

Introduction: Mapping American Territorialities

JENS TEMMEN, Mainz University
NICOLE WALLER, University of Potsdam

In her introduction to *The Transit of Empire*, Jodi Byrd describes how the Chickasaw nation “lost our country twice—once through the removals Tocqueville described in *Democracy in America*, and then through allotment and the creation of the state of Oklahoma in 1907.”¹ Even though Byrd asserts the continuing strength of the Chickasaw nation despite its losses, she begins her book by reflecting on the way in which survival in an ongoing situation of settler colonialism is burdened by a particular form of displacement frequently ignored in diaspora and migration studies. Writing about her father, who passed away while she was at work on her book, Byrd describes how the loss of his country “was unmappable, ungrievable, and unapproachable within the constraints of US settler society. ... That loss never allowed the United States to be home, even though the lands the United States was built upon might in fact be so.”²

This Special Forum contributes to an ongoing debate that questions the territorial scope and reach of the US nation-state—both from its alleged “inside” and its alleged “outside.” Although work in the field of transnational American studies has contributed significantly to this debate, thinking with the “transnational” in this context comes with its own challenges. As Byrd’s work reminds us, the theorizing of transnational American studies must address the colonization of Native American land and other US imperial endeavors, including the nation-bending (but ultimately nation-affirming) legal construct of “unincorporated territory” and the very transnational circuits of the Atlantic slave trade. As Hōkūlani Aikau has argued,

For those of us who either live under US occupation or who live under conditions of occupation by states supported by the United States, the embrace of the transnational, postnational, international, or global frameworks are merely “a series of moves to innocence which,” Eve Tuck and K. Wayne Yang argue,

“problematically attempt to reconcile settler guilt and complicity, and rescue settler futurity.” On their own, these frameworks do not call to an end of US Empire, decolonization, de-occupation, and settler colonialism ...³

Addressing a related challenge in his reading of the work of Chamoru poet Craig Santos Perez, Paul Lai has raised the question “how transnational American studies can consider the lands of Guam and other unincorporated territories—all technically intra- rather than trans-national spaces—without reinscribing them as subordinate to or dependent on the United States and other industrialized nations.”⁴ The potential and the pitfalls of transnational American studies approaches in the context of analyzing and challenging the colonial/imperial structures sustaining the historical and contemporary manifestations of the US nation-state lie at the heart of this Special Forum. The contributions collected here approach these issues via a focus on territorialities.

American Territorialities: Approaches, Disciplines, Positionalities

The concept of territoriality functions as the starting point of this Special Forum. To offer an initial definition of the term as outlined by Miles Kahler, territoriality is “spatially defined political rule.”⁵ In this reading, nation-states can be understood as “*territorial regimes*” marked by the dual principles of “*border delimitation*” and “*jurisdictional congruence*.”⁶ As scholars trained in US-American literary and cultural studies, we envisioned a forum dedicated to the complication of this definition, particularly through an examination of the way in which “borders” and “jurisdiction” are defined and function in different cultural traditions and practices, but also in different academic fields like geography and legal studies. The Special Forum thus brings together the work of scholars who study how place-based practices, narratives, and visualizations create or question the nation as “territorial regime” in a geographical, legal, and cultural sense. We believe that spatial conceptions, prominently the question of territory and territoriality, can open up angles that a concentration on subjecthood and subject/object or self/other relations (as it is prominent, for example, in postcolonial studies) may not. In addition, thinking through land, water, and territory can help us to move from discussions of inclusion and complicity to other layers of coloniality and postcoloniality. As Byrd and various other scholars have argued, the US-American focus on individual rights and inclusion tends to erase the question of the colonization of Indigenous land and relegates it to a hidden layer underneath.

The Special Forum is thus driven by several concerns, among them the wish to pay attention to the way in which territoriality as land- or water-based social and political organization is defined and embodied very differently in, say, US legal texts, African American literature, Indigenous theory and activism, or (im)migrant practices. Not only is there a vast variety of cultural conceptions of living in relation to the land, but the “texts” which carry the weight of these conceptions also differ according to cultural traditions and historical circumstances. For the purposes of this forum, this

means actively reading legal texts and maps *as texts*, but also, as Eric Cheyfitz and Shari Huhndorf have argued, acknowledging the “juridical force” of stories, songs, names, poems, and practices, as well as their function as cognitive maps or navigational tools.⁷ It also means relating concepts such as extraterritoriality in legal studies or scale theory in geography to space-based theories more current in American studies, such as border theory or archipelagic theory. Finally, the Special Forum is meant to bring together both a critical analysis of the ways in which the US nation-state was and is constructed and sustained as a territorial regime and a focus on the various ways of thinking territoriality otherwise, via the epistemologies of the people, peoples, communities, and groups affected by US territorial rule. In the words of Catherine Walsh, thinking “otherwise” cannot simply be subsumed as an “alternative” to the colonial model, “since the idea of ‘alternatives’ takes us back to the centrality of colonial frameworks and dominant models of power.”⁸ What is more, thinking otherwise necessarily includes a spatial dimension. In the context of her work on Abya-Yalean insurgence, Walsh argues that the “otherwise” is located “in the struggles, propositions, knowledge, practice, and thought of indigenous and African-descended peoples and movements.”⁹ Being located, for Walsh, thus means thinking from “the historical, cultural, epistemological, and existence-based spaces, places, and locations that configure, shape, and give substance to meaning, thought, struggle, and praxis.”¹⁰ From this vantage point, we arrive at the plural form of “American territorialities,” not as a simple celebration of multiplicity, but as a critique of a national narrative that disavows its own imperialism and negates other forms of relating to land and water.

How we might analyze territoriality as a foundation of US governance and how we might envision other forms of inhabiting and theorizing territory is a complex question. Frequently, these matters seem divided by disciplinary, political, and epistemological boundaries. Colonial discourse analysis, the study of American imperialism, and settler colonial studies are fields which, though highly critical of colonialism and aware of the existence of multiple epistemologies, often function within European and Euro-American traditions of knowledge. Fields like Native American studies, Indigenous studies, African American studies, Caribbean studies, transpacific studies, border studies, decolonial studies, and archipelagic studies more frequently insist on the necessity of openly challenging and redefining what is considered research, knowledge, and scholarship in Western institutions. As J. Kēhaulani Kauanui has argued, “the growing field of Native and Indigenous studies is not merely about the study of Indigenous Peoples but also about privileging Indigenous methodologies as a way of decolonizing knowledge production.”¹¹ Simultaneously, there is a passionate debate underway on whose experiences should be at the center of scholarly analyses. Alyosha Goldstein, among others, has pointedly warned of “the danger ... of making the study of colonialism ultimately about the colonizers or the colonial imaginary.”¹²

We agree with these assessments, particularly in the context of ongoing colonial and imperial processes. If we concentrate predominantly on Pacific histories of empire, for example, we miss out on the networks and connections of what Epeli

Hau'ofa has called the “Sea of Islands” that draw island spaces together, centering Native Pacific experiences and transpacific spaces and circuits.¹³ In addition, as Eve Tuck and K. Wayne Yang have argued, in a settler colonial context, acknowledging incommensurabilities may be the most honest way to relate various (albeit progressive) settler and Indigenous positionalities: “The answers will not emerge from friendly understanding, and indeed require a dangerous understanding of uncommonality that un-coalesces coalition politics—moves that may feel very unfriendly.”¹⁴ As they formulate poignantly, using a spatial logic: “Decolonization is not an ‘and.’ It is an elsewhere.”¹⁵

At the same time, we believe that although grounded in different epistemologies and focusing on different experiences, the critical study of US colonialism/imperialism and fields like Caribbean studies or Native Pacific studies can and must be connected in meaningful ways. To cite Kauanui once more, “we can acknowledge the juggernaut of Western civilization and what is coming through Western constructions while still making other worlds legible.”¹⁶ As “counterpart analytics,” these different approaches keep colonial/imperial processes in full view and simultaneously insist on thinking and theorizing otherwise.¹⁷ Within the US academy, disciplinary divisions have often served to keep apart fields that could productively be put into dialogue, or that would, at the very least, stand to gain a lot from an open and unflinching examination of incommensurabilities.¹⁸

In this vein, our work as editors is informed by our own academic and political positionalities. As white German scholars in academia outside the United States, we recognize our position as outsiders to many of the discussions in the field. Nevertheless, in allegiance to anti-, de-, and postcolonial perspectives, we hope to contribute to the project of relating the work of an array of scholars, artists, and activists, as well as different positions and forms of knowledge relevant to the analysis of colonial/imperial US territoriality and to thinking territorialities otherwise.

The question, then, becomes how to relate, contrast, or connect these strands in productive ways, and when to acknowledge the incommensurable. One possibility is inspired by what Edward Said has called the counterpoint, which enables different versions or voices to intersect while remaining distinguishable, thus transcending a purely oppositional structure while retaining the notion of difference. Another possibility arises from Walter Dignolo's conception of border thinking, which attempts to provide an alternative to the techniques of “interpreting, translating from the Western hegemonic perspective, or transmitting knowledge from the perspective of area studies.”¹⁹

In a first step, such models have frequently served to bring into relation or contrast colonial and anticolonial histories and worldviews. However, they also imply a second step, which is our central concern here: namely, how to relate (or, at times, how to differentiate) multiple perspectives in their *critique* of imperialism and colonialism. Jodi Byrd, again in *The Transit of Empire*, discusses the stakes of such a relational approach, arguing that

[t]here is no singular indigenous sovereignty, nor is there a singular history that contains the specificities of U.S. imperialism as it has affected Alaska Native villages, American Indian nations, unincorporated, insular, and incorporated territories, Hawai'i, Iraq, Okinawa, and Afghanistan, to name just a few. There is, however, a United States government that uses precedent and the "rule of law" to colonize through the unification of the bureaucratic and militaristic system of colonial administration and control.²⁰

Byrd reminds us here that a thorough critique of the contextual strategies of US imperialism via multiple (Indigenous) perspectives must be equally sensitive to the specificities of these perspectives in order not to reproduce the imperial structure that brought these peoples and epistemologies into forced relation to US imperialism and sometimes to each other in the first place. To keep a potentially productive relationship from turning into an imperial embrace, Teresia Teaiwa advocated centering the work of Indigenous scholars, who "would begin by asking, where are the indigenous or first people? ... instead of asking, where is the empire? as American studies scholars feel a legitimate responsibility to do"²¹ Such a constellation, Teaiwa argued, would then not only inform projects of anti-imperial critique, but effectively transform American studies as such.²² Teaiwa's call for a transformation of American studies stems from a suspicion that, for all its anti-imperial intentions, the field is actually incapable of shaking its epistemological underpinnings: "I know that there have been attempts to formulate hemispheric and transnational American studies, and more recently, aspirations for archipelagic American studies, but can an anti-imperialist American studies ever truly decenter the United States as a nation-state formation and recenter first people? Or is that a task best led by Native American and indigenous scholars and scholarly associations?"²³ An American studies discipline that is unable to decenter the US nation-state, and thus remains entangled with the internal logic of US imperialism, Teaiwa argues, cannot do justice to the specificities of Indigenous epistemologies and the decolonial agendas of different Indigenous communities.

To follow Teaiwa's insight means to follow the lead of Indigenous scholars such as Leanne Betasamosake Simpson who have similarly insisted on working from "within Indigenous thought systems, intelligence systems that are continually generated in relationship to place."²⁴ We believe that following this lead may also provide a lesson in how to do justice to the territorialities of the Black Atlantic, or of Chicana concepts of Aztlán and the borderlands, or of Puerto Rican critiques of the imperial logic of "island" and "mainland," even as these may at times collide with Native American positionalities. As Mark Rifkin has recently written, the discussion "of modes of collective placemaking and governance on lands claimed by the US cannot sidestep Indigenous nations' presence and rightful self-determination."²⁵ At the same time, he argues, this "ethical and political accountability does not mean that Native peoples are the only ones who have had or could have sociopolitical formations that defer, define, or

exceed the terms of US state sovereignty.”²⁶ Rifkin asks how we might “read for traces of alternative models of governance at play in scenes of biopolitical regulation with respect to non-native populations.”²⁷ Our Special Forum hopes to contribute to this question. Finally, for those who still, in all humility, feel the need to retain a remnant of the question “where is the empire,” the lessons are equally poignant: Following Teaiwa, we would argue that any critical assessment of US colonialism/imperialism must position itself in relation to (and not in isolation from) the work of scholars, artists, and activists who go beyond a focus on the US as a settler colony or empire by thinking otherwise.

We believe that all of the individual contributions collected here engage with this task, and we refer to them throughout this introduction to point out the conceptual work each text performs. What is more, as a collection, the contributions develop the full force of an engagement across academic fields, disciplines, and positionalities. Although the Special Forum’s table of contents sequences them in a fashion designed to highlight methodological, thematic, historical, and geographic resonances, reading the articles against this imposed order is equally productive. Our Special Forum thus hopes to enact what Byrd has called the strategy of reading “the cacophonies of colonialism as they are rather than to attempt to hierarchize them into coeval or causal order.”²⁸ Commenting on Choctaw novelist LeAnne Howe’s writing on Louisiana in her story “A Chaos of Angels,” Byrd describes how “the French, Choctaw, Haitian, Creole, Chickasaw, indigenous, slave, and free identities collide in the lands that will become Louisiana.”²⁹ Byrd cites Howe’s use of the Choctaw term *haksuba*: “‘*Haksuba* or chaos,’ she [Howe] tells us, ‘occurs when Indians and non-Indians bang their heads together in search of cross-cultural understanding.’”³⁰ It is in this spirit that we hope for the Special Forum to function as a platform for a large scope of work on American territorialities.

Terms of the Debate: Conceptualizing the US Nation-State

Despite the hopeful intervention of “American territorialities” in the plural, we nevertheless cannot ignore the existence of the US nation-state and its various institutions. Boris Vormann has cautioned scholars working in the field of transnational American studies to distinguish more clearly between the nation as a discursive formation and the nation-state as an institutional structure.³¹ It is exactly within this tension that we locate the need to reread some of the most current narratives of US-American nationhood. With regard to territoriality, this would include an examination of what scholars have called the “territorial trap”—the assumption that “state boundaries equal social boundaries.”³² In the context of American imperialism in places such as Puerto Rico or Hawai‘i, however, it also means taking a closer look at the nuances of what Hōkūlani Aikau has referred to as the division between “Indigenous rights discourses,” which

focus on interactions between Indigenous people and the state, and “Indigenous resurgence,” which centers on Indigenous conceptions of “land- and water-based practices,” including attempts to create nonstatist forms of governance.³³

With this caveat in mind, we revisit two overlapping ways in which the historical development of the US nation-state has been fashioned into academic narrative: the narrative of a coherent nation-state only recently undermined by new forms of sovereignty, and the narrative of neatly divided phases of US expansion. Both narratives have been contested and criticized as problematic. The first version usually incorporates the story of US nationhood into a European “Westphalian” model. In this model, as Leti Volpp argues, “a single sovereign controls absolutely a defined territory and its associated population.”³⁴ Western conceptions of territoriality thus define nation-states as territorial regimes, in which the “law and legal remedies are connected to, or limited by territorial location.”³⁵ While territory and border limitation are clearly constitutive of the Westphalian nation-state, state sovereignty in this model is vested not only in territory, but also in the relationship between state territory and the extent of state jurisdiction. To quote Volpp once more:

Under this system, the legal jurisdiction of the sovereign is entirely congruent with its territorial borders in a way that would correlate with how maps are drawn, maps that are usually imagined to resemble a Mondrian painting, with dark borders absolutely separating brightly colored nation states. Such a map envisions no “fuzzy spaces,” transitional zones or bleeding boundaries, and suggests a world of nations “territorialized in the segmentary fashion of the multicolored school atlas.”³⁶

As critics have argued, this logic of the Westphalian nation-state was frequently exported across the world via European colonial endeavors.³⁷ The national history of the United States is assumed to be consistent with this model of strict borders and neat territorialization up until the US and the rest of world entered our globalized age. Contemporary discussions of transnationalism and globalization have tended to assert that only our current situation challenges the conception of the nation-state as described above. Scholars now theorize the nation-state as an assemblage and emphasize processes that “unbundle” sovereignty from notions of unambiguous territory.³⁸ Contemporary sovereignty, we are told, takes the form of “overlapping sovereignty,” which “disrupt[s] the notion of mutually exclusive domains”; of “graduated sovereignty,” which “refers to a state’s differential treatment of segments of its population or territory”; or of “detached sovereignty,” which “describes forms of extraterritorial control.”³⁹

Criticism of this narrative is mostly leveled at the conception of a neat genealogy of territoriality that moves from the Westphalian nation-state to more flexible models in recent history. In spite of claims that “territoriality is decreasingly important as

a jurisdictional principle,” scholars have identified a continued attachment of nation-states to conceptions of national territory.⁴⁰ Both the nation-state and cultural constructions of nationhood are, thus, “far from obsolete.”⁴¹ Moreover, as Leti Volpp has persuasively argued, the detachment of territory from sovereignty is not simply a recent phenomenon. Building on the work of Kal Raustiala, Volpp argues that history furnishes numerous examples of exceptions to the Westphalian model in the form of “territorial spaces where the territorial sovereign’s power did not reach, with sanctuaries and ambassadors’ residences, as well as exceptions in the form of sovereigns that controlled territory outside its own, with colonial governance and extraterritorial jurisdiction.”⁴² Because of these “legal fictions, called exceptions,” however, the notion that historically, the Westphalian nation-state was a congruent geopolitical unit continues to carry political and cultural weight.⁴³

The second historical narrative, which has become the critical focus of scholars attentive to the colonial and imperial processes of US-American history, is a point in case. Here, we begin with an early phase of US colonial and territorial expansion characterized by the taking of Native American land and Indian Removal, the Louisiana Purchase, the annexation of Texas, the war against Mexico, and the territorial extension of the slave system, all within the space of the North American continent. In the logic of this narrative, we then “progress” to an imperialist phase characterized by the acquisition of overseas “insular possessions” such as Guam, Hawai‘i, or Puerto Rico. Finally, scholars have attempted to describe the contemporary US in terms of globalization, capitalist domination, neoimperialism, or simply “Empire.”

Critics studying US imperialism, such as Amy Kaplan and Alyosha Goldstein, have taken a closer look at the logic of structuring the history of US expansion into three neatly demarcated phases (continental, overseas, global). The work of these critics has shown that this notion of different phases serves to conciliate the United States’s history of expansion with its self-ascribed identity as an “anticolonial” and Westphalian continental nation, by suggesting that territories on the continent would eventually participate in the nation through statehood and overseas territories would eventually be placed within the reach of independence.⁴⁴ The notion of different phases acknowledges that the United States did in fact go through a history of expansion marked by different modes of territorial management and incorporation, but also insists that none of these phases at any point challenged the jurisdictional congruence of the United States. Thus this second historical narrative clearly overlaps with the first discussed above. And in similar fashion, criticism of this narrative is aimed at the narrative’s temporality and its strict differentiation of a “regular” territoriality on the continent and an “imperial” beyond, which blatantly glosses over the violent dispossession of Indigenous and other peoples on which US expansion rests. It is for this reason that we use the term “colonialism/imperialism” throughout our introduction. The term acknowledges the different historical phases of US expansion and territorial management, but also insists on their connectedness.

Based on the work of Kaplan, Volpp, and other critics, we argue that one of the ways in which the US nation-state has historically affirmed its coherence is via a flexible manipulation of the notion of “jurisdictional congruence,”⁴⁵ or “the ability of the state to exercise recognized rights of exclusive jurisdiction” within a “territorially delimited space.”⁴⁶ Leti Volpp argues that “ambiguous spaces, neither entirely foreign nor domestic, have characterized the building of the American nation-state.”⁴⁷ Two Supreme Court decisions, *Cherokee Nation v. Georgia* and *Downes v. Bidwell* (of the Insular Cases)—each of which has shaped the characteristics of territorial management of one alleged phase of US expansion—exemplify the importance of these ambiguous spaces for “the presumed coherence of the U.S. territorial and jurisdictional imaginary.”⁴⁸ Mark Rifkin has noted how *Cherokee Nation* conjures the notion of “domestic dependent nations” as a way of describing Native Americans as being exceptional within the “regular regime of law.”⁴⁹ Native peoples, Rifkin argues, are located clearly under US sovereignty, yet not quite and fully within US jurisdiction.⁵⁰ *Downes v. Bidwell*, Amy Kaplan argues, places “unincorporated territories” and overseas populations within a similarly ambiguous location, described in the ruling as “foreign to the United States in a domestic sense.”⁵¹ This status affirmed US sovereign control over these territories, but disenfranchised the population of these territories from full access to the Constitution. In spite of a clear discursive resonance between the legal limbo of “foreign in a domestic sense” and the status of “domestic dependent nations,” the Supreme Court judges insisted that the legal treatment of Native Americans on the continent did not provide precedence for any of the Insular Cases.⁵²

Reading the Insular Cases against the grain reveals, however, how in both cases US expansion relies on different variations of a flexible detachment and reattachment of sovereignty, jurisdiction, and territory to suspend Indigenous and island peoples and territories between the domestic and the foreign.⁵³ In the case of Puerto Rico, this suspension has become most obvious in what Frances Negrón-Mutaner has called the “emptying” of the island, a strategy she traces throughout various historical periods to the present.⁵⁴ This discursive bedrock of detachment and reattachment, paradoxically, serves to affirm the United States’s status as a Westphalian nation-state, concealing the fact that, as Goldstein argues,

the United States of America has never been a uniform or unequivocal geopolitical entity. ... Rather, the United States encompasses a historically variable and uneven constellation of state and local governments, indigenous nations, unincorporated territories, free associated commonwealths, protectorates, federally administered public lands, military bases, export processing zones, *colonias*, and anomalies such as the District of Columbia that do not comprehensively delineate an inside and outside of the nation-state.⁵⁵

This fragmentation of US national territory debunks the notion of juridical congruence as a central feature of the territorial nation-state, highlighting instead that “the nation-state need not actually be unitary or cohesive in order to decisively enact juridical power ‘domestically’ and exercise coercion ‘at home and abroad.’”⁵⁶ Examining American territorialities, then, is also an attempt to underline the multiple axes and trajectories of American colonialism/imperialism against a narrative of unruffled national coherence. Several of the articles collected in this Special Forum perform exactly this work.

René Dietrich’s contribution to this volume is a case in point. Dietrich reads the 2008 US-backed uprising against the Bolivian government’s Indigenous head of state, Evo Morales, in the Bolivian department of Pando, through Allison Hedge Coke’s poem “Pando/Pando.”⁵⁷ Dietrich argues that the US intervention in Bolivia should not merely be read as economically motivated, but should rather be understood as a reproduction and transnationalization of the territorializing structures of US settler colonialism. Dietrich’s contribution clarifies that these structures—both in the North American context and as they are employed in the case of Bolivia—strategically obscure and legitimize US structures of Indigenous dispossession. This reading lays bare how settler colonialism becomes a matrix of US imperial endeavors “elsewhere.” In Dietrich’s argument, Hedge Coke’s poem counters this transnationalization of US settler colonialism by turning the site of a violent uprising into a space of decolonial crossings and related Indigeneities that move beyond settler-state lines in its connection of the Bolivian district of “Pando” with the clonal colony of the quaking aspen of the same name located in Utah. Through its relational mode of composition, Hedge Coke’s poem, Dietrich argues, indicates additional layers of meaning in both sites that can only be evoked by replacing the transnational settler relations with an emphasis on Indigenous life, growth, and rootedness in both the colonial spaces of the US and Bolivia.

Amelia Flood’s contribution likewise addresses the reach of US imperialism but focuses on the so-called “island possessions.” Flood describes the journey and plight of Leander Hassell Holder, an Afro-Danish woman resident in New York, who was denied her home journey to New York in 1924 after having visited relatives in St. Thomas (US Virgin Islands). Layer after layer, Flood carefully uncovers the relevant forces that resulted in Holder’s “limbo” state, ranging from the colonial history of the Virgin Islands and the US “acquisition” of the islands from Denmark to the nature of the limited US citizenship granted to the populations of the US’s “island territories.” Building on the work of Ann Laura Stoler, Flood reads the gaps and malfunctions of the US imperial machinery that set Holder adrift as characteristic of US empire-building and explores the way in which its legal and territorial ambivalences primarily and negatively impacted racially othered island populations. At the same time, she argues that Holder’s story exemplifies the way in which a single traveler can expose the discrepancies and power structures of empire and nationhood.

Likewise, **Judith Madera**’s contribution explores the workings of US empire with regard to its overseas territories. Approaching the placing of Puerto Rico within US imperial reach through the concept of “location,” Madera traces how the territorial

linking of Puerto Rico to the US resulted from legal and popular discourses designed to keep “quiet,” diffuse, and unreadable the imperial status of the US and simultaneously tie Puerto Rico firmly into US-American economic circuits. Madera chronicles how this imperial structure helped to displace the island and its population from other, older geographies, politics, and relations and destroyed the economic circuits that had sustained Puerto Ricans throughout earlier colonial phases. Madera’s interpretation of the US Supreme Court’s location of Puerto Rico as “foreign in a domestic sense” reads the ruling’s ambivalent placing of the island as a formative factor in Puerto Rico’s contemporary economic crisis.

A similar reading emerges in **Michael Lujan Bevacqua** and **Manuel Lujan Cruz’s** examination of the continuously ambiguous territorial status of the island of Guam—whose relationship to the US, like Puerto Rico’s, was initially organized under the Insular Cases. In their contribution to this volume, Bevacqua and Cruz highlight what they call the “political banality” of Guam as constructed in US political, military, and cultural discourse. In their analysis, the authors focus on Guam’s virtual absence in international debates on twenty-first-century colonialism and decolonization, as well as its invisibility in US popular and cultural representation. Guam’s invisibility on the level of its colonial status, they argue, is contradicted by its hypervisibility in US military discourse as “the tip of America’s spear,” “Fortress Guam,” and “America’s unsinkable aircraft carrier.” In this way, their argument contributes to a current debate in Pacific contexts on the link between what we have here called “colonialism/imperialism” and militarization.

Brian Russell Roberts’s contribution to this forum analyzes and theorizes various conceptions of territorial borders and their consequences both for the enforcement of nation-state structures and for envisioning alternative forms of polity. Roberts interrogates the “borderwaters” between the US and Indonesia, a watery space of overlap created by US imperial history in the Pacific. He begins by teasing out the way in which watery spaces have been implicated, but never fully acknowledged, in theories of the US/Mexican border and its borderlands, defined as both the border’s cultural effects and the various contestations of the border’s power to fully divide. Roberts complicates these definitions via his theorizing of the sinuous, shifting fractal lines of coastal areas and their accompanying borderwater spaces, which he sees exemplified in the State of Indonesia’s archipelagic conception of Indonesia as a land–water assemblage, but most poignantly in the Mexican artist Miguel Covarrubias’s maps of the US and Indonesia. The maps, in Roberts’s reading, become themselves an archipelagic countermove to the “continental” logic of US dominance in Pacific island and ocean spaces and serve as the centerpiece of Roberts’s vision of a global “borderwaters framework.”

Taken together, these essays provide critical readings of the mechanisms of US empire but also carefully highlight the resistance to imperial practices. In doing so, they begin the important work of laying bare the stories of those who envision territorialities from within other epistemological frameworks.

Territorialities Otherwise

The wide-ranging functions of territorial strategies—from colonial to anticolonial and otherwise—is best exemplified in current debates on archipelagic (American) studies. Like the flexible disconnect of territory, sovereignty, and jurisdiction deployed in US imperial projects, an archipelagic logic can create carceral spaces outside US territory but within US control or extend US power across the globe in an archipelago-like network of military bases. In this vein, Chamoru scholar Craig Santos Perez has argued that from a Pacific Islander’s perspective, the United States maintains its continental identity not in spite of, but in fact through its overseas island possessions and military bases. To highlight the centrality of island possessions for US imperialism, Perez, citing Lanny Thompson, proposes the notion of the United States as an “imperial archipelago.”⁵⁸ At the heart of this redefinition of the American empire lies a renegotiation of territoriality: Perez underscores that, although the notion of exclusive territory—in tandem with undisputed sovereignty—remains an organizing principle of modern sovereign nation-state structures, the concept of territory itself has been in constant flux.⁵⁹ Coining the term “American imperial terripelago” (a combination of territory and *pélago*, signifying sea), Perez argues that, in the context of Pacific imperialism, territory as a concept has always included a conjoining of land and sea, island and continents.⁶⁰ Likening the fluidity of territoriality to the structure of maritime currents, Perez draws attention to how the multitude of territorial regimes within the US empire, among them maritime borders and the management of the sea, are less a challenge to, but more of a strategic pattern within the logic of US imperialism.⁶¹

Perez’s analysis, however, not only shows how the nation-state can flexibly deploy archipelagic modes of mapping, but also how an archipelagic approach can help to detect and deconstruct this very strategy. In addition, archipelagic theory can also function to envision the United States otherwise, as Brian Russell Roberts and Michelle Ann Stephens have argued.⁶² Building on the work of scholars such as Edouard Glissant and Antonio Benítez-Rojo, they advocate for an “archipelagic American studies” that does not focus on the US as a coherent continental nation entitled to colonize smaller island spaces but rather approaches the US within the larger space of the Americas, described as “the temporally shifting and spatially splayed set of islands, island chains, and island-ocean-continent relations which have exceeded US-Americanism and have been affiliated with and indeed constitutive of competing notions of the Americas since at least 1492.”⁶³ Roberts and Stephens begin to imagine different maps, which they envision as marked by “an archipelagic nissology of the anti-explorer.”⁶⁴ Thus the map of a continental nation-state gives way to the act of mapping the US as situated flexibly within both larger transnational scales and smaller local scales of interconnected islands, coastlines, and bodies of water that defy an imperial logic.

In Caribbean and (trans)Pacific studies, the sites where archipelagic thought and practice was developed and deployed most prominently, such non-continental

mapping has served, as in the work of Hau'ofa, to envision Oceania as an interconnected "Sea of Islands," or, as in the work of Benítez-Rojo, to relate the Caribbean to the planet as a generative "meta-archipelago."⁶⁵ Here, the concern is not the United States but the world, and the archipelagic becomes a creative act of worldmaking that both surpasses nation-state structures and acknowledges the nation-state's anticolonial potential for formerly colonized islands.

Similar strategies of imagining territorialities otherwise have been developed by Native nations, Maroon communities, and those dwelling in the borderlands. These approaches constitute a rich body of work crucial to this Special Forum and the question of American territorialities. In the Caribbean and Latin America, the study of slave uprisings, but particularly the study of Maroon communities, has been formative in showing how runaway slaves created political and social structures based on the combination of their specific spatial surroundings and the creative use of African and various other traditions of knowledge. Maroon use of space, this research has indicated, both shielded them from the attacks of plantation owners and soldiers during colonial times and formed the basis of their paradoxical positioning vis-à-vis postcolonial nation-states after decolonization. As Werner Zips has shown for the Maroons of Jamaica, the postcolonial Jamaican nation-state has appropriated Maroon communities both as heroes and traitors, as protonational communities and as problematic nations-within-the-nation, a relationship complicated by the histories of Maroon treaties with the colonial authorities.⁶⁶

In the US, historians have, for a long time, argued that Maroon communities were relatively insignificant or short-lived in comparison to their Caribbean and Latin American counterparts.⁶⁷ However, scholars are presently taking a second look at Maroon communities on US soil, studying their interconnections with Native Americans, their awareness of other Maroon communities, and their development of models of identity. Writing about Maroon activity in South Carolina from the early eighteenth century to the Civil War, Tim Lockley and David Doddingtong argue that contemporary maps often suggested slaveholders' control over continuous space, while enslaved persons and Maroons frequently controlled or frequented areas invisible on such maps: "It is all too easy for contemporary maps to give the impression that white mastery extended over the entire landscape, but planter control of the isolated back swamps was loose at best."⁶⁸ The archaeologist Daniel Sayers, working on excavating traces of Maroon communities in the Great Dismal Swamp, has argued that the influence of Maroon communities on African American history has been larger than scholars have so far allowed for, and that we need to integrate (or, in his view, reintegrate) the networks of the Underground Railroad and the free Black communities in the US and Canada into the idea of maroonage.⁶⁹ In this definition, maroonage is a form and network of resistance that has shaped Black resistant strategies in the African diaspora, tying together various African American conceptions of territoriality.

In fields like Black geographies, archaeology, community history, and material history, scholars have likewise focused on the implications of African Americans' creation of a sense of space. Scholars studying the Underground Railroad have argued that the network constitutes, and needs to be examined as, a significant African American intervention into conceptions of US-American territoriality and jurisdictional congruence.⁷⁰ Some scholars have reconceptualized African American territorialities on the entire North American continent as “geographies of resistance.”⁷¹ In addition, scholars working on what has been called the “fluid frontier” of African American and Afro-Canadian communities at the US–Canadian border have traced the ways in which this national border was undermined or employed by Black communities to resist enslavement.⁷²

As Judith Madera has argued in her study of nineteenth-century African American literature, African Americans thus created a geography that “interrupts ideas of black history as a march of progress, or a story of protest within a national frame.”⁷³ In order to write themselves out of white “principles of containment,” Madera argues, Black writers questioned the scale of the nation and nationalism through deterritorialization.⁷⁴ Asserting that “nineteenth-century African American literature is starkly geographic,” Madera analyzes how Black writers perceived, critiqued, or cultivated hemispheric and transnational networks, addressed the occupation of Native American land, refashioned colonial mappings of the Americas, and developed regionalist practices that did not “fold back neatly into the discursive and social parameters of nation.”⁷⁵

African American conceptions of space also reverberate in contemporary theory. In her book *In the Wake*, Christina Sharpe's structural analysis of racism builds on Saidiya Hartman's work on “the afterlife of slavery” to locate African Americans “in the wake.”⁷⁶ In Sharpe's reading, “the wake” encompasses the multiple dimensions of watching over and honoring the dead, of being in a line of flight and sight, of awakening, but also of being positioned in the wake of a slave ship.⁷⁷ Working with a spatial metaphor that simultaneously carries the burden of brutal material realities, Sharpe attempts to develop “in the wake” as a position from which African Americans can act and care for each other: “I want *In the Wake* to declare that we are Black peoples in the wake with no state or nation to protect us, with no citizenship bound to be respected, and to position us in the modalities of Black life lived in, as, under, despite Black death: to think and be and act from there.”⁷⁸ Such wake work, then, both critiques and strategically deploys African Americans' positioning outside the protection of the state.

A comparable approach to the deconstruction of nation-state territoriality has shaped the histories of Chicana relations to the US. With the publication of her seminal book *Borderlands/La Frontera*, Gloria Anzaldúa inaugurated a new critical approach to the nation-state by powerfully mapping the United States against the grain of its narrative of territorial integrity.⁷⁹ Anzaldúa's work reads the Mexican-American border from a Chicana perspective as not so much a dividing *borderline*, but a *borderland*—an

ambiguous and often unstable realm in which, as Pekka Hämäläinen and Samuel Truett argue, “boundaries are also crossroads, peripheries are also central places, homelands are also passing-through places, and the end points of empire are also forks in the road. ... [B]orderlands are places where stories take unpredictable turns and rarely end as expected.”⁸⁰ Anzaldúa’s Mexican-American borderland is marked as much by the violence of racist and forced demarcation, as by the hybridity of mestizo/a identity that transcends imagined geopolitical, linguistic, racial, and sexual borders.⁸¹ Through the construction of this borderspace, which eludes an unambiguous nation-state mapping, Anzaldúa blurs the dark borderlines that delineate a world of segmentary nation-states—to paraphrase Leti Volpp—by instead reminding us that in spite of the imperial positioning of Chicanx and Native Americans as “aliens” and “intruders” in the United States, these groups were frequently crossed or engulfed by the border. In addition, Anzaldúa uses the ambiguous borderland as a point of departure for imaginaries of “Aztlán/El Otro México,” a homespace for Chicanx that exists in spite of, across, and parallel to US imperial mappings of national territory.⁸²

In an approach that could be described as discursively related to Anzaldúa’s borderspace framework, Choctaw critic Louis Owens critically engages with the notion of the “frontier” as an asymmetrical dividing line between Western “civilization” and Indigenous “savagery.”⁸³ As a semipermeable border between Indigenous peoples in North America and the US settler society, the frontier as a territorial concept served to affirm US territorial sovereignty as the United States extended its national borders across the North American continent in the course of the nineteenth century, and simultaneously codified the systematic disenfranchisement of Indigenous people within US national territory: while the frontier was projected to continuously push westward, adding to US national territory in the process, Indigenous peoples who were crossed by that frontier were imagined to have internalized this border and thus to continue to exist in a liminal space strictly under US rule, but somewhat outside US national territory.⁸⁴ Owens’s intervention advocates a reconceptualization of the frontier as a highly unstable space, and a “multidirectional and hybridized ... contact zone” in which the existence of a multitude of perspectives and voices is possible.⁸⁵ Owens’s reconceptualization of the frontier appropriates the liminal position assigned to Native Americans within US identity and US territoriality and turns it into a source of sovereignty and agency.

Our contributors to this Special Forum explicitly work with or within these dynamic traditions of thinking territorialities otherwise. **Katja Sarkowsky**’s essay focuses on conceptions of Indigenous land-based relationality and the way these conceptions complicate Western definitions of territoriality. Examining autobiographical texts by Kiowa author N. Scott Momaday, writer Leslie Marmon Silko (Laguna Pueblo), and Ojibwe writer and poet Louise Erdrich, Sarkowsky discusses how these authors establish self-reflexive storytelling as a way of creating discursive authority—storytelling that draws its own authority from reference to earlier storytelling and storytelling conventions, but also from its orientation towards an individual and collective future.

Sarkowsky's analysis relates to a contemporary Native American political debate on how sovereignty as a concept not only describes territorial control, land rights, and political self-determination, but is, for many Indigenous scholars, communities, and peoples, also intertwined with cultural agency. Sarkowsky's reading establishes how the abovementioned texts employ territoriality as a category of selfhood that engages with, but also runs counter to settler-colonial inscriptions of territorial control and citizenship. In addition, these "cartographies of selves" relate to, but are not identical with, tribal-nationalist notions of territoriality.

Aanchal Saraf's contribution likewise engages the question of Indigenous epistemologies as a way of thinking otherwise. Saraf traces the Kanaka Maoli (Native Hawaiian) protests against the construction of the "Thirty Meter Telescope" (TMT) atop the summit of Mauna Kea mountain (on Big Island) in Hawai'i—a sacred site in Kanaka Maoli cosmology and part of the state of Hawaii's trust land to be used for the improvement of Kānaka Maoli only. Saraf's analysis highlights how the struggle over the construction of the TMT repeats an imperial pattern of pitting Western assumptions about science (the telescope as a manifestation of scientific progress) against the alleged "anti-scientific primitivism" of Kanaka Maoli ontologies and epistemologies (the sacredness of Mauna Kea) to delegitimize Indigenous land claims and Kanaka Maoli sovereignty per se. Using interviews with protectors (the self-designation chosen by the protestors) which Saraf conducted as part of her fieldwork at Mauna Kea, she notes that the protests not only attempt to contest the construction of the TMT itself, but also assert the validity of both Kanaka Maoli sovereignty and conceptualizations of land ownership specifically denied by the settler-colonial discourses underwriting the construction.

African American writing and practices of counter-territoriality are the focus of **Nele Sawallisch's** contribution to this forum. Building on recent theorizations of territoriality, Sawallisch traces how Black people defied enslavement and exclusion by creating a conception of territoriality that intervened into US-American and British/Canadian notions of bounded territoriality and jurisdiction. Sawallisch's reading of fugitive slave extradition cases engages with current scholarship about nineteenth-century Black communities' conceptualizations of border "fluidity" but shifts the focus from the negotiation of the specificities of escape and mobility across riverine terrain or the formation of dynamic emigrant identities to emphasize the specific territorialities envisioned by Black subjects. In her reading, Black cross-border communities created a theory and praxis of law that helped to envision North American space according to the needs and political goals of its various Black communities.⁸⁶

Finally, our Afterwords bring us back to the beginning of our introduction, where we outlined our goal of discussing the issue of American territorialities in conversation with scholars working with legal texts and maps. In this vein, **Vincent Brown**, as well as **Lucy E. Salyer** and **Lila M. Teeters**, draw our attention to maps and legal texts as textual formats, but also argue that they must be understood as embedded in

material realities, social interactions, political structures, and specific locales and traditions.

Salyer and Teeters propose that an effort to map and discuss multiple territorialities can profit from understanding the law itself as equally polythetic. To this end, they direct our attention to the concept of “legalities” as opposed to the notion of a monolithic law. This pluralized concept is more sensitive to the possibility of producing legal discourses outside the established juridical institutions. In addition, legalities can exceed a textual form and also include practices that acquire a legal force. The concept of multiple legalities—rather than *the law*—questions the way in which Western legal discourses are privileged and, conversely, highlights the legitimacy of legal traditions and norms that form the foundation of American territorialities imagined otherwise.

Vincent Brown’s work has been instrumental in addressing the possibilities and pitfalls of maps as forms of historical narration.⁸⁷ Tracing an eighteenth-century slave revolt in Jamaica through an online digital map project, Brown has emphasized that the map as textual format helps us to see how the rebels “utilized Jamaica’s distinctive geography and aimed toward the creation of alternative enduring societies.”⁸⁸ Thus, the map offers glimpses of territorialities imagined otherwise—although visualized, as Brown is careful to point out, in maps that by necessity must utilize the colonizers’ sources and cartographic traditions. In his afterword, Brown brings into relief another aspect contained in the project described above: the question of violence and struggle. Brown reminds us that colonialism and imperialism work both through discourse and through acts of brutality. His reading of the contributions to our Special Forum serves to highlight that the placemaking they describe arose from the violence of colonial conquest and the resistances against it.

Rather than simply rounding off the Special Forum, then, the afterwords work to keep open the discussion and implications of “American territorialities.” They also help to remind us that there are histories and positionalities related to, but not prominently featured, in this collection—from Teemu Ruskola’s discussion of “legal Orientalism” and the US’s assumption of extraterritorial jurisdiction over US citizens in what was called the “District of China” in the first half of the twentieth century to current debates over US territorial strategies in the Middle East or the extension of US jurisdictional reach to “preclearance locations” at airports or outside US borders.⁸⁹ Finally, our afterwords, each in its own way, remind us that the issue of American territorialities reverberates across various cultures and disciplines and can only begin to take shape as a collaborative effort. We hope that this Special Forum contributes to such an effort.

Notes

We would like to thank Keith L. Camacho, Sebastian Jablonski, Frederike Offizier, and Nicole Poppenhagen for their invaluable input at various stages of this project. We also thank the reviewers of this collection and the members of the *JTAS* editorial board for

their insight and suggestions. Finally, thank you to Erika Doss, *JTAS* special forum editor, and managing editor Sabine Kim for making this Special Forum possible. Funded by the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG, German Research Foundation) – 265331351/RTG 2130 minor cosmopolitanisms.

¹ Jodi A. Byrd, *The Transit of Empire* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2011), xi.

² Byrd, *The Transit*, xi.

³ Hōkūlani K. Aikau, “Following the Alaloa Kīpapa of Our Ancestors: A Trans-Indigenous Futurity without the State (United States or Otherwise),” *American Quarterly* 67, no. 3 (2015): 658, <https://doi.org/10.1353/aq.2015.0038>.

⁴ Paul Lai, “Discontiguous States of America: The Paradox of Unincorporation in Craig Santos Perez’s Poetics of Chamorro Guam,” *Journal of Transnational American Studies* 3, no. 2 (2011): 2, <https://escholarship.org/uc/item/02f4v8m3>.

⁵ Miles Kahler, “Territoriality and Conflict in an Era of Globalization,” in *Territoriality and Conflict in an Era of Globalization*, ed. Miles Kahler and Barbara F. Walter (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006), 3.

⁶ Kahler, “Territoriality and Conflict,” 3, 5; original emphasis.

⁷ Eric Cheyfitz and Shari M. Huhndorf, “US Federal Indian Law and Violence against Native Women in Louise Erdrich’s *The Round House*,” in *New Directions in Law and Literature*, ed. Elizabeth S. Anker and Bernadette Meyler (New York: Oxford University Press, 2017), 264–65.

⁸ Catherine E. Walsh, “Life and Nature ‘Otherwise’: Challenges from the Abya-Yalean Andes,” in *The Anomie of the Earth: Philosophy, Politics, and Autonomy in Europe and the Americas*, ed. Federico Luisetti, John Pickles, and Wilson Kaiser (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2015), 96. We would like to thank Julia von Sigsfeld for bringing the concept of “thinking otherwise” to our attention.

⁹ Walsh, “Life and Nature ‘Otherwise,’” 96.

¹⁰ Walsh, “Life and Nature ‘Otherwise,’” 94.

¹¹ J. Kēhaulani Kauanui, *Paradoxes of Hawaiian Sovereignty: Land, Sex, and the Colonial Politics of State Nationalism* (Durham, NC and London: Duke University Press, 2018), 33.

¹² Alyosha Goldstein, “Toward a Genealogy of the U.S. Colonial Present,” in *Formations of United States Colonialism*, ed. Alyosha Goldstein (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2014), 6.

¹³ Epeli Hau'ofa, "Our Sea of Islands," in *Inside Out: Literature, Cultural Politics, and Identity in the New Pacific*, ed. Vilsoni Hereniko and Rob Wilson (Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield, 1999), 27–38.

¹⁴ Eve Tuck and K. Wayne Yang, "Decolonization Is Not A Metaphor," *Decolonization, Indigeneity, Education & Society* 1, no. 1 (2012): 35, <https://jps.library.utoronto.ca/index.php/des/article/view/18630>.

¹⁵ Tuck and Yang, "Decolonization," 36.

¹⁶ Kauanui, *Paradoxes*, 29.

¹⁷ Kauanui, *Paradoxes*, 33.

¹⁸ See Goldstein, "Toward a Genealogy," 6. Goldstein here builds on Rey Chow, *The Age of the World Target: Self-Referentiality in War, Theory, and Comparative Work* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2006).

¹⁹ Edward W. Said, *Culture and Imperialism* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1993). Walter D. Mignolo, *Local Histories/Global Designs: Coloniality, Subaltern Knowledges, and Border Thinking* (Princeton, CT: Princeton University Press, 2000), 8–9.

²⁰ Byrd, *The Transit*, 150.

²¹ Teresia Teaiwa, "Postscript: Reflections on Militourism, US Imperialism, and American Studies," *American Quarterly* 68, no. 3 (2016): 851, <https://doi.org/10.1353/aq.2016.0068>.

²² Teaiwa, "Postscript," 852.

²³ Teaiwa, "Postscript," 852.

²⁴ Leanne Beasamosake Simpson, *As We Have Always Done: Indigenous Freedom through Radical Resistance* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2017), 16.

²⁵ Mark Rifkin, "Geo into Bio and Back Again, or Tracing the Politics of Race and Sovereignty," *American Quarterly* 71, no. 3 (September 2019): 876, <https://doi.org/10.1353/aq.2019.0061>.

²⁶ Rifkin, "Geo into Bio and Back Again," 876.

²⁷ Rifkin, "Geo into Bio and Back Again," 876.

²⁸ Byrd, *The Transit*, xxvii.

²⁹ Byrd, *The Transit*, xxvii.

³⁰ Qtd. in Byrd, *The Transit*, xxvii.

- ³¹ Boris Vormann, "Who Needs American Studies? Globalization, Nationalism, and the Future of Area Studies," *Amerikastudien/American Studies* 59, no. 3 (2014): 390–93, <https://www.jstor.org/stable/44071850>.
- ³² Alexander C. Diener and Joshua Hagen, *Borders: A Very Short Introduction* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012), 14, 54.
- ³³ Aikau, "Following," 656–57.
- ³⁴ Leti Volpp, "The Indigenous as Alien," *UC Irvine Law Review* 5 (2015): 294, <http://scholarship.law.uci.edu/ucilr/vol5/iss2/5>.
- ³⁵ Raustiala qtd. in Leti Volpp, "Imaginings of Space in Immigration Law," *Law, Culture and the Humanities* (2012): 6.
- ³⁶ Liisa Malkki qtd. in Volpp, "The Indigenous as Alien," 294. For the image of the Mondrian painting, Leti Volpp references Rainer Bauböck, "Citizenship and National Identities in the European Union," in *Integration durch Demokratie: Neue Impulse für die Europäische Union*, ed. Eugen Antalovsky, Josef Melchior and Sonja Puntischer Riekman (Berlin: Metropolis Verlag, 1997).
- ³⁷ Benedict Anderson, *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and the Spread of Nationalism* (London: Verso, 2006), 90.
- ³⁸ David Held qtd. in Kal Raustiala, "The Evolution of Territoriality: International Relations and American Law," in *Territoriality and Conflict in an Era of Globalization*, ed. Miles Kahler and Barbara F. Walter (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006), 234.
- ³⁹ Diener and Hagen, *Borders*, 67, 73, 74. See also Kal Raustiala, *Does the Constitution Follow the Flag? The Evolution of Territoriality in American Law* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006).
- ⁴⁰ Raustiala, "The Evolution of Territoriality," 220.
- ⁴¹ Kahler, "Territoriality and Conflict," 2.
- ⁴² Volpp, "The Indigenous as Alien," 294.
- ⁴³ Volpp, "Imaginings of Space in Immigration Law," 6.
- ⁴⁴ Goldstein, "Toward a Genealogy," 12, 14–15.
- ⁴⁵ Kahler, "Territoriality and Conflict," 5.
- ⁴⁶ Franklyn Griffiths qtd. in Natalia Loukacheva, "Nunavut and Canadian Arctic Sovereignty," *Journal of Canadian Studies* 43, no. 2 (Spring 2009): 84, <https://doi.org/10.3138/jcs.43.2.82>.
- ⁴⁷ Volpp, "The Indigenous as Alien," 295.

⁴⁸ Mark Rifkin, "Indigenizing Agamben: Rethinking 'Sovereignty' in Light of the Peculiar Status of Native Peoples," *Cultural Critique* 73 (2009): 89, <https://www.jstor.org/stable/25619838>.

⁴⁹ Rifkin, "Indigenizing Agamben," 89–90.

⁵⁰ Rifkin, "Indigenizing Agamben," 89.

⁵¹ Amy Kaplan, *The Anarchy of Empire in the Making of US Culture* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2002), 10.

⁵² Kaplan, *Anarchy of Empire*, 10.

⁵³ See Jens Temmen, *The Territorialities of U.S. Imperialism(s): Conflicting Discourses of Sovereignty, Jurisdiction and Territory in Nineteenth-Century U.S. Legal Texts and Indigenous Life Writing* (Heidelberg: Universitätsverlag Winter, 2020).

⁵⁴ Frances Negrón-Mutaner, "The Emptying Island: Puerto Rican Expulsion in Post-Maria Time," *Hemispheric Institute* 14, no. 1 (2018), <https://hemisphericinstitute.org/en/emisferica-14-1-expulsion/14-1-essays/the-emptying-island-puerto-rican-expulsion-in-post-maria-time.html>. Using the trope of the emptying island as the critical lens through which to both understand and resist Puerto Rican colonial history, Negrón-Mutaner simultaneously highlights the various, and varying, strategies of resistance developed by Puerto Ricans in the aftermath of Hurricane María, strategies that in their very combination enforce a communal sense of accountability and belonging that may point the way to a rethinking of models of nationhood and sovereignty.

⁵⁵ Goldstein, "Toward a Genealogy," 1.

⁵⁶ Goldstein, "Toward a Genealogy," 2.

⁵⁷ Allison Hedge Coke, "Pando/Pando," in *Streaming* (Minneapolis, MN: Coffee House Press, 2015), 29–32.

⁵⁸ Craig Santos Perez, "Transterritorial Currents and the Imperial Terripelago," *American Quarterly* 67, no. 3 (2015): 619, <https://doi.org/10.1353/aq.2015.0044>.

⁵⁹ Perez, "Transterritorial Currents," 620.

⁶⁰ Perez, "Transterritorial Currents," 620.

⁶¹ Perez, "Transterritorial Currents," 620–621.

⁶² Brian Russell Roberts and Michelle Ann Stephens, "Introduction: Archipelagic American Studies: Decontinentalizing the Study of American Culture," in *Archipelagic*

American Studies, ed. Roberts and Stephens, 1–54 (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2017).

⁶³ Roberts and Stephens, “Introduction,” 1.

⁶⁴ Roberts and Stephens, “Introduction,” 19.

⁶⁵ Epeli Hau’ofa, “Our Sea of Islands,” 27–38; Antonio Benítez-Rojo, *The Repeating Island: The Caribbean and the Postmodern Perspective* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1996).

⁶⁶ Werner Zips, *Black Rebels: African Caribbean Freedom Fighters in Jamaica* (Kingston: Ian Randle, 1999), 9–11.

⁶⁷ For an overview of such scholarship and a counterargument, see Tim Lockley and David Doddington, “Maroon and Slave Communities in South Carolina before 1865,” *The South Carolina Historical Magazine* 113, no. 2 (2012): 126–27, <https://www.jstor.org/stable/41698100>.

⁶⁸ Lockley and Doddington “Maroon and Slave Communities,” 130.

⁶⁹ Daniel O. Sayers, “Marronage Perspective for Historical Archaeology in the United States,” *Historical Archaeology* 46, no. 4 (2012): 135–61, <https://www.jstor.org/stable/43491350>.

⁷⁰ Scott Hancock, “Crossing Freedom’s Fault Line: The Underground Railroad and Recentering African Americans in Civil War Causality,” *Civil War History* 59, no. 2 (2013): 205, <https://doi.org/10.1353/cwh.2013.0037>.

⁷¹ Cheryl Janifer LaRoche, *Free Black Communities and the Underground Railroad: The Geography of Resistance* (Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 2014).

⁷² See, for example, Afua Cooper, “The Fluid Frontier: Blacks and the Detroit River Region. A Focus on Henry Bibb,” *Canadian Review of American Studies* 30, no. 2 (2000): 129–49, <https://doi.org/10.3138/CRAS-s030-02-02>; Winfried Siemerling, *The Black Atlantic Reconsidered: Black Canadian Writing, Cultural History, and the Presence of the Past* (Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queens University Press, 2015); Karolyn Smardz Frost and Veta Smith Tucker, eds., *A Fluid Frontier: Slavery, Resistance, and the Underground Railroad in the Detroit River Borderland* (Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 2016). For Black Geographies, see Katherine McKittrick and Clyde Woods, eds., *Black Geographies and the Politics of Place* (Toronto: Between the Lines, 2007).

⁷³ Judith Madera, *Black Atlas: Geography and Flow in Nineteenth-Century African American Literature* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2015), 2.

⁷⁴ Madera, *Black Atlas*, 3.

⁷⁵ Madera, *Black Atlas*, 8, 22.

⁷⁶ Christina Sharpe, *In the Wake: On Blackness and Being* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2016), 15.

⁷⁷ Sharpe, *In the Wake*, 17–18.

⁷⁸ Sharpe, *In the Wake*, 22.

⁷⁹ Gloria Anzaldúa, *Borderlands/La Frontera: The New Mestiza* (San Francisco: Aunt Lute Books, 1999).

⁸⁰ Pekka Hämäläinen and Samuel Truett, “On Borderlands,” *Journal of American History* 98, no. 2 (September 2011): 338, <https://doi.org/10.1093/jahist/jar259>.

⁸¹ Anzaldúa, *Borderlands/La Frontera*, 2.

⁸² Anzaldúa, *Borderlands/La Frontera*, 1, 11.

⁸³ Louis Owens, *Mixedblood Messages: Literature, Film, Family, Place* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1998), 26.

⁸⁴ Owens, *Mixedblood Messages*, 26.

⁸⁵ Owens, *Mixedblood Messages*, 26.

⁸⁶ See also Nele Sawallisch, *Fugitive Borders: Black Canadian Cross-Border Literature at Mid-Nineteenth Century* (Bielefeld: transcript, 2019).

⁸⁷ Vincent Brown, “Slave Revolt in Jamaica, 1760–1761: A Cartographic Narrative,” revolt.axismaps.com.

⁸⁸ Vincent Brown, “Mapping A Slave Revolt: Visualizing Spatial History through the Archives of Slavery,” *Social Text* 33, no. 4 (125) (December 2015): 137, <https://doi.org/10.1215/01642472-3315826>.

⁸⁹ See Teemu Ruskola, *Legal Orientalism: China, the United States, and Modern Law* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2013). We thank the members of the JTAS editorial board for sharing their insights into the wider implications of this Special Forum.

Selected Bibliography

Aikau, Hōkūlani K. “Following the Alaloa Kīpapa of Our Ancestors: A Trans-Indigenous Futurity without the State (United States or Otherwise).” *American Quarterly* 67, no. 3 (2015): 653–61. <https://doi.org/10.1353/aq.2015.0038>.

Anderson, Benedict. *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. London: Verso, 2006.

Anzaldúa, Gloria. *Borderlands/La Frontera: The New Mestiza*. 1987. 2nd edition. San Francisco: Aunt Lute Books, 1999.

- Benítez-Rojo, Antonio. *The Repeating Island: The Caribbean and the Postmodern Perspective*. Translated by James E. Maraniss. 2nd edition. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1996.
- Brown, Vincent. "Mapping A Slave Revolt: Visualizing Spatial History through the Archives of Slavery." *Social Text* 33, no. 4 (125) (December 2015): 134–140. <https://doi.org/10.1215/01642472-3315826>.
- . "Slave Revolt in Jamaica, 1760–1761: A Cartographic Narrative." revolt.axismaps.com.
- Bruyneel, Kevin. *The Third Space of Sovereignty: The Postcolonial Politics of US-Indigenous Relations*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2007.
- Byrd, Jodi A. *The Transit of Empire: Indigenous Critiques of Colonialism*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2011.
- Cheyfitz, Eric, and Shari M. Huhndorf. "US Federal Indian Law and Violence against Native Women in Louise Erdrich's *The Round House*." In *New Directions in Law and Literature*, edited by Elizabeth S. Anker and Bernadette Meyler, 264–78. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2017.
- Cooper, Afua. "The Fluid Frontier: Blacks and the Detroit River Region; A Focus on Henry Bibb." *Canadian Review of American Studies* 30, no. 2 (2000): 129–49. <https://doi.org/10.3138/CRAS-s030-02-02>.
- Diener, Alexander C., and Joshua Hagen. *Borders: A Very Short Introduction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012.
- Goldstein, Alyosha. "Toward a Genealogy of the U.S. Colonial Present." In *Formations of United States Colonialism*, edited by Goldstein, 1–32. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2014.
- Hämäläinen, Pekka, and Samuel Truett. "On Borderlands." *Journal of American History* 98, no. 2 (September 2011): 338–61. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jahist/jar259>.
- Hancock, Scott. "Crossing Freedom's Fault Line: The Underground Railroad and Recentering African Americans in Civil War Causality." *Civil War History* 59, no. 2 (2013): 169–205. <https://doi.org/10.1353/cwh.2013.0037>.
- Hau'ofa, Epeli. "Our Sea of Islands." In *Inside Out: Literature, Cultural Politics, and Identity in the New Pacific*, edited by Vilsoni Hereniko and Rob Wilson, 27–38. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield, 1999.
- Hedge Coke, Allison. "Pando/Pando." In *Streaming*, 29–32. Minneapolis, MN: Coffee House Press, 2015.

- Kahler, Miles. "Territoriality and Conflict in an Era of Globalization." In *Territoriality and Conflict in an Era of Globalization*, edited by Kahler and Barbara F. Walter, 1–10. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006.
- Kaplan, Amy. *The Anarchy of Empire in the Making of US Culture*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2002.
- Kauanui, J. Kēhaulani. *Paradoxes of Hawaiian Sovereignty: Land, Sex, and the Colonial Politics of State Nationalism*. Durham, NC and London: Duke University Press, 2018.
- Lai, Paul. "Discontiguous States of America: The Paradox of Unincorporation in Craig Santos Perez's Poetics of Chamorro Guam." *Journal of Transnational American Studies* 3, no. 2 (2011): 1–28. <https://escholarship.org/uc/item/02f4v8m3>.
- LaRoche, Cheryl Janifer. *Free Black Communities and the Underground Railroad: The Geography of Resistance*. Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 2014.
- Lockley, Tim, and David Doddington. "Maroon and Slave Communities in South Carolina before 1865." *The South Carolina Historical Magazine* 113, no. 2 (2012): 125–45. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/41698100>.
- Loukacheva, Natalia. "Nunavut and Canadian Arctic Sovereignty." *Journal of Canadian Studies* 43, no. 2 (Spring 2009): 82–108. <https://doi.org/10.3138/jcs.43.2.82>.
- Madera, Judith. *Black Atlas: Geography and Flow in Nineteenth-Century African American Literature*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2015.
- McKittrick, Katherine, and Clyde Woods, editors. *Black Geographies and the Politics of Place*. Toronto: Between the Lines, 2007.
- Mignolo, Walter D. *Local Histories/Global Designs: Coloniality, Subaltern Knowledges, and Border Thinking*. Princeton, CT: Princeton University Press, 2000.
- Negrón-Mutaner, Frances. "The Emptying Island: Puerto Rican Expulsion in Post-Maria Time." *Hemispheric Institute* 14, no. 1 (2018). <https://hemisphericinstitute.org/en/emisferica-14-1-expulsion/14-1-essays/the-emptying-island-puerto-rican-expulsion-in-post-maria-time.html>.
- Owens, Louis. *Mixedblood Messages: Literature, Film, Family, Place*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1998.
- Perez, Craig Santos. "Transterritorial Currents and the Imperial Terripelago." *American Quarterly* 67, no. 3 (2015): 619–24. <https://doi.org/10.1353/aq.2015.0044>.
- Raustiala, Kal. *Does the Constitution Follow the Flag? The Evolution of Territoriality in American Law*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006.

- . “The Evolution of Territoriality: International Relations and American Law.” In *Territoriality and Conflict in an Era of Globalization*, edited by Miles Kahler and Barbara F. Walter, 219–50. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006.
- Rifkin, Mark. “Indigenizing Agamben: Rethinking ‘Sovereignty’ in Light of the Peculiar Status of Native Peoples.” *Cultural Critique* 73 (2009): 88–124.
<https://www.jstor.org/stable/25619838>.
- . “Geo into Bio and Back Again, or Tracing the Politics of Race and Sovereignty.” *American Quarterly* 71, no. 3 (September 2019): 871–79.
<https://doi.org/10.1353/aq.2019.0061>.
- Roberts, Brian Russell, and Michelle Ann Stephens. “Introduction: Archipelagic American Studies: Decontinentalizing the Study of American Culture.” In *Archipelagic American Studies*, edited by Roberts and Stephens, 1–54. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2017.
- Ruskola, Teemu. *Legal Orientalism: China, the United States, and Modern Law*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2013.
- Said, Edward W. *Culture and Imperialism*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1993.
- Sawallisch, Nele. *Fugitive Borders: Black Canadian Cross-Border Literature at Mid-Nineteenth Century*. Bielefeld: transcript, 2019.
- Sayers, Daniel O. “Marronage Perspective for Historical Archaeology in the United States.” *Historical Archaeology* 46, no. 4 (2012): 135–61.
<https://www.jstor.org/stable/43491350>.
- Sharpe, Christina. *In the Wake: On Blackness and Being*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2016.
- Siemerling, Winfried. *The Black Atlantic Reconsidered: Black Canadian Writing, Cultural History, and the Presence of the Past*. Montreal and Kingston, ON: McGill-Queens University Press, 2015.
- Simpson, Leanne Betasamosake. *As We Have Always Done: Indigenous Freedom through Radical Resistance*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2017.
- Smardz Frost, Karolyn, and Veta Smith Tucker, editors. *A Fluid Frontier: Slavery, Resistance, and the Underground Railroad in the Detroit River Borderland*. Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 2016.
- Teaiwa, Teresia. “Postscript: Reflections on Militourism, US Imperialism, and American Studies.” *American Quarterly* 68, no. 3 (2016): 847–53.
<https://doi.org/10.1353/aq.2016.0068>.

- Temmen, Jens. *The Territorialities of U.S. Imperialism(s): Conflicting Discourses of Sovereignty, Jurisdiction and Territory in Nineteenth-Century U.S. Legal Texts and Indigenous Life Writing*. Heidelberg: Universitätsverlag Winter, 2020.
- Tuck, Eve, and K. Wayne Yang, “Decolonization Is Not A Metaphor.” *Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education & Society* 1, no. 1 (2012): 1–40.
<https://jps.library.utoronto.ca/index.php/des/article/view/18630>.
- Volpp, Leti. “Imaginations of Space in Immigration Law.” *Law, Culture and the Humanities* (2012): 1–19. <http://lch.sagepub.com/content/early/2012/02/27/1743872111435963>.
- . “The Indigenous as Alien.” *UC Irvine Law Review* 5 (2015): 289–326.
<http://scholarship.law.uci.edu/ucilr/vol5/iss2/5>.
- Vormann, Boris. “Who Needs American Studies? Globalization, Nationalism, and the Future of Area Studies.” *Amerikastudien/American Studies* 59, no. 3 (2014): 387–406. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/44071850>.
- Walsh, Catherine E. “Life and Nature ‘Otherwise’: Challenges from the Abya-Yalean Andes.” In *The Anomie of the Earth: Philosophy, Politics, and Autonomy in Europe and the Americas*, edited by Federico Luisetti, John Pickles, and Wilson Kaiser, 93–118. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2015.
- Zips, Werner. *Black Rebels: African Caribbean Freedom Fighters in Jamaica*. Kingston: Ian Randle, 1999.