

Redefinitions of Citizenship and Revisions of Cosmopolitanism— Transnational Perspectives: A Response and a Proposal

SHELLEY FISHER FISHKIN

It is both a pleasure and a privilege to offer this response to the essays in the symposium “Redefinitions of Citizenship and Revisions of Cosmopolitanism—Transnational Perspectives” by five of the leading scholars in the field. Indeed, without the transformative earlier work by these five scholars, the field of American Studies would look very different than it does today.¹ Each of them has pioneered in bringing transnational perspectives on our field of study to the fore, and for that we owe them a debt of gratitude. These short pieces are typical of their key contributions to the field: they are eloquent and insightful, and they give credit to the work on which they build and which they extend.

In his introduction, Günter Lenz notes that “recent debates have dramatically renegotiated the ideas and the interrelations of cosmopolitanism, nationalism, and localism as well as of citizenship in a time of transnationalism and the challenges of something like world citizenship.” We are increasingly called upon to develop “new visions of citizenship and of a *radical* cosmopolitanism in a theory of democracy for the globalizing, multipolar, and heterogeneous world today, questioning and transcending the common Euro-North American discursive frame of reference.” As they chart new futures for the field, these five scholars raise questions that are important, model approaches that are constructive, and make suggestions that are compelling. The challenges they identify have led me to develop my own proposal for a potentially fruitful “next step” in the field of transnational American Studies. In the comments that follow, I’ll respond briefly to each essay’s argument and then outline the new approach to scholarship that they prompt me to offer.

Günter Lenz draws a distinction between transnational and transcultural American Studies in the first section of his essay (subtitled “The Politics of Transnational and Transcultural American Studies”). Although I tend to view the latter as so closely related to the former as to be a subset of the former, it is nevertheless very helpful to have the range of approaches to current issues in the field laid out this clearly. After providing a useful summary of recent trends in scholarship, Lenz argues persuasively in the second section (subtitled “Redefining Citizenship and Belonging”) that research by both European and US-based American Studies scholars “should be complemented by, and extended to, a more explicit engagement with the provocative discourses of a wide range of political philosophers, anthropologists, political scientists, and sociologists who have explored the contours, dynamics, and potentials of a new theory of democracy in a globalizing, multipolar, and heterogeneous world today.” Bringing in examples from a number of these disciplines to make his case, he offers a sampling of some of the ways in which philosophers, sociologists, and others are redefining ideas of “citizenship” in ways that have bearing on how we might reconfigure our understanding of the term in American Studies. Lenz discusses recent efforts by scholars to define concepts of “cultural citizenship,” “ecological citizenship,” “cosmopolitan citizenship,” “postnational citizenship,” “transnational citizenship,” “flexible citizenship,” “European citizenship,” and so on, involving “transnational and deterritorialized rights” in a world marked by constant migration, immigration, and globalization. In the third section (subtitled “Redefinitions of Cosmopolitanism”), Lenz rejects some of the rather reductive dismissals of “cosmopolitanism” as “a bohemian, Eurocentric, bourgeois, and elitist notion that, in the end, is supportive of globalist capitalism” while nonetheless valuing the fact that critics’ insistence on paying attention to the politics of cosmopolitanism forces us to challenge the idea of a universal cosmopolitanism and examine plural cosmopolitanisms operating in different contexts. I agree with his idea that “a new critical engagement with competing ‘partial,’ ‘discrepant’ versions of a new cosmopolitanism, articulated from different parts of the world,” would be a fruitful approach to take. And I share his appreciation of the European and American theorists of cosmopolitanism who are trying to extend the boundaries of a “Western notion of cosmopolitanism by engaging in a reconstructive, dialogic rearticulation of a wide range of *non-Western* cosmopolitan discourses,” and who are trying to decenter, destabilize, and reconfigure ideas of citizenship at the same time.

One area that Lenz does not touch on, but which is germane to his discussion of new perspectives on citizenship, is the idea of “statelessness.” The best discussion of the problem that I know of is Linda Kerber’s 2007 presidential address to the Organization of American Historians, “The Stateless as the Citizen’s Other: A View from the United States.”² Missing from Lenz’s illuminating overview of new explorations of ideas of cosmopolitanism is the work of scholars in American Studies who have explored versions of cosmopolitanism in nineteenth-century America,

linking a canonical Transcendentalist to a fourteenth-century Persian poet in one case (Wai-chee Dimock) and connecting nineteenth-century French Caribbean intellectuals to an early African American poet in another (Anna Brickhouse).³ His argument would be enriched by mention of this work.

Lenz reasonably raises some concern about the “‘centrifugal’ dynamics” that have “deconstructed [the] traditional boundaries, objectives, and methodological procedures” of the field of American Studies and further jeopardized “the sense of its traditional unity as an interdisciplinary field.” What holds it all together as we broaden the field to include even more disciplines and approaches? When we do research centered on cultural forms, processes, or products not born in the US or on events that didn’t happen in the US, our focus remains on the ways in which those forms, processes, products, or events had an impact on America or Americans in some way (either materially or intangibly or both, shaping their understanding of the world). For example, we might look at phenomena ranging from *mah jongg* to Japanese architecture—but our focus would be on why a Chinese game played with tiles became a favorite game among immigrant Jewish women in New York from the 1920s through the 1950s, or how Japanese architecture, through its influence on Frank Lloyd Wright and others, influenced postwar home design in the US—including the house in which I am writing this essay. We might investigate the condition of the Maori in nineteenth-century New Zealand or King Leopold’s rule in the Belgian Congo but the impetus would be better insight into the ways in which these issues engaged Mark Twain and shaped Americans’ understanding of European imperialism.⁴ In other words, the US should be a part of the equation. Thus a study of how African American diplomat Richard Greener understood the Russo-Japanese War (during which he was stationed in Vladivostok) would be recognized as a valid research subject in the field of American Studies, but, just as clearly, a study of Russian and Japanese responses to the war or an examination of how a British diplomat in Vladivostok at the time understood that same war would not—except, perhaps, for comparative purposes. A study of the influence of Japanese block painting on the work of painter Mary Cassatt would be relevant to the field, but not the influence of Japanese block painting on European artists—unless the influence was traced onto American artists whom those European artists influenced in turn, or unless comparative perspectives were sought. Studies of how the 1949 Chinese Revolution came about would not be American Studies research, but examinations of why that event took nearly all the US reporters covering China at the time by surprise would be. These distinctions are simply offered as examples to indicate that the field of American Studies is not so loose and amorphous as to include potentially any object of inquiry.

Rob Kroes’s essay, “Citizenship in a Trans-Atlantic Perspective,” reminds us that from a European standpoint, the seemingly new forms of cosmopolitanism, emerging in an era when mass culture can make the whole idea of cosmopolitanism seem “banal,” have their counterparts not only in mid-twentieth-century phenomena

but also in cultural configurations that are centuries old. Today, Kroes writes, “people everywhere have appropriated cultural codes alien to their homogenized national cultures” as they are “exposed to a worldwide flow of cultural expression.” The multiple identities they develop allow them “to move across a range of cultural affinities and affiliations.” He notes that in the postwar era, as younger generations sought a cultural identity, “American ingredients served as alternatives in cultural struggles waged in every European national setting with cultural gatekeepers guarding the purity of the national identity.” Today, ironically the “cultural gatekeepers guarding the purity of the national identity” can be found as easily in the US as in Europe, as “English-only” advocates and anti-immigration activists turn a blind eye to the multilingual, multicultural nation that America is and always has been.⁵ Kroes reminds us of the “long historical experience of cosmopolitanism in Europe, of a view of the civilized life centering on what can only be described as European culture,” a “high-minded version of cultural elites producing and consuming a culture that was truly cosmopolitan, transcending the borders and bounds of the nation state.” “It was always a rooted cosmopolitanism,” Kroes notes, “with European trends and styles in the arts always being refracted through local appropriations, reflecting local tastes and manners. . . . This is the lasting and exhilarating promise of European history, in spite of the atrocities committed on European soil in the name of the homogenized nation, marching in lockstep, purging itself of unwanted ‘others.’”

Kroes observes that the idea that “countries like France, Germany, Britain, or the Netherlands are no longer nation states but transnational states” resonates with attitudes that were associated with “Europe” for centuries. What must we learn from the fact that these centuries-old transnational and cosmopolitan ideals and ideas were not strong enough to prevent the resurgence of nationalism from destroying much of civilization-as-we-know-it in Europe at mid-century? Can our research offer any insights into reasons for the resurgence of nationalism (and the rejection of cosmopolitanism) on the part of the right in America today—and strategies for countering it? Do European efforts to subsume national identities into a broader sense of “European” or “world” citizenship offer any lessons for those in the US who would like to see aspirations to more transnational forms of identification thrive?

While one would naturally resist attributing these scholars’ gifts to the fact that they hail from Europe (not wanting to essentialize what it means to be European), one has to wonder whether the fact that they are all so very good at recovering cosmopolitan impulses in American cultural history and in articulating their significance with such energy and clarity might be related to the fact that their own part of the world has been negotiating these issues (as Kroes reminds us) for centuries.

Rüdiger Kunow’s essay, “Melville, Religious Cosmopolitanism, and the New American Studies,” models one way of recovering cosmopolitan dimensions of a

canonical American writer not previously analyzed very often in this light, while Alfred Hornung's essay, "Planetary Citizenship," shows us how to appreciate the ways in which two contemporary North American figures, Barack Obama and David Suzuki, forged identities that extend beyond the narrowly national. I applaud Kunow's recuperation of Melville's critique of the missionaries and his respect for the native cultures he encountered (which resonate with Twain's related critiques of missionaries—primarily in Asia, as well as with his championing of the merits of native cultures in Australia and New Zealand). And I am particularly grateful to Hornung for having made me aware of Suzuki's "Declaration of Interdependence" (wonderful!). Indeed, how do we nurture and develop that sense of interdependence that on some level has been always with us, if not necessarily foregrounded or celebrated? Melville, Suzuki, and Obama offer three ways of doing that. Each of these three figures came to a more global sense of identity through specific experiences that led to specific insights, as Kunow and Hornung tell us. Might there eventually be enough of these intriguing narratives to allow us to develop a category that described them such as a "global *bildungsroman*"? That is, a *bildungsroman* not simply of growth and development, as is traditionally the case, but the story of how an individual moves from a local or national sense of identity to a sense of himself or herself as a global citizen, a citizen of the planet? (Might there not be enough of such narratives right now, if only we could collect them and display them in a way that highlighted this dimension of them? Perhaps my proposal in the next section of this essay might be one way of achieving this.)

As Hornung notes, recent theorists including Ursula Heise and Paul Gilroy have explored a sense of planetary identity forged by foregrounding concerns with the environment or with race that of necessity transcend narrow national political boundaries, as well as by focusing on a range of other issues that similarly complicate nation-based concepts of identity (in *Sense of Place and Sense of Planet*, Heise lists some of these as "hybridity, creolization, *mestizaje*, migration, borderlands, diaspora, nomadism, exile, and deterritorialization"⁶). One area that the five contributors to this symposium do not explore is the issue of gender: transnational movements countering violence against women, for example, as well as movements against trafficking and exploitation in various forms, along with transnational women's empowerment movements, have helped women in many countries come to a sense of identification with other women around the world, which could probably be described as a gendered cosmopolitanism, if you will. This topic merits more attention from scholars in the future.⁷

William Boelhower, in his essay "Side-by-Side with You: The Common as Foundational Figure," argues for the centrality in all of these discussions of the conceptual figure of "the common"—"common humanity, common wealth, and common ground"—what political philosopher David Held has referred to as the "overlapping communities of fate" in which we all live.⁸ I was intrigued by Boelhower's etymology for the concept of "common knowledge"—particularly his

observation that “*conscientia* (the common’s epistemology of knowledge-with) is the etymon for both moral conscience and consciousness.” That statement immediately brought to mind the title of one of my favorite sections in Gloria Anzaldúa’s book *Borderlands/La Frontera*, “*La conciencia de la mestiza: Towards a New Consciousness*.”⁹ A gifted poet and essayist whose deft command of both English and Spanish allowed her to imbue her text with subtle interlingual portmanteau valences as she moved back and forth between languages, Anzaldúa probably welcomed the fact that the word for “consciousness” in Spanish suggested the word for “conscience” in English—as the “New Consciousness” for which she called involved addressing social injustice by exercising the kind of moral awareness that we associate with conscience. “*La conciencia de la mestiza*” demands that we become more *conscientious* about respecting the multiple strands of complex identities—a challenge that requires broadening both our mental and moral awareness.

I particularly like the Whitmanesque catalogue that starts Boelhower’s penultimate paragraph:

Each of us—whether we be academic scholars, bus drivers, state senators, war veterans, terminally ill, political scientists, janitors, hairdressers, state governors, cooks, supreme court judges, yard workers, mill hands, medical doctors, students, care workers, Wall-Street brokers, unemployed, undocumented aliens, bus drivers, refugees, prisoners, or the elderly (all people who belong together because of their common humanity)—I repeat, each of us is a crossing-point for a variety of political orders, from the local, state, and regional to the hemispheric and the global. Each of us, as inhabitants of planet Earth, has a stake in imagining and producing a global commonwealth. And that planetary point of view is anchored in our own backyard and our own neighborhood, as we choose or do not choose to be conscious of our fundamental and inevitable condition of being-in-common. As a unique political order that cuts across all of the other orders mentioned above, the common must continually be evoked, configured, produced and reproduced.

I agree with his concluding statement, “The collective point of view is a way of holding global space in common; as such it provides us with a figure of thought and place on which we can build a global political order.”

Reading the stimulating pieces in this symposium prompted me to ponder a potentially fruitful “next step” for the field of transnational American Studies—for “Transnational American Studies 2.0,” if you will, designed to develop new ways of collaborating across borders and thinking beyond borders, of providing self-evident

rationales for greater planetary awareness, and of helping the academy nurture the global citizens of the future.

It is clear that the digitization of documents and images is proliferating at a dizzying pace all over the world. In a majority of cases, each item has its own stable URL. The enormous proliferation of digitized collections presents an unprecedented opportunity for scholars interested in transnational American Studies. I propose that colleagues in American Studies around the world collaborate in developing what I call Digital Palimpsest Mapping Projects—DPMPs for short. I suggest that we pronounce the acronym DPMPs as “Deep Maps.” There might be as many varieties of Deep Maps as there are scholars, and they might take a dizzying range of forms. But they would all have certain features in common:

- (a) Digital Palimpsest Mapping Projects (Deep Maps) would embed links to archival texts and images, as well as interpretive materials, in nodes on an interactive map, using the durable URL of the material in the digital archive in which it resides.
- (b) Deep Maps would focus on topics that cross borders and would include links to materials in different locations, sometimes in different languages, and sometimes reflecting conflicting interpretations of the material involved.
- (c) Deep Maps would be as accessible to as broad an international public as possible, hosted on open-access university or other nonprofit websites.

Digital Palimpsest Mapping Projects are palimpsests in that they allow multiple versions of events, of texts, of phenomena—as well as multiple interpretations—to be written over each other—with each version still visible under the layers. They involve mapping, since the form of display—the gateway, if you will, into any topic—would be a geographical map that links the text, artifact, phenomenon, or event to the location that produced it, that responded to it, or that is connected with it in some way. They are projects rather than products because they are open-ended, collaborative works-in-progress. They would not displace the traditional forms in which we present our scholarship; in fact, they would bring our books and articles greater attention. Rather, they would be a new way of presenting our work as scholars, and a new way of encouraging our students to think about their work and ours.

By requiring collaboration across borders, languages, nations, continents, and disciplines, Deep Maps would bring our interdependence—as scholars, as citizens, as human beings—to the foreground. The process of working together on Deep Maps

could help us take the field of transnational American Studies in some exciting new directions. It could also help us develop new ways of understanding ourselves as “global citizens.”¹⁰ I want to thank Günter Lenz, Rob Kroes, Rüdiger Kunow, Alfred Hornung, and William Boelhower for having stimulated these ideas with their intriguing meditations on citizenship and cosmopolitanism.

Notes

¹ It is impossible to list all of their many important contributions to American Studies here, but a sampling of works that are most germane to the topic at hand should suffice. The field of transnational American Studies has been enormously enriched by the many edited volumes that have appeared in the American Studies monograph series published by the German American Studies Association, which Alfred Hornung has coedited for many years, as well as those that have appeared in the monograph series of the European Association of American Studies under the editorial guidance of Rob Kroes; a few of these titles are noted below, along with some relevant monographs and essays by these five authors. See William Q. Boelhower, “The Rise of the New Atlantic Studies Matrix,” *American Literary History* 20, nos. 1–2 (2008): 83–101; William Boelhower, Rocío G. Davis, and Carmen Birkle, eds., *Sites of Ethnicity: Europe and the Americas* (Heidelberg: Universitätsverlag Winter, 2004); Alfred Hornung, “Terrorist Violence and Transnational Memory: Jonathan Safran Foer and Don DeLillo,” in *Transnational American Memories*, ed. Udo J. Hebel (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2009), 171–84; Alfred Hornung, ed., *Intercultural America* (Heidelberg: Universitätsverlag Winter, 2007); Alfred Hornung, “European Perspectives of American Studies,” in *Virtually American? Denationalizing North American Studies*, ed. Mita Banerjee (Heidelberg: Universitätsverlag Winter, 2009), 55–65; Alfred Hornung, “Transnational American Studies: Response to the Presidential Address,” *American Quarterly* 57, no. 1 (2005): 67–73; Alfred Hornung and Rüdiger Kunow, eds., *Global Fictions*, special issue, *Amerikastudien/American Studies* 47, no. 2 (2002); Rob Kroes, *Them and Us: Questions of Citizenship in a Globalizing World* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 2000); Rob Kroes, *If You’ve Seen One, You’ve Seen the Mall: Europeans and American Mass Culture* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1996); David W. Ellwood and Rob Kroes, eds., *Hollywood in Europe: Experiences of a Cultural Hegemony* (Amsterdam: VU University Press, 1994); Rob Kroes, Robert W. Rydell, and Doeko F. J. Bosscher, eds., *Cultural Transmissions and Receptions: American Mass Culture in Europe* (Amsterdam: VU University Press, 1993); Robert W. Rydell and Rob Kroes, eds., *Buffalo Bill in Bologna: The Americanization of the World, 1869–1922* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2005); Rüdiger Kunow, “In Sickness and in Health: Transnationalism Reconsidered,” in Banerjee, *Virtually American?*, 23–36; Günter H. Lenz, “Radical Cosmopolitanism: W. E. B. Du Bois, Germany, and African American Pragmatist Visions for Twenty-First Century Europe,” in *Representation and Decoration in a Postmodern Age*, ed. Alfred Hornung and Rüdiger Kunow (Heidelberg: Universitätsverlag Winter, 2009), 65–96; Günter H. Lenz, “Transculturations: American Studies in a Globalizing World—the Globalizing World in

American Studies,” *Amerikastudien/American Studies* 47, no. 1 (2002): 97–98; Günter H. Lenz, “Toward a Dialogics of International American Culture Studies: Transnationality, Border Discourses, and Public Culture(s),” in *The Futures of American Studies*, ed. Donald E. Pease and Robyn Wiegman (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2002), 461–85; Günter H. Lenz, “Transnational American Studies: Negotiating Cultures of Difference—Multicultural Identities, Communities, and Border Discourses,” in *Multiculturalism in Transit: A German-American Exchange*, ed. Klaus J. Milich and Jeffrey M. Peck (New York: Berghahn Books, 1998), 129–66; Günter Lenz, “Internationalizing American Studies: Predecessors, Paradigms, and Cultural Critique—A View from Germany,” in *Predecessors: Intellectual Lineages in American Studies*, ed. Rob Kroes (Amsterdam: VU University Press, 1999), 236–55.

² Linda K. Kerber, “Presidential Address: The Stateless as the Citizen’s Other: A View from the United States,” *American Historical Review* 112, no. 1 (2007): 1–34, <http://www.historycooperative.org/journals/ahr/112.1/kerber.html>. Kerber’s 1997 article, “The Meanings of Citizenship,” which Lenz cites, was an early exploration of some of the ideas that came together in this later piece. See Kerber, “The Meaning of Citizenship,” *Journal of American History* 84, no. 3 (1997): 833–54.

³ See Wai Chee Dimock, *Through Other Continents: American Literature across Deep Time* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2006); Wai Chee Dimock, “Deep Time: American Literature and World History,” *American Literary History* 13, no. 4 (2001): 755–75; and Anna Brickhouse, *Transamerican Literary Relations and the Nineteenth-Century Public Sphere* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004).

⁴ On mah jongg and Jewish American women, see Christina Cavallaro and Anita Luu, *Mah-jongg: From Shanghai to Miami Beach* (San Francisco: Chronicle Books, 2005); Hanna Miller, “Identity Takeout: How American Jews Made Chinese Food Their Ethnic Cuisine,” *Journal of Popular Culture* 39, no. 3 (2006): 430–65; Jenna Weissman Joselit, *The Wonders of America: Reinventing Jewish Culture, 1880–1950* (New York: H. Holt, 2002); Carole Bell Ford, *The Girls: Jewish Women of Brownsville, Brooklyn, 1940–1995*, SUNY Series in Modern Jewish Literature and Culture (Albany: State University of New York Press, 2000); see also the 2011 exhibit, “Project Mah Jongg” (<http://www.projectmahjongg.com/about.html>) at the Museum of Jewish Heritage in New York. On the influence of Japanese architecture in the US, see Dell Upton, *Architecture in the United States*, Oxford History of Art (New York: Oxford University Press, 1998); Anthony Alofsin, *Frank Lloyd Wright: The Lost Years, 1910–1922* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1993); and Kevin Nute, *Frank Lloyd Wright and Japan: The Role of Traditional Japanese Art and Architecture in the Work of Frank Lloyd Wright* (London: Chapman & Hall, 1993). Mark Twain wrote sympathetically about the Maori in New Zealand in Twain, *Following the Equator: A Journey around the World* (Hartford, CT, American Pub., 1897); and he wrote a scathingly critical satire of King Leopold’s exploits in the Belgian Congo in Twain, *King Leopold’s Soliloquy: A Defense of His Congo Rule* (Boston: P. R. Warren, 1905).

⁵ It is refreshing to hear the name “Beck” associated with efforts to think critically about a cosmopolitan sense of citizenship, however banal it may be, since today’s Americans hearing the name “Beck” probably think not of Ulrich Beck, the German sociologist to whom Kroes refers, but of the right-wing television demagogue, Glenn Beck, who opposes all that a cosmopolitan worldview represents and advocates in a narrow, jingoistic, nationalist “purity.”

⁶ Ursula K. Heise, *Sense of Place and Sense of Planet: The Environmental Imagination of the Global* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2008), 5.

⁷ For some perspectives on the ways in which feminism is shaping transnational activist networks linking women in the US to women around the globe, see Marjorie Agosín, *Women, Gender, and Human Rights: A Global Perspective* (New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 2001); Lee Ann Banaszak, *The U.S. Women’s Movement in Global Perspective* (Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield, 2005); Myra Marx Ferree and Aili Mari Tripp, eds., *Global Feminism: Transnational Women’s Activism, Organizing, and Human Rights* (New York: New York University Press, 2006); Julie Peters and Andrea Wolper, eds., *Women’s Rights, Human Rights: International Feminist Perspectives* (New York: Routledge, 1995); Leila J. Rupp and Verta Taylor, “Forging Feminist Identity in an International Movement: A Collective Identity Approach to Twentieth-Century Feminism,” *Signs* 24, no. 2 (1999): 363–86; Valerie Sperling, Myra Marx Ferree, and Barbara Risman, “Constructing Global Feminism: Transnational Advocacy Networks and Russian Women’s Activism,” *Signs* 26, no. 4 (2001): 1155–86. For an insightful look at some global dimensions of issues that have been the focus of concern for US-based scholars, see Shirley Geok-lin Lim, “The Center Can(not) Hold: U.S. Women’s Studies and Global Feminism,” *American Studies International* 38, no. 3 (2000): 25–35. See also other articles in this issue of *American Studies International*, whose theme is “Intersections: Global Feminisms, American Studies.”

⁸ David Held, *Global Covenant: The Social Democratic Alternative to the Washington Consensus* (Cambridge: Polity, 2004), 168.

⁹ Gloria Anzaldúa, “*La conciencia de la mestiza: Towards a New Consciousness*,” *Borderlands/La Frontera* (San Francisco: Spinsters/Aunt Lute, 1987), 77–91. After an epigraph (“*Por la mujer de mi raza/ hablará el espíritu*”) that she describes as “my own ‘take off’ on José Vasconcelos’s idea,” Anzaldúa begins this chapter like this: “José Vasconcelos, a Mexican philosopher, envisaged *una raza mestiza, una mezcla de razas afines, una raza de color—la primera raza síntesis del globo*. He called it a cosmic race, *la raza cósmica*, a fifth race embracing the four major races of the world. . . . From this racial, ideological, cultural, and biological cross-pollination, an ‘alien’ consciousness is presently in the making—a new *mestiza* consciousness, *una conciencia de mujer*. It is a consciousness of the Borderlands” (77).

¹⁰ This spring, in keynote talks at conferences on “Transnational American Cultures” at the City University of Hong Kong and on “Global Studies in the 21st Century” at Nanjing University, and in a plenary lecture at the annual conference of the German Association of American Studies in Regensburg (a conference focused, this year, on “Transnationalism”), I will be exploring some of the ways in which Deep Maps might enhance our scholarship and our teaching; I look forward to getting suggestions from colleagues and developing this material for publication.