245–68.

[Return to note reference.](#)

Book Forum

Author’s Response to *Empire’s Mobius Strip* Forum

Stephanie Malia Hom

Books, especially scholarly ones, are the products of sustained conversations that illuminate the critical questions asked within them from perspectives both sundry and incisive. The highest compliment to an author is to have one’s book generate fresh insights into these questions and indeed generate new questions themselves. The reviews and commentary on my book, *Empire’s Mobius Strip*, in this forum represent exactly that: they explore how the control of mobility, which I argue is empire’s standard operating procedure, articulates with race, anti-Blackness, and the ripple effects of Italian colonialism on subject making in Somalia, Niger, and among young people of African descent immured in Italy’s system of migrant detention centers.

Expanding and applying questions of empire and mobility to sub-Saharan Africa, as the research of all three reviewers do, is an especially fruitful direction of inquiry, especially for the Horn of Africa. Contemporary understandings of Blackness in Italy—and more sharply, anti-Blackness in Italy—are perceived through a set of optics formed during Italian colonial rule in Eritrea, Somalia, and Ethiopia. It recalls a question that Camilla Hawthorne puts so eloquently—namely, how do we “take seriously the histories of racial boundary drawing that were caught up with the process of national unification as well as Italy’s own colonial history . . . and the reverberations of these histories in the present?”¹

A through line in all the commentaries, as well as in my book, is that the exercise of empire upholds the global apparatus of neoliberalism. In our interdependent world, we are all yoked to this system and are to varying degrees subject to its stratifying and discriminatory forces. For people who are Black, Brown, mixed race, female, queer, trans, disabled, or basically anyone who does not fit neatly into the sanctioned understandings of belonging as once defined by Enlightenment Europe, these forces can be, and often are, deadly. As an example, one need only look at the disproportionate number of Black and Brown people who have died of COVID-19 in the United States in 2020. A Black person is six times more likely to die than a white person, and this figure is likely an underestimate.² Heather Merrill writes that Black social death is a prerequisite for European ontology, but here, the mass death of Black people from COVID-19 lays bare the brutal, violent forces of neoliberalism going about their work.³

One way to push back against these forces is to foreground the unruly and messy subjectivities lived by people of African descent. Such is the case with Torin Jones’s fieldwork among West African youth in migrant centers in Italy, Ampson Hagan’s work with people in Niger who are subject to the “humanitarian” initiatives of supranational organizations like the EU and UN, and Xafsa Ciise’s research into how Somali Muslims become signified as recalcitrant subjects in need of carceral management. In these ways, the complexity of affective and subjective ties that are too often erased are made visible.

To go deeper, we might ask about the historical precedents that both shape and complicate these subjective constellations. By way of one example, the renowned Italian journalist Indro Montanelli famously boasted during a 1969 television interview of buying a twelve-year-old child bride named Destà while serving in Italian-occupied Eritrea. Montanelli proudly recalled this “marriage”:⁴ “Pare che avessi scelto bene. Era una bellissima ragazza bilena, di dodici anni” (It appears that I chose well. She was a beautiful Bilen girl of twelve years old). The moment he uttered Destà’s age, there was a chuckle in the crowd. Montanelli turned to the audience and with a sly smile rejoined, “Scusate, ma in Africa è un’altra cosa” (Excuse me, but in Africa, it’s another thing). Despite the fact that Elvira Banotti, an Italian-Eritrean journalist in the audience, took Montanelli to task about sexually assaulting a minor, Montanelli remained stalwart and unflustered: “No signora, guardi, sulla violenza . . . nessuna violenza perché le ragazze in Abissinia si sposano a 12 anni” (No ma’am, look, regarding violence . . . there was no violence because in Eritrea [Abyssinia], they marry at twelve years old).

Montanelli’s display of toxic masculinity, misogyny, sexual violence, and absolute devaluation of Black life—not to mention his framing of Africa as Other (*altro*), as a place beyond European mores and values, where anything and everything goes (*ma in Africa è un’altra cosa*)—speaks to deep-seated white supremacy in Italy that is directly linked to its colonial past. This past is only now starting to be addressed by scholarship on Black Italy and the Black Mediterranean.

Activism, too, has been picking up in Italy. During the BLM protests in June 2020, a statue of Indro Montanelli in Milan was doused in red paint and graffitied with the words *razzista* (racist) and *stupratore* (rapist), making visible the violence of Montanelli’s racism and sexual assault on his monumentalized body. What is more, Destà now has her own mural in the same city—her fist is raised, her presence vibrant and demanding of our attention. In precisely this way, art takes us to the edges of empire’s Mobius strip, affords us a brief reprieve from its force field, and if only for a moment, allows for equity and social justice to flourish unabated.

Stephanie Malia Hom is a faculty member in the Department of French and Italian at the University of California, Santa Barbara. She writes and lectures on modern Italy and the Mediterranean, mobility studies, colonialism and imperialism, migration and detention, and tourism history and practice.

Notes

1. Camilla Hawthorne, “In Search of Black Italia: Notes on Race, Belonging, and Activism in the Black Mediterranean,” *Transition* 123 (2017): 165.
[Return to note reference.](#)
2. Ladan Golestaneh et al., “The Association of Race and COVID-19 Mortality,” *EClinicalMedicine* (2020): 1. In the interview in this special issue with Nunu Kidane and Gerald Lenoir, Kidane argues that these numbers are not only disproportionate—they are “catastrophic.”
[Return to note reference.](#)
3. Heather Merrill, *Black Spaces: African Diaspora in Italy* (London: Routledge, 2018), 59–62.
[Return to note reference.](#)
4. Indro Montanelli, interview by Gianni Bisiach, *L’ora della verità*, 1969, “Montanelli e la moglie dodicenne—Video Completo 1080p,” YouTube video, 3:10, June 14, 2020, <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=PYgSwluzYxs>.
[Return to note reference.](#)

Book Forum