

UC Santa Barbara

Journal of Transnational American Studies

Title

Introduction: Transnational American Studies in the "Age of Trump"

Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/7xb153vv>

Journal

Journal of Transnational American Studies, 8(1)

Authors

Kim, Sabine
Robinson, Greg

Publication Date

2017

DOI

10.5070/T881036820

Copyright Information

Copyright 2017 by the author(s). This work is made available under the terms of a Creative Commons Attribution License, available at <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>

Introduction: Transnational American Studies in the “Age of Trump”

SABINE KIM and GREG ROBINSON

Borders are never purely abstract boundaries, created to demarcate and serve the ends of nation and social power. Even when passing along natural barriers such as rivers or mountains, borders are artificial creations, predominantly experienced materially by the bodies who move (or are prevented from moving) across them. In a time of forced migrations, refugee “crises,” and increasingly closed borders, it is more important than ever to question positivist views on frontiers. Transnational American Studies perspectives may be useful in conceptualizing borders as performative phenomena that do not so much separate as suture spaces, practices, languages, and affiliations with countries, regions, and identities, often in ragged and uneven ways. It is thus more accurate to speak not of borders, but of borderlands and *la frontera*, in Gloria Anzaldúa’s term for the hybrid cultures and unequal concentrations of capital produced by the US–Mexico border. As Shelley Fisher Fishkin has shown, people can have multiple affiliations that, where positivist borders would insist on choosing one or the other, are lived without contradiction.¹ The arbitrariness of the boundary becomes increasingly problematic when physical borders harden. This was the case in the mid-nineteenth century Rio Grande area, when, in the space of less than twenty years, as the result of territorial struggles, those living on the banks of the river were alternately citizens of Mexico, the Republic of Texas, the Republic of Rio Grande, and finally of the United States (and soon after, one may add, of the Confederate States of America); all, Fishkin points out, “without ever having left home” (303). A large number of essays in this issue of the *Journal of Transnational American Studies* are concerned with tracing genealogies—colonial, imperial, postcolonial—of movements across borders of various kinds, during the period of transatlantic slavery and after, in the age of nineteenth-century empire and of modern exchanges. In a modest way, these essays

contribute to such important thinking, as does this issue's Special Forum on *La Floride française: Florida, France, and the Francophone World*. The Special Forum examines French Florida from various perspectives of transnational exchange, including several essays on *la Floride française* as a colonial contact zone extending from a Native American Florida (in one case via Frankfurt, Germany) to Spain and the Caribbean.

Like every issue of *JTAS*, this edition includes a special Forward and Reprise section, in which, respectively, excerpts from the newest monographs in Transnational American Studies are presented, sometimes even in advance of the book's publication, or, in the case of Reprise, book excerpts and articles that are drawn from the archives because they have special relevance for what is taking place today; in each case, they are framed with a contextualizing introduction by Nina Morgan (Reprise) and Greg Robinson (Forward).

This issue represents our journal's first appearance after the onset of what multiple Americanists have referred to, and not in overly positive fashion, as the "Age of Trump."² A central theme of Trump administration discourse is its strident defense of physical borders and its general attack on undocumented workers, immigrants, and refugees—in short, those "racial others" who support the creation of US wealth even as the administration would disavow them. This has not only manifested itself in harshly exclusionary policies, most notably the administration's abandoning of the existing DACA program, but has fostered increased visibility of white nationalist groups and openly racist discourse. At the same time, the White House, led by the president, has distinguished itself by its nationalist attacks on international trade and multilateral diplomacy. As scholars of American Studies based outside the United States, we both feel a special responsibility to make use of our position to investigate and discuss the larger forces at play here. One thing that larger transnational approaches can help reveal is the complex interface between national identity, domestic politics, and state policy, especially in regard to international relations.³ In addition to examining the domestic context for diplomatic choices, they broaden the scope of foreign policy actors from government and elites to artists, foreign travelers, and individual residents, prominently including members of ethnic/racial minorities. In some respects, ironically, the Trump administration forms part of a transnational movement. One can see similar trends of hostility over immigration in the Brexit campaign in Great Britain in 2016, as well as in political campaigns across the continent of Europe—with refugees as the chief targets of outrage and suspicion; dismissive attitudes regarding international alliances; and rhetoric (not matched by reality) about prioritizing funding for welfare state protections for older citizens, who would purportedly benefit from abandonment of international responsibilities.

A related arena for integrating an American Studies approach with international relations is that of the impact of race and ethnicity on immigration and refugee policy. In historical terms, although immigration law and exclusion have usually been claimed by individual governments as a purely domestic matter, isolated

from international policy (a view often shared by specialists in international relations), the issue of immigration, especially by non-Anglos, has historically occupied a prominent role in United States foreign relations. For example, a crucial impetus for the battle against ratification of the Treaty of Versailles and entry of the United States into the League of Nations in the aftermath of World War I came from Senator Henry Cabot Lodge and his allies among the “irreconcilables” in the Senate. They feared that the provisions for equality of nations enshrined in the League’s covenant (a less binding alternative to Japan’s rejected proposal that racial equality be enunciated) would void all forms of discrimination among nations in immigration, thus ending Asian exclusion and opening the door for renewed Asian entry to the United States. During the World War II era, President Franklin D. Roosevelt became convinced that eliminating overpopulation was vital to world peace, since the concentration of diverse populations led to competition for scarce resources and ultimately to ethnic conflict. He therefore commissioned the so-called M Project, a team of anthropologists, demographers, and social scientists who would draw up plans for large-scale postwar selection of Jews and other “unwanted” ethnic groups in accordance with eugenic principles, and assist in the mass migration of such displaced persons from overcrowded regions of Europe to South America (FDR preferred not to challenge domestic opposition by proposing immigration to the United States, on the excuse that the nation was not sufficiently uncrowded for these purposes!).⁴ By the same token, an unspoken but compelling aspect of President Harry S. Truman’s postwar support for Jewish emigration to Palestine, and eventually the creation of the state of Israel, was his fear of international pressure to permit a large-scale expansion of Jewish immigration to the United States, and the potentially negative domestic reaction.

Questions of race and ethnicity can also be connected with international affairs in other ways. Mary L. Dudziak’s *Cold War Civil Rights* examines how American government policy on civil rights was shaped by international considerations during the Cold War era.⁵ She reveals how national leaders, anxious to secure the support of non-white nations to the cause of the “free world” and to counter Soviet propaganda, put a priority on securing civil rights for Black Americans at home, precisely because discrimination was an embarrassment internationally. The result was an unprecedented level of executive branch leadership, and intervention by State Department officials in arguments before the courts and Congress. Conversely, Marc S. Gallicchio, in *The African American Encounter with China and Japan*, underlines the strength of internationalism within the Black community.⁶ Not only did African Americans pay close attention to international events and associate themselves with resistance against colonialism and white European domination (such as their jubilation following Japan’s epochal victory over Russia in the Russo-Japanese War of 1904–1905), but they built their own communities by absorbing aspects of other cultures and developing a cosmopolitan consciousness that enabled them to transcend the limited role they were permitted to occupy in domestic affairs.⁷ Penny

M. Von Eschen plays both sides of the street, as it were. In *Satchmo Blows up the World*, she discusses the paradoxes of State Department sponsorship of Black American artists during the Cold War period, and the attempts of these artists to avoid co-optation and express their own position on national and international affairs.⁸ Meanwhile, in *Race Against Empire*, she examines the extraordinary participation of Black Americans in anticolonial struggles.⁹ Black activists raised funds for African independence movements, sought to build political coalitions in cooperation with Africans, and encouraged a pan-African identity. The work of Greg Robinson in this area includes the study of the performer-activist Paul Robeson.¹⁰ In the period following the outbreak of World War II, Robeson became an outspoken defender of China's struggle against the Japanese occupation, participating in China relief rallies and recording a bilingual album of Chinese songs. His activism not only followed from his interest in cultural politics, but also permitted him to maintain an antifascist solidarity in the aftermath of the Nazi-Soviet pact without violating the Communist Party's antiwar political line.

The issue of immigration also illuminates the evolution of the distinctive relationship between the United States and Canada. As Erika Lee reminds us in *At America's Gates*, it was in the effort to eliminate illegal immigration by Chinese during the age of the Exclusion Acts that American authorities built up the regime of border fences, police raids, and border agents that represent the visible face of the nation's immigration policy today.¹¹ Furthermore, it was to restrain such immigration that the United States imposed the American border checkpoints in Canadian territory to prevent any illicit entry on American soil by immigrants who could then claim basic rights—a unique arrangement, and arguably a direct ancestor of the constitutional theory under which the Bush administration and its successors have maintained that the camp at Guantánamo is a foreign area not subject to constitutional guarantees of due process.¹²

Again, while the Trump administration is remarkable for the stridency of its public statements, such rhetoric forms part of a larger refusal of United States leaders in recent years to admit any connection between refugee crises and the nation's foreign policy. This marks a significant generational change. Throughout the Cold War era, the United States made acceptance of refugees a rhetorical cornerstone of its foreign policy. Both from humanitarian interest—especially in the shadow of the Holocaust—and to demonstrate its stature as leader of “the free world,” the United States made a point of opening its doors to people fleeing persecution, notably defectors from communist nations. Special exceptions to exclusionist immigration policies were enacted by Congress to permit entry of refugees from China after 1949, Hungary in 1956, and from Cuba following the installation of the Castro government in 1959. Although the admission of refugees was not always popular domestically, and became increasingly contested on economic as well as racial grounds in the case of Indochinese refugees following the

Vietnam War, advocates of the consensus view that acceptance of refugees formed part of the nation’s commitment to its allies triumphed over domestic critics.¹³

The War against Terrorism and the Iraq conflict, by contrast, gave rise to a new definition of American freedom and how to defend it. Instead of continuing Cold War-era universalism, which would have meant not only working together with allies, but spotlighting a welcome to refugees from Islamic fundamentalism (such as the women whose rights American opinion leaders claim to be fighting to protect), the Bush administration developed a military policy based on independent action, and scorned alliances on an equal basis with other nations. At the same time—and as a logical corollary to this policy—it took for the first time a (literally) isolationist position on admitting refugees, unilaterally tightening existing restrictions on entry and residence of foreign nationals in a manner reminiscent of the period before Pearl Harbor. In creating the new—and suggestively named—Department of Homeland Security, it defined its commitment to American freedom in an exclusive manner: a liberty to be protected from threats conceived of as by definition foreign. Its actions, which stoked fears that the entry of foreigners would threaten national values, prefigure the current administration’s “America First” sloganeering, wholesale denunciation of Muslims, and rejection of all forms of immigration.

In the Articles section of this issue, we are proud to present nine compelling and well-researched essays that highlight important concerns—from problems of mobility and confinement to transnational constructions and displays of identity, on both the individual and institutional level. The objects of analysis range from a redress petition of the 1780s (Kaur) through experiments in biopolitical control of Indigenous medical subjects in nineteenth-century Hawai’i (Perreira) to popular culture narratives of tourism and exotic danger in twenty-first-century Mexico and Latin America (Rivers). The geographic constellations are equally wide-ranging, including the performance of diasporic memory by Chinese miners in California’s goldmining districts (Lee), the construction of hypermasculinized white US identities in the transnational spaces of the Panama Canal Zone (Yang), a Morocco in transition to independence mediated in the letters and novels of Beat writer William S. Burroughs (Suver), and the US exercise of soft power via an unprecedented major exhibition of American art in interwar Paris (Riley). A majority of the essays in this issue consider cultural and social phenomena from the nineteenth century or earlier, and almost all are interdisciplinary. Some perform readings of archival documents (Lee, Perreira, Kaur, Riley), while others trace connections between spaces geographically distant but linked via colonial circuits (Tripp), or via the adaptation by one country of another’s biopolitical legal regime (Yazell).

In their unique ways, these nine articles make new forays into Transnational American Studies. **Rajender Kaur**, for instance, in “The Curious Case of ‘Sick Keesar’ and the Roots of South Asian America in the Early Republic” directs our attention to the US presence of lascars, highly skilled master seamen from the countries

bordering the Indian Ocean, during the early days of the US nation. Examining Keesar's petition for redress for unjust confinement by a ship's captain and the withholding of wages, she reads the legal complaint as exercising a subaltern agency, in which the fledgling republic is tested for its commitment to ideals of democratic treatment. Here, as in Robert G. Lee's article, a moral economy is outlined in which past wrongs might be put right through just actions in the present. Keesar's petition in Baltimore, an important node in the emergent transoceanic trade, informs his position as racial other in defining the national character in the wake of revolutionary change. Kaur's critical engagement with the Atlantic seaboard—as opposed to the Pacific—as a site in South Asian America breaks new ground by turning our gaze farther back than the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, the period that the incisive scholarship of Vivek Bald on South Asian lascars has thus far explored. It also triangulates the US, India, and Great Britain, expanding the important work of Gopalan Balachandran on a global British Empire.

It is a small step from Keesar, as a South Asian seaman held captive in several senses of the word by Boston capitalist and ship's captain John O'Donnell, to the “nominally free” persons on whom **Colleen Tripp** focuses in her essay, “Beyond the Black Atlantic: Pacific Rebellions and the Gothic in Herman Melville's ‘Benito Cereno.’”¹⁴ Tripp builds on scholarship that connects Melville's work to a broader transoceanic world. Focusing on the Malay figures aboard the slave ship in Melville's novella, she argues that they introduce a plurality that triangulates the US, West Africa, Spain, Peru, and South Asia via a common denominator of Islam. A reading attuned to discourses of Orientalism in the novella complicates multicultural readings of “Benito Cereno” that too easily celebrate multicultural plurality. It also points to the postcolonial critique implied by the spectral “yellow arms” hidden under the deck, poised with a hundred sharp spears; in the curious temporality introduced by the figure of the Malay ghost, these shadowy threats are to be understood as a retributive violence. Such threats foretell the wages of empire that will come home in a terrible way following the bloodshed and brutality of Atlantic slavery and military intervention in the Pacific Islands.

In “‘Suppose for a moment, Keanu has reasoned thus’: Contagious Debt and Prisoner–Patient Consent in Nineteenth-Century Hawai'i,” **Christopher Perreira** draws out the connotations of “deficiency,” “debt,” and “indebtedness” to develop a concept of *contagious debt*, which he uses to analyse how nineteenth-century Western medicine regarded indigenous Hawai'ians, not as subjects of a sovereign nation, but as experimental subjects deficient in corporeal sovereignty whose lives were not to be valued in their living but in their dying. Keanu, the Native Hawai'ian at the center of the essay, is able to commute his death sentence to life in prison on the basis of his value as a medical subject in leprosy experiments; he died in 1892, shortly before the forcible annexation of Hawai'i by the US in 1898. Medicalization and criminalization are here analysed as intersecting discourses of containment, with the subsidiary but crucial effect of stripping subjects of rights not only to their person but

also to property, thereby contributing to the material dispossession of Native Hawai’ians. Perreira’s work critically links sovereignty, Indigenous Hawai’ian decolonization, and nineteenth-century medicalization of Indigenous subjects. It thus contributes to what Hsuan L. Hsu describes as a “concerted effort to study the histories and cultures of US imperialism not as historical footnotes but as constitutive moments in the US’s consolidation of global military, economic, and cultural influence.”¹⁵

Bryan Yazell opens up a critical studies perspective in “Governable Travelers: International Comparison in American Tramp Ethnography.” Yazell demonstrates how Mark Twain’s travelogue of journeying across Europe inadvertently provided US policy makers with a comparative tool in their efforts to contain and regulate the movement of tramps, those highly mobile travellers who became the very embodiment of American fears concerning downward spirals of economic instability. In an essay sensitive to historical context and drawing on Michel Foucault’s 1970s lectures on biopolitics, Yazell analyzes the ethnographic work of Josiah Flynt in his *Tramping with Tramps* alongside Twain’s *A Tramp Abroad*. Yazell suggests that US anti-tramp legislation drew on the same discourses of dangerously liberal mobility as the popular literature about tramps. The legislators’ goal: to identify itinerant populations as a category wholly separate from the working poor. As Kaur points out in her article vis-à-vis lascars, the terms and categories that do this work of differentiation and categorization are historical products; just as “lascar” is not an inherited social category but one that emerged in a colonial context, so too does “the tramp” first emerge as a clearly distinct type in the wake of the 1873 Great Depression.

Robert G. Lee asks how we might begin to imagine the lives of the Chinese miners who emigrated to California during the Gold Rush, since their history comes down to us in anecdotal and fragmentary ways as “remnants scattered across the California landscape.” Lee builds on Pierre Nora’s notion of memory as *lieux de mémoire*—sites where memory is stored not in physical environments but via bodies, objects, and practices that are historically situated—to develop a theory of diasporic memory.¹⁶ In the face of the loss of any conventional archive, Lee turns to a temple carving, a devotional text, and the *Hongmen Shouce*, a manual of the secret Hongmen brotherhood, texts which he connects through his reading. Through diasporic remembering, Lee proposes that a sense of historical continuity can be transmitted across time and across vast distances, from the Pearl River Delta to the Sacramento Delta. Lee is thus able to suggest how social violence among Chinese miners in California had religious hierarchical underpinnings similar to those of the Red Turban ethnic conflicts in South China. The connections Lee makes also equip us to better understand how these men imagined themselves in a US landscape, which they mediated by performing the heroic identities prescribed in the secret society manuals and embodied in their rituals of initiation. In the process, they created a site of memory, layering California with traces of Guangdong. Something which the author

does not emphasize but that we would like to highlight is that two of the texts central to Lee's reading come down to him as an inheritance from his uncle, Samuel D. Lee, who himself retrieved these materials in the 1930s from abandoned Chinese temples. Lee's article is, in this sense, a very moving work of memory in its own processes of recovery.

Examining the figure of the "Panama roughneck" in popular early twentieth-century literature set in the Panama Canal Zone, **Sunny Yang** throws new light on how white US Canal laborers used these discourses of hyperbolic white virility to construct masculinity in ways that undercut the hierarchies of the economic and legal "gold and silver" system. For a time, this system was organized not strictly along racial, but rather national lines; this placed some West Indian workers on the gold roll and relegated some white Europeans to "silver" status. In making this apparent, Yang thus draws our attention to how transnational perspectives can help us understand how the Panama Canal Zone distinctions operated in ways different—though no less detrimental—than the Jim Crow laws of the US South.

In "'Strengthen the bonds': The United States on Display in 1938 France," **Caroline M. Riley** shows how an exhibition of American art at Paris's Jeu de Paume museum during the 1930s invented a genealogy of American art built on claimed mutual aesthetic influences and artistic exchanges between France and the United States. Eight years in the making, the 1938 exhibition *Three Centuries of American Art* by New York's Museum of Modern Art involved three main axes: the arm of state diplomacy; the creation of new MoMA departments of photography, film, and architecture to serve a redefinition of "art"; and the strategic positioning of folk art as a bridge to a putatively simpler past. The goal of MoMA curators was to situate American modernism as both uniquely American and audaciously international at the same time. To achieve such goals, they had to work both with and against understandings of American art mediated to a French public by the World's Fairs and *Expositions universelles*, during a period of rising European fascism and economic uncertainty. Creating a narrative of American art history spanning three centuries meant inventing, in the sense of Eric Hobsbawm, an origin myth that would culminate in a uniquely American aesthetic expression—one connoting democracy, technological innovation, and artistic individualism.¹⁷ Riley ultimately locates this event as the site of shared French and American ideologies of modernism and of progress overthrowing tradition.

Stacey Andrew Suver examines the antiauthoritarianism of William S. Burroughs from the perspective of transnational literary biography. Suver asks how and to what extent the American writer's experience of living in French colonial Tangier during the height of independence struggles in Morocco altered and affected his concept of revolution. Suver offers a nuanced examination, focusing not, as might be expected, on writing that references Morocco explicitly. Rather Suver carries out what could be thought of as a symptomatic reading, tracing not so much the city of Tangier but the after-effects of revolutionary struggle and the psychic marks, as it

were, left on Burroughs’s writing by his witnessing of social and actual violence. Interestingly, though Suver contends that Burroughs’s writing changed in a marked way, the author concludes that the Beat writer, though profoundly stirred by Moroccan anticolonial protests and the nationalist movement, viewed independence and revolution in less transformative terms. Instead, Burroughs described such events as brief glimpses of a potential, truly radical alternative that too quickly vanish into power structures. Burroughs was scathing about hierarchies that carry over relatively unchanged, subsumed in what is merely a transfer of power from one set of elites to another.

And finally, in his essay “Dangerous Playgrounds: Hemispheric Imaginings and Domestic Insecurity in Contemporary US Tourism Narratives,” **Daniel Lanza Rivers** reflects on the visceral anti-immigrant sentiment of recent US border policies, reading these back in time and discussing the US tendency to associate Latin America with a putatively contaminating leftism. Rivers identifies the trope of US tourism in Latin America gone wrong as a trend that he names “dangerous playgrounds” narratives. He examines the way the representation of borders in Jessica Abel’s graphic novel *La Perdida* and the films *Turistas* and *Indigenous* participates in ideologies of containment and dangerous release. Whereas the gap year spent abroad is meant to be a step towards maturity, in these narratives, wealthy tourists from the global North fail to grasp the implications of their presence as Americans in spaces that are riven by legacies of US imperialism as a historical result of CIA secret operations and US financial interests in the drug trade, not to mention outright military “interventions” and torture.¹⁸ Rivers intriguingly argues that this failure to mature is a type of bildungsroman border narrative that exposes the US’s failure to mature as a nation.

The common concern that binds these articles together is the importance of bringing to bear, through their transnational outlook, a critical perspective on the concept of the United States. In this, they suggest that Transnational American Studies has arrived at a certain maturity. On the one hand, it supports a celebratory stance, in which transnationalism in itself has a positive valence due to its liberatory potential. It supports, as Ifeoma Kiddoe Nwankwo has argued in her work on the transnationalizing effects of the Haitian Revolution for Black public intellectuals, *Black Cosmopolitanism*, claiming affiliations of *transnational* identity to affirm the category of human when the *national* category of citizenship is denied.¹⁹ On the other hand, transnational perspectives critically expand the category of the national. As Fishkin has challenged us: If in our classrooms we had taught and learned the lessons of Gloria Anzaldúa’s “wrenching poem about living in the borderlands [or] ... Twain’s trenchant exposés,” we might now be more prepared “to remind those who call critics of the current administration ‘traitors’ that criticizing your country when you know it to be wrong is *as American as Mark Twain*.”²⁰

Notes

¹ Shelley Fisher Fishkin, “Mexican American Writers in the Borderlands of Culture,” *Writing America: Literary Landmarks from Walden Pond to Wounded Knee, A Reader’s Companion* (New Brunswick, NJ, and London: Rutgers University Press, 2015), 303.

² Whether Trump is a symptom or a major cause of the current rise in US populism and militarism remains an open question but Americanists from all disciplines have been compelled to reflect on what it means to live in the US under the Trump administration. At a May 2017 conference titled “Trump’s America,” for instance, speakers analysed the concept of *post-truth*, the shifting definition of rights and liberties, the carceral state, and the nexus of wealth and power, especially in its intersection with racialization and gendering. See the conference program of the Clinton Institute, University College Dublin, here: <http://ucdclinton.ie/trumps-america-5-6-may-2017/>

³ See Kathy-Ann Tan, “Citizenship Unhinged,” in *Reconfiguring Citizenship and National Identity in the North American Literary Imagination* (Detroit, MI: Wayne State University Press, 2015), 108–24; Zareena Grewal, *Islam is a Foreign Country: American Muslims and the Global Crisis of Authority* (New York: New York University Press, 2013); Joseph Bauerkemper and Heidi Kiiwetinepinesiik Stark, “The Trans/National Terrain of Anishinaabe Law and Diplomacy,” *Journal of Transnational American Studies* 4, no. 1 (2012): 1–12. Andrea Geiger, *Subverting Exclusion: Transpacific Encounters with Race, Caste, and Borders 1885–1928* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2011); G. Balachandran, “Circulation through Seafaring: Indian Seamen, 1890–1945,” In *Society and Circulation: Mobile People and Itinerant Cultures in South Asia, 1750–1950*, eds. Claude Markovits, Jacques Pouchepadass, and Sanjay Subrahmanyam, 89–130 (Delhi: Permanent Black, 2003); G. Balachandran, “Recruitment and Control of Indian Seamen, Calcutta, 1880–1935,” *International Journal of Maritime History* 9, no. 1 (1997): 1–18.

⁴ See Greg Robinson, “Political Science? FDR, Japanese Americans, and the Postwar Dispersion of Minorities,” in *After Camp: Portraits of Midcentury Japanese American Life* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2012), 15–30, 250–52 [excerpted in *Journal of Transnational American Studies* 4.1 (2012)].

⁵ See Mary L. Dudziak, *Cold War Civil Rights* (Princeton University Press, 2002).

⁶ See Marc S. Gallicchio, *The African American Encounter with China and Japan* (University of North Carolina Press, 2000).

⁷ For a transnational, intersectional perspective linking Black struggles for justice, see the collected interviews of Angela Y. Davis, *Freedom is a Constant Struggle: Ferguson, Palestine and the Foundations of a Movement*, edited by Frank Barat with a foreword by Cornel West (Chicago: Haymarket Books, 2015).

⁸ See Penny M. Von Eschen, *Satchmo Blows up the World* (Harvard University Press, 2004).

⁹ See Penny M. Von Eschen, *Race Against Empire* (Cornell University Press, 1997).

¹⁰ See Greg Robinson, “Internationalism and Justice: Paul Robeson, Asia, and Asian Americans,” in *AfroAsian Encounters: Culture, History, Politics*, edited by Shannon Steen and Heike Raphael-Hernandez (New York University Press, 2006), 260–77.

¹¹ See Erika Lee, *At America’s Gates: Chinese Immigration during the Exclusion Era, 1882–1943* (University of North Carolina Press, 2003). See also Kornel S. Chang, *Pacific Connections: The Making of the US–Canadian Borderlands* (Berkeley, CA: California University Press, 2012); and Lisa Rose Mar, *Brokering Belonging: Chinese in Canada’s Exclusion Era, 1885–1945* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2010).

¹² See Amy Kaplan, “Where is Guantánamo?” *American Quarterly* 57, no. 3 (2005): 831–58; and Nina Morgan, “The Freedom of Information and the Imprisonment of Poetry: Guantánamo, Transnational American Studies, and the Right to Know,” in *Moroccan American Studies*, ed. Mohammed Benzidan (Casablanca: Université Hassan II Mohammedia, 2010).

¹³ Catherine Ceniza Choy examines this history in *Global Families: A History of Asian International Adoption in America* (New York University Press, 2013), a portion of which is excerpted in the Reprise section of this issue of *JTAS*.

¹⁴ We take this term from G[opalan] Balachandran, “Indefinite Transits: Mobility and Confinement in the Age of Steam,” *Journal of Global History* 11, no. 2 (2016): 189.

¹⁵ Hsuan L. Hsu, “Circa 1898: Overseas Empire and Transnational American Studies,” *Journal of Transnational American Studies* 3, no. 2 (2011): 2.

¹⁶ Similarly, in one of the Special Forum articles in this issue of *JTAS*, Frank Lestringant conceptualizes Timuca engravings as a “theater” in which Indigenous perspectives can be mapped as a constellation of cultural practice, word, and image.

¹⁷ Hobsbawm’s conception of the “factitious” nature of the historic past evoked in the invention of historical continuity is pertinent here, as is his analysis of the paradox that in seeking to legitimate themselves modern nations claim not modernity but its opposite, namely, an origin in antiquity. Hobsbawm, “Inventing Tradition,” in *The Invention of Tradition*, ed. Eric Hobsbawm and Terence Ranger (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983), 2, see 14.

¹⁸ See, among others, William C. Spanos, “Vietnam and the *Pax Americana*: A Genealogy of the ‘New World Order,’” in *America’s Shadows: An Anatomy of Empire* (Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press, 1999), 126–69; Peter Dale Scott and Jonathan Marshall, *Cocaine Politics: Drugs, Armies, and the CIA in Central America, Updated Edition* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1998); Amy Kaplan and Donald Pease, eds. *Cultures of United States Imperialism* (Durham, NC, and London: Duke University Press, 1993); and Howard Zinn, *A People’s History of the United States* (London and New York: Longman Publishing, 1980).

¹⁹ See Ifeoma Kiddoe Nwankwo, *Black Cosmopolitanism: Racial Consciousness and Transnational Identity in the Nineteenth-Century Americas* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2005).

²⁰ Shelley Fisher Fishkin, “Crossroads of Cultures: The Transnational Turn in American Studies: Presidential Address to the American Studies Association, November 12, 2004,” *American Quarterly* 57, no. 1 (2005): 18–19.

Selected Bibliography

- Anzaldúa, Gloria. *Borderlands/La frontera: The New Mestiza*. San Francisco: Aunt Lute Books, 1987.
- Balachandran, G[opalan]. “Circulation through Seafaring: Indian Seamen, 1890–1945.” In *Society and Circulation: Mobile People and Itinerant Cultures in South Asia, 1750–1950*, edited by Claude Markovits, Jacques Pouchepadass, and Sanjay Subrahmanyam, 89–130. Delhi: Permanent Black, 2003.
- . *Globalizing Labour? Indian Seafarers and World Shipping, c. 1870–1945*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016.
- . “Indefinite Transits: Mobility and Confinement in the Age of Steam.” *Journal of Global History* 11, no. 2 (2016): 187–208.
- . “Recruitment and Control of Indian Seamen, Calcutta, 1880–1935.” *International Journal of Maritime History* 9, no. 1 (1997): 1–18.
- Bald, Vivek. *Bengali Harlem and the Lost Histories of South Asian America*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2015.
- Bauerkemper, Joseph and Heidi Kiiwetinepinesik Stark. “The Trans/National Terrain of Anishinaabe Law and Diplomacy.” *Journal of Transnational American Studies* 4, no. 1 (2012).
- Brennan, Sue. “Time, Space, and National Belonging in *The Namesake*: Redrawing South Asian American Citizenship in the Shadow of 9/11.” *Journal of Transnational American Studies* 3, no. 1 (2011): 1–22.
- Chang, Kornel S. “Introduction.” In *Pacific Connections: The Making of the U.S.–Canadian Borderlands* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2013), 1–16. [Excerpted in *Journal of Transnational American Studies* 5, no. 1 (2013)].
- Davis, Angela Y. *Freedom is a Constant Struggle: Ferguson, Palestine and the Foundations of a Movement*, ed. Frank Barat. Foreword by Cornel West. Chicago: Haymarket Books, 2016.
- Dudziak, Mary L. *Cold War Civil Rights: Race and the Image of American Democracy*. (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press), 2000.

- Fishkin, Shelley Fisher. “Crossroads of Cultures: The Transnational Turn in American Studies: Presidential Address to the American Studies Association, November 12, 2004.” *American Quarterly* 57, no. 1 (2005): 17–57.
- . “Mexican American Writers in the Borderlands of Culture.” *Writing America: Literary Landmarks from Walden Pond to Wounded Knee, A Reader’s Companion*, 303–06. New Brunswick, NJ, and London: Rutgers University Press, 2015.
- Gallicchio, Marc S. *The African American Encounter with Japan and China: Black Internationalism in Asia, 1895–1945*. Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press, 2003.
- Garcia, Jerry. “The Long Reach of American Empire: Japanese Mexicans, US Hegemony, and Mexican Propaganda, 1941–1945.” In *Looking Like the Enemy: Japanese Mexicans, the Mexican State, and US Hegemony, 1897–1945* (Tucson, AZ: University of Arizona Press, 2014), 106–38. [Excerpted in *Journal of Transnational American Studies* 6, no. 1 (2015)].
- Geiger, Andrea. “Introduction.” In *Subverting Exclusion: Transpacific Encounters with Race, Caste, and Borders 1885–1928* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2011), 1–14. [Excerpted in *Journal of Transnational American Studies* 3, no. 2 (2011)].
- Grewal, Zareena. “Introduction: Unmapping the Muslim World.” In *Islam is a Foreign Country: American Muslims and the Global Crisis of Authority* (New York: New York University Press, 2013), 1–27. [Excerpted in *Journal of Transnational American Studies* 6, no. 1 (2015)].
- Hebel, Udo J., ed. *Transnational American Memories*. Berlin: De Gruyter, 2009.
- Hobsbawm, Eric. “Inventing Tradition.” Introduction to *The Invention of Tradition*, edited by Eric Hobsbawm and Terence Ranger, 1–14. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983.
- Hsu, Hsuan L. “Circa 1898: Overseas Empire and Transnational American Studies.” *Journal of Transnational American Studies* 3, no. 2 (2011): 1–6.
- Kaplan, Amy. “Where is Guantánamo?” *American Quarterly* 57, no. 3 (2005): 831–58.
- Lee, Erika. *At America’s Gates: Chinese Immigration During the Exclusion Era*. Chapel Hill, NC: The University of North Carolina Press, 2003).
- Lenz, Gunter H., William Boelhower, Alfred Hornung, Rob Kroes, and Rüdiger Kunow. “Symposium: Redefinitions of Citizenship and Revisions of Cosmopolitanism—Transnational Perspectives.” *Journal of Transnational American Studies* 3, no. 1 (2011): 1–53.
- Mar, Lisa Rose. *Brokering Belonging: Chinese in Canada’s Exclusion Era, 1885–1945*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2010, n. pag. [Excerpted in *Journal of Transnational American Studies* 3, no. 1 (2011)].

- Morgan, Nina. "The Freedom of Information and the Imprisonment of Poetry: Guantánamo, Transnational American Studies, and the Right to Know." In *Moroccan American Studies*, edited by Mohammed Benzidan. Casablanca: Université Hassan II Mohammedia, 2010.
- Nwankwo, Ifeoma Kiddoe. *Black Cosmopolitanism: Racial Consciousness and Transnational Identity in the Nineteenth-Century Americas*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2005. [Excerpted in *Journal of Transnational American Studies* 6, no. 1 (2015): 1–29].
- Pratt, Mary Louise. *Imperial Eyes: Travel Writing and Transculturation*. 2nd edition, with new preface and revised introduction. London: Routledge, 2010.
- Robinson, Greg. "Internationalism and Justice: Paul Robeson, Asia, and Asian Americans." In *AfroAsian Encounters: Culture, History, Politics*, edited by Heike Raphael-Hernandez and Shannon Steen, 260–76. New York: New York University Press, 2006.
- . "Political Science? FDR, Japanese Americans, and the Postwar Dispersion of Minorities." In *After Camp: Portraits of Midcentury Japanese American Life*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2012, 15–30, 250–52. [Excerpted in *Journal of Transnational American Studies* 4, no. 1 (2012)].
- Spanos, William V. "Vietnam and the *Pax Americana*: A Genealogy of the 'New World Order.'" In *America's Shadows: An Anatomy of Empire* (Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press, 1999), 126–69. [Excerpted in *Journal of Transnational American Studies* 6, no. 1 (2016)].
- Tan, Kathy-Ann. "Citizenship Unhinged." In *Reconfiguring Citizenship and National Identity in the North American Literary Imagination* (Detroit, MI: Wayne State University Press, 2015), 108–24. [Excerpted in *Journal of Transatlantic American Studies* 7, no. 1 (2016)].
- Von Eschen, Penny M. *Race Against Empire: Black Americans and Anticolonialism, 1937–1957*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1997.
- . *Satchmo Blows Up the World: Jazz Ambassadors Play the Cold War*. Boston, MA; Harvard University Press, 2006.