

Political geography: political geographies of globalization (1) – dominance

Matthew Sparke

Department of Geography, Box 353550, University of Washington,
Seattle, WA 98105, USA

I Introduction

We live in urgent times in spaces defined by exploitation, brutality, anxiety, desperation, and too often too limited efforts at resistance. How are political geographers responding? The most progressive are becoming more political: more politically critical and engaged, more concerned with the vast diversity of contemporary power relations, and thus more attuned to the politically significant economic, social and cultural processes that at once exceed and enframe the increasingly instrumentalized and banalized space of state politics. As recent collective deliberations on the limits of the subdiscipline have shown, the resulting remappings of the ‘political’ in political geography have been remarkable (Cox and Low, 2003; Desbiens *et al.*, 2004). However, as Eleonore Kofman (2003) argues, they have brought with them the danger of emptying the political of meaning, of finding it everywhere and thus ultimately nowhere. Following Ruth Fincher (2004) and Lynn Staeheli (1996), she suggests that one ethnographically engaged approach to this problem is to investigate the discontinuities between that which is socially debated as ‘political’ and the geographical contexts in which it can be said to take place (see also the parallel discussion of P/politics in Philo and Smith, 2003). Another more disciplinary but complementary tactic, following John Agnew (2003a), is to return to such core geographical themes as territoriality, scale, region, space and place, connecting them to some of the main questions about politics – including questions of distribution, antagonism and political constitution (Brown and Staeheli, 2003) – that continue to animate political theory (for an impressive example of the complementarity of this approach when combined with engaged feminist ethnography, see Silvey, 2003). Both these responses make a great deal of sense, particularly as correctives to the unfortunate recent trend towards the double dissolution of politics and geography in

self-indulgent, arrogant and yet (despite the swarming ANTs) ultimately empty visions of topological networks (e.g., R. Smith, 2003). Here in this paper and in the next two political geography reports I have been invited to write, I propose to follow the calls for more ethnographically engaged and geographically responsible analyses of the political, but I seek to do so by taking a narrower thematically specific approach. In short, inspired by feminist, Marxist and development geography critiques (Cooper, 2001; Coronil, 2000; Hart, 2001; 2002; 2003; 2004; Katz, 2001; Kelly, 1999; Nagar *et al.*, 2002), I want to highlight some of the most politically alive and spatially attuned examples of political geography by holding the heterodox diversity of the field in analytical tension with another academic shibboleth that also seems to lead everywhere and nowhere at once: namely globalization.

Among the burgeoning work on what I am calling the political geographies of globalization, three main themes stand out. These are dominance, governance and resistance. I will defer discussion of debates over the last two categories to my next two reports, respectively. Here the focus is on dominance, perhaps the least theorized and most avoided category among the three. In the aftermath of the Iraq and Afghanistan wars, and in the shadow of the fence that is turning Palestine into a ghetto-cum-bantustan, the notion of dominance may perhaps make more intuitive sense today than it would have done two or three years ago. As was illustrated by the AAG's anti-war resolution in 2003, many geographers keenly want to name and, at the very least, restrain such dominance (e.g., Murphy, 2002). Nevertheless, it is still not a category that has the same immediate academic respectability as governance or resistance (Sakho, 2003). Indeed, discussing dominance among intellectuals who consider themselves theoretically sophisticated these days is a little like posing direct questions about the lies of the Bush administration in a White House press briefing. One risks being dismissed as naïve and hopelessly ignorant of complexity, not to mention unaware of the full performative paradoxes of nonrepresentationality (which, yes, I should explain for copy-editors everywhere, has now been dignified as an academic 'theory' and is not just a CIA excuse for leaving lies about Iraq's weapons of mass destruction uncorrected). Dominance, in any event, is performed and is extremely complicated. It is worth remembering in this respect Judith Butler's own original emphasis on the regulative force of reiterated gender performances in consolidating heteronormative lifeworlds (Butler, 1993; yet see Gregson, 2003, on the limits of the performance of performativity *qua* theory). Dominance needs to be understood as working repetitively like this at and across a variety of scales, including global spaces, producing relations of authority and subordination (Butler, 2004). The type of power relations performed and understood as 'dominance' are specific, however. How can this specificity be best understood?

We can return to find some useful resources in Stuart Hall's path-opening paper on 'Race, articulation and societies structured in dominance' (Hall, 1980). Hall's argument takes off from concerns about combined class and race subordination in South Africa. He moves carefully from this situated conjuncture towards a theoretical engagement with Althusser's cryptic account of society as a 'complex unity, structured in dominance' (p. 325), and famously proceeds through a complete radicalization of the concept of overdetermination (326–28) to an argument about the ways in which we need to examine how class and race mediate domination through various conjunctural *articulations*. By the end of the essay, though, something has happened to the notion of dominance itself that Hall does not address. He had

started by reworking a Marxist structuralist framing of the term in which dominance meant affirming in the last instance the pre-eminence of one set of causal imperatives (i.e., the economic). Hall's first critical move *vis-à-vis* the structuralists is to say that class dominance of elites over workers is powerfully mediated through articulatory racial practices. However, as he proceeds to move much further past structuralism with his reworked Gramscian notions of articulation, overdetermination and hegemony, this theoretical framing falls away. Hall's own concern still remains at the end with how to make nonreductionist sense of capitalist-cum-racist social relations without substituting causal pluralism for analysis of real hierarchies of force. Nevertheless, when Hall reaches his conclusion he has: (a) made a thorough case against any *a priori* assumptions about what sorts of processes explain hierarchies of force (including all his arguments against economism and class reductionism); (b) argued that the forcefields of power, domination and subordination need to be understood in terms of various situated arrangements of hegemony; and (c) thereby freed up the category of dominance to serve as a name for a particular type of hegemony.

Hall's essay does not detail how dominance might be theorized as a more particular type of hegemony, but it does provide further inspiration insofar as it carefully notes Gramsci's own, often ignored, point that hegemony involves a mixture of *both* coercion and consent (Hall, 1980: 331–32 especially; cf. Anderson, 1977). Using this, we can, I think, reinterpret *dominance* after Hall after Gramsci as *a particular form of hegemony articulated (and thus both experienced and consolidated) more through coercion than through consent*. This does not mean that dominance eclipses the ideological interpellation of consent altogether. Understood instead as just part of the wider overdetermination of social and political life, it can be analyzed as working in conjunction with (and in varying, situationally specific degrees of) consent to skew the larger performance of hegemony more towards the pole of brute force, naked violence and coercion. In our attempts to speak truth to power, to name and restrain dominance, and to avoid the pitfalls of political abdication in nonrepresentational theoreticism, such a definition is, I submit, useful. However, having thereby interpreted dominance as part of the wider flux of hegemony one further clarification about its political geography is necessary because of an unhelpful dichotomy that has elsewhere divided approaches to describing, or, more commonly, assuming, the contours of hegemony's own political geography. On the one side are the analyses best illustrated by the formidable example of *Hegemony and socialist strategy* (Laclau and Mouffe, 1985) which despite its dense deconstruction of hegemony's genealogy retains an implicit assumption of the nation state as the territorial container of hegemonic struggle (see Sparke, 2005: Chapter 4). On the other side are the world systems approaches that tend by contrast to theorize hegemony chiefly on a global scale (Taylor, 1996). Tellingly, these discontinuous geographies also bifurcate the approach to hegemony itself with the nation-state-scaled approaches stressing hegemony as consensual power and the global-scaled approaches stressing hegemony as coercive power. To be sure, attempts are made to cross this divide, but world-scale attempts to theorize consent as 'soft power' often take the form of shallow, dehistoricized and ironically unworldly accounts of American culture (e.g., Nye, 2002), while more sophisticated cultural theories that broach questions of dominance on a world scale tend nonetheless to downplay global power politics while privileging issues of articulation and audience reception in national domestic space (e.g., McAlister, 2001).

A useful way beyond the dualistic divides in approaches to hegemony is suggested by feminist theorists who have sought to analyze what they call the 'scattered hegemonies' of subordination and resistance in the context of intensifying global interdependency (Grewal and Kaplan, 1994; see also Kaplan *et al.*, 1999). There is a great sensitivity to the ways that race, language, nationality and sexuality, as well as gender, mediate transnational ties in this work. Yet as Jennifer Hyndman has indicated, the emphasis is more on cultural difference and economic inequality than political conflict *per se* (Hyndman, 2004: 315). This, I think, is where an attention to dominance can potentially prove complementary. Further developing the 'scattered hegemonies' approach, we can therefore also analyze scattered forms of *dominance-in-hegemony*, and these can be understood as operative at and across the personal and national scales just as much as (and often at the same time as) at the global scales of transnationalism and the world system. Moreover, adapting one of Sallie Marston's feminist arguments in the debate over scale-switching (Marston, 2000), we can also seek to investigate how the dominance that is sometimes coercive with consent in a particular personal sphere of social reproduction is interarticulated with dominance at other scales (see the related discussion of the terroristic ties between personal and structural violence in Marston and Rouhani, 2001). As Klaus Theweleit (1987), for example, showed with his investigation of the relays between interpersonal fascist violence against women, Jews and socialists and the interstate violence of Nazi war-making and occupation, these articulations are consequential and not just analogical. Such an approach to dominance as a component form of hegemony at and across a variety of scales does not leave us marooned on an epistemological island (*pace* Purcell, 2003), but rather allows us to track how dominance as coercion works alongside the manufacture of consent to consolidate what might be called after Dan Clayton (2000) 'islands of truth'. In the rest of this essay two islands of geographical imagination and dominance interest me in this way: namely, home and empire. I want to suggest that attempts by political geographers to make sense of the scattered forms of dominance that subtend such spaces have also successfully begun to point to the contours of their connections in the context of globalization.

II Home, partitions and embodied dominance

In the wake of the anti-World Trade Organization protests in Seattle and elsewhere (see McFarlane and Hay, 2003; Wills, 2002), one of the fallback positions for third-way academic advocates of neoliberal globalization has been the argument that the processes of market-led integration, despite all their problems, will at least lead to more emancipation for women (e.g., Giddens, 2000). Little evidence is marshaled to support such spin, and a sobering corrective in this respect is provided by political geographies of women's experiences in export-processing zones (political geographies that have also been effectively developed outside of the discipline [e.g., Klein, 2000; 2002; Freeman 2000; 2001] and outside of Anglo-America [e.g., Rajalakshmi, 2004; Lindquist, 2002]). Within geography, Silvey's discussion of the story of the brutal rape and murder of an Indonesian labor activist called Marsinah points in this way to the ways in which the dominance of masculinist and militarist violence is performed as a more coercive component of hegemonic labor control

(Silvey, 2003: 138). At the same time, she also shows how in many ways such dominance backfires as a form of hegemony, becoming instead the target against which the resistance of export-processing workers can be further organized. 'Through Marsinah,' she explains, 'NGO activists in the Jowo region were able to capture the imaginations and the furor of the workers, furthering workers' willingness to strike' (2003: 138). More than this, Silvey's study is critically attuned to the local geographical variations in the organization of hegemony and resistance (see also the useful study of southeast Asian regional variations by Kelly, 2002). Building on the work of Sarah Radcliffe (1999) and others who have made the case for a contextually sensitive approach to women's activism, she thus compares the Jowo region near Jakarta with Sunda, a different suburban periphery near Bandung where she finds less resistance and a more successful alignment of local labor control with global production (a depressing third-way coda to the 'Non-Alignment' of the Bandung conference and the original declaration of a third world; cf. Scott, 1999). Silvey's examination of the hegemonic regime of labor control in Sunda leads her in turn to the homes of women like Sri. 'Sri (22 years old and single, living with her parents) said, "My parents wouldn't like it if I joined in strikes. We have to stick together and keep Sunda orderly"' (Silvey, 2003: 147). Based on multiple ethnographic encounters such as these, Silvey suggests that a local discourse of the dutiful daughter plays a central role in curtailing labor activism.

Silvey's findings compare in interesting ways with another exemplary political geographic study of an export-processing zone, Melissa Wright's Marxist-feminist analysis of disciplinary discourses in Dongguan, China. Here we meet the verbose manager Howard Li who explains to Wright how: 'We have naive girls. Here we are like their parents. They have to obey us. We will do what is right for them and right for us' (Wright, 2003: 296). Wright's sobering analysis of the *in loco parentis* managerial discourse of Li and his colleagues shows how they repeatedly position themselves as patriarchal fathers providing a home in the heartless world of globalization. Wright contrasts this approach to discipline with her previous study of Mexican maquiladoras (Wright, 1999), emphasizing how in the Dongguan case the balancing of the corporeal turnover rate of women workers with the turnover time of capital is secured through diverse appeals to a discourse of dutiful daughterdom. The managers try to describe the women's discipline as the willing consent of well-behaved little girls, but Wright's critique shows how a great deal of patriarchal-cum-capitalist coercion is at work too. The hegemony of dutiful daughter discipline in the Dongguan factory, then, represents another situational mix of dominance-with-governance. The comparison with Silvey's study is particularly notable in this regard because, whereas most of the workers in Sunda are daughters of local families, the vast majority of workers in Wright's study are young women who have migrated from family homes in far away parts of rural China to find work in the giant export-processing zone that is the Pearl River Delta. The two studies therefore show that islands of truth about 'home' operate in at least two different ways to reproduce dominance over women workers. There are the close-by Indonesian homes of dutiful daughters who must not strike in order to keep domestic harmony aligned with the reproduction of global capital, and there are the faraway Chinese homes of migrant workers who must nevertheless work hard as dutiful daughters to maintain their factory home of their factory fathers as a haven amid globalization. Both studies thereby show that (notwithstanding the *value theory of labor*; Elson, 1979)

forms of extra-economic coercion are key to the contemporary globalization of capitalist production. At the same time both studies also introduce the ways in which an embodied, ethnographic approach to the question of 'home' can play a vital role in the development of a political geography of globalization.

Just like aspatial discussions of 'the state', neither abstract talk of 'the body' nor of 'the home' should be seen automatically as constitutive of political geography. Indeed, I think there is a particular danger of us fostering today a sort of reverse essentialism that misses important political geographical contexts and imperatives through an overemphasis on bodies as the essential stuff of study. Against this, a key achievement of feminist geographers in recent years has been to put bodies in contexts in ways that reveal their reciprocal political geographical implications for one another. It is exactly these sorts of strategies that underpin the inspiringly, praxis-orientated 'feminist geopolitics' recently advocated by Hyndman (2001), offering us an 'embodied view from which to analyze visceral conceptions of violence, security, and mobility' (Hyndman, 2004: 315). Critical work on the home, and what Mitchell *et al.* (2003) call 'life's work', has been central in this regard. While 'the associations of the home with power and conflict . . . have tended to be ignored in most nonfeminist analyses of the social meaning of the home' (McDowell, 2002: 816), feminist geographers have for a long time now emphasized the 'need to think of home in terms of dominance and resistance; to consider how and why a particular ideology of home maintains its hegemonic position and how this might be contested through alternative interpretations' (Gregson and Lowe, 1995: 226). The majority of the studies that have ensued have focused on North American and UK experiences, but one of the most recent and provocative problematizations of the home by a feminist geographer has been Paula Meth's (2003) study of the 'domus' in domestic violence in South Africa. Here again dominance comes into the foreground, but what makes Meth's research so provocative is the way in which she keeps asking what it means to talk about domestic violence for women who are essentially homeless, whose 'homes' consist of temporary shacks in squatter settlements that afford little protection from outside abusers while still providing a site for violent familial oppression within (cf. the discussion of 'houseless domesticity' by Appadurai, 2000). Meth's interviews with women dealing with such dominance also bring us face to face with the embodied experience of post-apartheid, ANC-mediated neoliberalism, revealing a new society structured in dominance that still shares all too much with the older South Africa discussed by Hall. Meth's own concern is with her interviewees' agency rather than South African neoliberalism, but for a valuable collection of studies on the links between liberalization and urban informality see Roy and Alsayyad (2004), especially the brilliant concluding essay by Ananya Roy (2004) on the transnational geopolitics of the staging of agency amid informality.

Studies such as Meth's and Roy's certainly put a worldly political geographical gloss on what Jane Jacobs, after Denis Wood, calls 'home rules' (Jacobs, 2003). So too, I would argue, does the fast-expanding research on foreign domestic workers (see England, 2003). Not only has such scholarship investigated the rules and relationships governing work and life inside the home (Cox and Narula, 2003), it has also gone back outside the home again and explored the transnational ties connecting the domestic work of nannies and maids to much more global forcefields of power and subordination (Ehrenreich and Hochschild, 2003; England, 1996; Momsen, 1999; Pratt, 2003). One only has to read a novel like Toni Morrison's *The bluest eye* to get a painful sense of how dominance can coerce women to care for other people's children while depriving

them of intimacy with their own (Morrison, 1970). Yet, while it was the transnational entrapment of slavery that led to the brutal deprivations Morrison evokes, it is the silent violence of global inequality and the resulting requirements for remittances from migrant workers that create the domestic 'servants of globalization' today (Parrenàs, 2001). Relatedly, another feminist contribution to the political geography of globalization has been work on the mediations of the state in managing migrant-worker movements (Lawson, 2002; Leitner, 1997). In the recent special issue of *Political Geography* featuring feminist critiques of the state, Alison Mountz (2004) argues that state practices too can be studied in terms of embodiment, and she seeks to show how with an ethnography of *Citizenship and Immigration Canada*. Her article provides a humanistic portrait of the ways in which state practices are mediated by messy interpersonal negotiations, but the resulting dominance of the state as it is experienced at the bodily level of migrants themselves – including the handcuffed children shown in the photograph used in the article – ultimately comes to appear less central in the analysis (compare Nevins, 2002, and Silvey, 2004).

Further feminist explorations of 'home' are also developed in two other papers in the special issue of *Political Geography* (Desbiens, 2004; and Walton-Roberts, 2004). These articles are more about governance and resistance than dominance, but the theme of negotiating national homelands that they develop can certainly be examined in other contexts in terms of how dominance, including patriarchal dominance, overdetermines the ties between home and homeland (see also Parker *et al.*, 1992). Carole Gallagher's (2000) work on the US Patriot movement does this, as does Colin Flint's (2001) article on the changing locales of far right 'nativism' in Pennsylvania. Both these studies also provide important contributions to what has tended to be an underdeveloped side of the geographical literature on masculinities, a literature that sometimes seems focused less on the performance of dominance than on the dominance of performance (see Berg and Longhurst, 2003, for a review). More than this, both Gallagher's and Flint's work usefully connect masculinist nativism in the USA to the economic repercussions of America's changing place in the global economy. Equally attentive to the global context of territorialization, Chaturvedi's postcolonial reflections on the partition of India and Pakistan remind us of other violent demarcations of homelands in the world beyond America (Chaturvedi, 2003; see also Gallagher and Froehling, 2002). He argues that a 'critical geography of partition(s) should compel us to look at the other side of the "exact" maps of the world', focusing not just on the map-makers but also on the 'map-takers' (Chaturvedi, 2003: 148). In doing so, he also underlines the ways in which dominance can overdetermine such 'map-taking': noting how the reverberations of partition in a BJP/RSS India have led to the borders of a Hindu homeland being marked in lethal ways on the bodies of Muslim women in Gujarat (see also Roy, 2003b).

In calling for a 'critical geography of partition(s)' Chaturvedi also highlights the lessons of Oren Yiftachel's hopeful attempts to develop a 'post-partition perspective' on Israel-Palestine. This work by an Israeli scholar who has courageously sought to develop a critique of the Zionist territorialization of 'ethnocracy' deserves more attention than it has received in political geography (see Yiftachel, 1999; 2000a; 2000b; 2003; 2004). While I am in favor of an anti-apartheid type divestment campaign to protest Israeli colonialism, I disagree with those who have called for a boycott of Israeli academics. One of my counterarguments is that scholars such as Yiftachel and his colleague David Newman (2003; 2004) continue to offer extremely useful and engaged domestic

critiques of the dominance pursued by Likud in the name of securing a Jewish homeland. As Derek Gregory's most recent book shows with political geographic passion, such work can be a vital resource for foreign critics too (Gregory, 2004a). Gregory also draws on many different Arab critiques, as well as the synthetic readings of diverse social and literary theories for which he is famous. However, what makes his latest writing so extraordinarily compelling from the perspective of progress in political geography is the way it connects postcolonial theory with the basic need to make sense of neocolonial reality (see also Gregory, 2003; 2004b). In doing so in a chapter addressing the violence of the recent Israeli attacks on the West Bank and Gaza and the associated geopolitical scripting of Palestinians as terrorists, he also systematically shows the relays between Sharon's local 'war on terror' and Bush's global 'war on terror' (see also Slater, 2001–2002). The result is a wonderfully worldly critique that, with attention to all kinds of embodied encounters on the ground (and their uneven erasure), operates just like the feminist deconstruction of home to make manifest the global production as well as the global stakes in the meaning of *homelands* (a double deconstruction that is also powerfully embodied in Jamoul, 2004).

There have been some other valuable analyses of the Israel-Palestine violence published in geography recently (see especially Falah, 2004; Finkelstein, 2003), but perhaps most powerful and poignant in the wake of his death are Edward Said's assessments of the situation in an interview with Cindi Katz and Neil Smith that was recorded in 2000 (Katz and Smith, 2003). Said's approach, of course, was never one that shied away from naming dominance. It also represented a responsibly embodied approach to the bodies (both dead and alive) that have suffered through the violence, including, not least of all, the many dispossessed Palestinian refugees whose rights (and routes) for an embodied return home have never been on the American 'road map for peace' or, as Said was keen to underline, even part of the Oslo cartographies. Nevertheless, he argued, '[t]he idea of return is central to Palestinian life in the global geography'. Discussing the challenges of transnational return, Said's various responses in the interview also introduced two other political geographies of globalization in valuably critical ways. Near the end, he notes the development of the rhetoric of 'globalization amongst the Palestinian authority as an alternative to liberation' (Katz and Smith, 2003: 640), but along the way, and contrapuntally, he underlines how the global cosmopolitanism heralded by many as a solution for the Middle East remains an inaccessible privilege held back from Palestinians treated repeatedly by border guards everywhere as possible terrorists. One of the advocates of a globalization solution that Said singles out for criticism in the interview is the *New York Times* columnist Thomas Friedman. To understand why someone such as Friedman can nevertheless persist with his messianic metanarrative – about 'the lexis' of liberalization leveling the global playing field and saving the world from 'olive tree' traditions of tribalism and terrorism (Friedman, 1999) – we now have to turn from the partition(s) of home to the imperialism(s) of empire.

III Empire, imperialism and the dominance of disembodiment

Friedman's *The lexis and the olive tree* is worth reading partly just as a symptomatic statement of the 'globalization is inevitable' metanarrative. Yet, despite all his influential soundbites about nobody being in control of the inexorable global juggernaut,

Friedman also alludes near the end of the book to a crucial and exceptional role for the USA as what he calls 'the hidden fist' backing up the free market's 'hidden hand' (1999: 373). Since 1999, these allusions to hyperpower exceptionalism have become much more pronounced in Friedman's writing as he has moved more and more from a multilateral neoliberalism towards the pole of a unilateral neoconservatism. Indeed, with his bellicose post-9/11 call to 'give war a chance' Friedman, (2002: 91), and his more recent democracy defying argument about Spain joining 'the axis of appeasement' (Friedman, 2004: 6), Friedman's rhetorical fist has become more akin to what Robert Kagan, one of the influential neoconservatives involved in the *Project for a New American Century*, once candidly called 'the unilateralist iron fist inside the multilateralist velvet glove' (Kagan, 2002). Such articulations of dominance-in-hegemony are important to track because of their influence in the Bush White House, and, through this exceptional home, their dominance in the world (Murphy, 2003). Beyond this, however, Friedman's own ideological transitions are worth noting because they also indicate how any adequate political geography of globalization must address the links running between the global entrenchment of neoliberalism and American dominance. If the new millennium began with much critical fanfare about the 'smooth', 'deterritorialized' and supposedly '*decentred*' space of the Empire outlined by Michael Hardt and Antonio Negri (2000), political geographers both inside and outside the discipline have increasingly been forced by events to try to come to terms with the violently *recentred* place of America in the context of neoliberal globalization.

With her speeches at the World Social Forum and other venues of anti-neoliberal organizing, perhaps one of the most articulate political geographers of American imperialism writing today has been Arundhati Roy (see Roy, 2003a; Bacqué, 2004). Her arguments are valuable because of the ways in which they combine a critique of American imperial dominance with an ongoing and profoundly worldly analysis of what, after Hardt and Negri, we can call the empire effects of neoliberal globalization (see also Roy, 2001; 2004). This sort of double-edged approach is not easy to develop, and yet it seems to me to be one of the most urgent political geographic challenges facing us today. We are confronted, I think, with a wholly new version, indeed a *New American Century* version, of the tensions over which Lenin and Kautsky famously diverged at the start of the first American century (Kautsky, 1970; Lenin, 1963). Today neither Lenin's vision of interimperial rivalries nor Kautsky's vision of a more collective global system of ultraimperialism adequately capture the complexity of America's neocolonial position in a neoliberal world order (Sidaway, 2000: 604–605). While the Clinton years made Kautsky's arguments seem somewhat more compelling (with the administration's commitments to the multilateralism of free trade and global marketization), and while Bush has made Lenin seem suddenly relevant again (unilaterally using the US war machine to reshape the Middle East, and radically undermine OPEC while funding US companies with anticipated Iraqi oil profits), the early twentieth-century arguments need updating based on the ways in which the imperial force of American dominance is mediated today through ideologies of market and judicial liberalization (Dezalay and Garth, 2002), constitutional reform (Robinson, 1996), transnational capitalist class formation (Sklair, 2001) and what scholars of governmentality have shown to be influential innovations in managerial vision, culture and risk management (Larner and Le Heron, 2003; Roberts, 2004; Ruddick, 2003; Thrift, 2000).

Despite its denial of contemporary American imperialism (Barawi and Laffey, 2002), its political abdications (Brennan, 2003), its adoption of a planar, Friedman-like vision of 'smooth space' in place of an analysis of uneven development (Sparke, 2003), and despite its quasi-religious and eurocentric invocation of homogenizing categories such as 'the multitude' (Rofel, 2001), Hardt and Negri's arguments about the quotidian biopolitics of empire provide some suggestive starting points for examining the dominance brought to Iraq by American intervention (Sparke, 2004). This is not to argue that the implementation of the 'Bush doctrine' of preemption simply led in the terms of *Empire* to an 'expansion of . . . "imperial sovereignty"' (Kirsch, 2003: 2). The dissonance between American dominance and Hardt and Negri's vision of imperial space as a decentered global free market fraternity is just too great and too contradictory. The geohistorical catalogue of American global aggressions (Kiernan, 2003; Slater, 2001–2002), the *realpolitik* goals of oil and gas field control (Klare, 2002; Mitchell, 2002; Parenti, 2003; Vitalis, 2002), the eccentric 'Israel's enemies are our enemies' attitudes of the neoconservative nationalists (Lind, 2003), the 'US against the EU' geopolitics (compare Gowan, 2001a and 2003b, with Kagan, 2003) and the often less-noted American global involvement in the building of the sorts of penal borders represented by Guantanamo's Camp X-ray (Dent and Davis, 2001), all these reterritorializations carried out in the name of the national homeland simply cannot be squared with a political geography of globalization that fetishizes the deterritorialization of network space and waxes lyrical about empire as 'a kind of smooth space across which subjectivities glide without substantial resistance' (Hardt and Negri, 2000: 198; compare also Hyndman, 2000, with Amin, 2002). Nevertheless, political geographers have shown that it is possible and, indeed, vital to explore (a) how neoliberal ideologies and norms (including their attendant geographical imaginings) helped make the imperial dominance thinkable and doable, and (b) how the global market dynamics of neoliberal capitalism also reflect such American imperialism.

Starting at the sharpest coercive tip of American imperialism, the 'full spectrum dominance' spoken of by Pentagon planners ahead of the much-touted 'shock and awe' blitzkrieg on Baghdad reflected the creeping influence of MBA vocabularies and visions. Steven Graham argues that this 'vertical geopolitics' of omniscient surveillance and global control had to be adapted on the ground in Iraq (Graham, 2004), an argument also fleshed out in sobering embodied detail in Gregory's exemplary chapter on the neocolonial violence of the war (Gregory, 2004a). Yet the signatures of global business biopolitics, including its god-tricks of global vision (Roberts, 2004), were written all over the global orchestration of the military violence. From the RAND corporation's talk of 'netwar', to the unreal 'reality-show' style of embedded-with-the-military reporting, to the sweetheart deals for private military contractors such as Haliburton, the neoliberal 'Revolution in Military Affairs' was very clear (see also Ek, 2000). Neoliberal nostrums about a newly networked world order were still more apparent in the globalist 'hidden-fist' script that was widely used as the 'real reason' for US intervention by neoliberal neocons such as Friedman. As Susan Roberts, Anna Secor and I have argued elsewhere (Roberts *et al.*, 2003), this geoeconomic script comprised a kind of neoliberal geopolitics in which the argument for intervention was made in the name of *connecting disconnected parts of the globalized world system* (see also Dalby, 2003). Thomas Barnett, a Department of Defense assistant for 'strategic futures' and author of a widely cited *Esquire*

magazine article on 'The Pentagon's New Map', was our focus because of his notably cartographic recycling of Friedmansque fantasies about the political geography of globalization (Barnett, 2003). For him the USA is the global 'systems manager' who every day has to apply the new global security maxim that 'disconnection defines danger' (see also Kennelly, 2003). However, Barnett's defense of unilateral systems management is by no means the only example of this emergent geoeconomic commonsense, and nor are his arguments as new as either he or other globalists would like to think. Two important books entitled *American empire* that were published in the midst of the buildup to the Iraq war made this very clear (Bacevich, 2002; Smith, 2003).

The first, quite uncritical essay by Andrew Bacevich, a retired US military officer, nevertheless usefully unpacked the simplistic media oppositions of multilateralism versus unilateralism to suggest that a much more continuous world-view has shaped American foreign policy (see also Gowan, 2003a). Republican and Democrat administrations alike, Bacevich argues, have effectively held to this common global purpose throughout most of the twentieth century: namely 'to expand an American imperium' by 'a commitment to global openness – removing barriers that inhibit the movement of goods, capital, ideas and people' (2002: 3). In a much more critical and historically sophisticated way, this is also an argument elaborated by Neil Smith in his *American empire* biography of the political geographer of globalization *par excellence*, Isaiah Bowman. Examining the start of the American Century through the embodied experiences and actions of 'Roosevelt's geographer', Smith shows how American leaders repeatedly imagined their postcolonial imperium as 'a quintessentially liberal victory over geography' (N. Smith, 2003: xviii). This 'deracination of geography in the liberal globalist vision', argues Smith, 'abetted a broad ideological self justification for the American Empire'. Elsewhere, John Agnew and Joanne Sharp (2002) have shown how the geopolitical genealogy of the liberal globalist vision in America can also be traced to the experience of the frontier – a thesis that also underpins Hart and Negri's argument that America holds a constitutionally privileged place in empire because of its long experience of networked governance over moving frontiers (see also Slater, 1999). Agnew and Sharp's more grounded essay builds on Sharp's valuable discourse analysis of American popular geopolitics in the cold war (Sharp, 2000; see also Sharp, 2004), and Agnew's long-standing concern with American exceptionalism (Agnew, 1983). In doing so, it suggests that while the liberal globalist vision may be 'deracinated' it is nevertheless racially and sexually underwritten by the dominance of white supremacism and patriarchal masculinism that once defined the moral geography of the US frontier (see also Shapiro, 1997; 2002). In turn, with Bush's born-again Christian-cum-cold war moral geography of the 'Axis of Evil', we saw how the old affect of America as a frontier nation could be brought back to life through an event such as 9/11 and channeled into a geopolitical justification for contemporary imperialism (Ó Tuathail, 2003). Such critical observations underline the importance of studying how geopolitical mythmaking about homelands and their others fills deracinated global spaces of geographical ignorance (cf. Smith and Mitchell, 1991; Driver, 2003). They also indicate some of the moral problems with avowedly progressive efforts by Christian geographers to 'deliver us from evil' (Cloke, 2002: compare with Hannity, 2004, as well as with the much more emancipatory geographies of evil sketched by Phillip Pullman in the *His dark materials* trilogy [Pullman, 1996; 1997; 2000]). Yet, if national

geopolitical affect might be understood to have come together with more globalist justifications to justify US dominance in Iraq, how can we understand the still more contradictory relationship between these actions and the actual economic organization of global capitalism?

Harvey's creative arguments about 'accumulation by dispossession' are especially compelling (Harvey, 2003), but I defer further discussion of this brutal form of neo-liberal governance to the next report. Another useful approach to answering such questions is offered by Agnew's ongoing work on American hegemony (2003b; 2003c). Explaining that he prefers the term 'hegemony' over 'empire', Agnew ably moves between the Gramscian and world systems registers of the term to make a much more robust case than Hardt and Negri ever do about the ways in which American national norms have also played a key role in materially expanding as well as ideologically justifying a liberal global capitalism. For him globalization (in the basic sense of increasing and increasingly liberalized economic integration) is in part a product of American norm-setting force, but it does not constitute either a specifically American imperium nor an all-encompassing empire. This insistence, combined with his emphasis on a global hegemony of consent, means that Agnew has less to say about American hegemony through dominance. For him the geopolitical violence visited on Iraq is more a sign of increasing hegemonic weakness than of strength, and in terms of the long-term and even medium-term economic outlook for the USA (and in light of the increased borrowing to pay for the war effort) such a view seems to make sense (see Brenner, 2002; Greider, 2002; Wallerstein, 2003). However, a number of Marxist scholars who are not so ready to accept the post-Bretton Woods hegemonic decline thesis have complicated this picture by highlighting how in the mean time America continues to enjoy a completely asymmetrical *economic* dominance, a dominance based in no small part on the government's ability to continue borrowing in the *de facto* global reserve currency (see especially Gowan, 1999; 2001b; and Panitch, 2000). According to Perry Anderson, such economic dominance, when combined with America's military dominance (and underpinned, he also argues in a rather too environmentally determinist flourish, by America's physical geography), allows the USA to swing away from a hegemony of consent towards a hegemony of force (Anderson, 2002). In Anderson's account such swings are narrated chronologically, and he suggests in this way that the swing towards the pole of force that we have witnessed of late will likely be short-lived. Adopting a more political geographical (as opposed to a physical geographical) approach, Leo Panitch and Sam Gindin (2003) argue that America's long success in extending a hegemony of consent around liberal capitalism has now come face to face with its limits in the periphery. The result, they suggest, is a geographical division of hegemony with ongoing hegemonies of consent in the core and scattered hegemonies of dominance in the periphery as nonperforming, nondisciplining states are brought back into line. Over and above all this, they caution against overly economic (and often overly optimistic) anticipations of a looming financial meltdown and remind us thus not to discount America's continuing capacity to intervene globally with both force and capitalist success.

Panitch and Gindin's thesis accords well with Naomi Klein's brilliant discussion of the Iraq war as a form of 'privatization in disguise' (Klein, 2003), and it provides much more materialist depth to the sorts of planar cartographies of Core and Gap offered by Barnett. Beyond this, however, it also suggests that we need to come to

terms not just with the god-tricks of globalist visioning that mediated the dominance, but also with what might be called a Jesus-trick too: a Jesus-trick imagined in the geopolitically incarnate form of the US military coming down to earth (or at least dropping bombs down to earth) and bringing neoliberal apostates and agnostics into order (cf. Graham, 2003). Perhaps, the best intellectual rendering of the resulting double vision came in the midst of the buildup to the Iraq war with the publication of Phillip Bobbitt's symptomatic *The shield of Achilles* (Bobbitt, 2003). Even the anachronistic Christian rhetoric of the book's dedication – 'To those by whose love God's grace was first made known to me and to those whose loving-kindness has ever since sustained me in His care' – alludes to the godly imaginations that follow for readers who can bear to go beyond the Baptist unction. If they do they are exposed to an argument of enormous arrogance (as well as eloquence) that builds on its author's god's-eye view as a powerful Washington intellectual: a nephew of Lyndon Johnson, a law professor in both Texas and Oxford, and a former Director of Intelligence on the National Security Council under Clinton. What makes Bobbitt's vision a double one, though, is that he combines all kinds of geopolitical assertions about the need for American leadership with a remarkably lucid discussion of neoliberal globalization, or what he likes to portray as the rise of choice-filled 'market-states'. As the war went on, these illusions became clearer to many critics too, critics for whom the 'reality of choice' was resistance: not Bobbitt's Achilles' shield so much as American imperialism's Achilles' heel. Roy's critique of the illusory military-cum-corporate missionary mandate was one of the best. Given that it mixes metaphors of home with a critique of empire in a way that alludes to their links, and given that it illustrates resistance and anticipates a discussion of democracy as governance, it is a fitting note on which to end this geographical exploration of dominance and globalization. 'So here we are, the people of the world, confronted with an empire armed with a mandate from heaven (and, as added insurance, the most formidable arsenal of weapons of mass destruction in history). Here we are, confronted with an empire that has conferred upon itself the right to war at will, and the right to deliver people from corrupting ideologies, from religious fundamentalists, dictators, sexism and poverty by the age-old, tried-and-tested practice of extermination. Empire is on the move, and democracy is its sly new war cry. Democracy home-delivered to your doorstep by daisy-cutters. Death is a small price to pay for the privilege of sampling this new product: Instant-Mix Imperial Democracy (bring to a boil, add oil, then bomb)' (Roy, 2003c).

References

- Agnew, J.** 1983: An excess of 'national exceptionalism': towards a new political geography of American foreign policy. *Political Geography Quarterly* 2, 152–66.
- 2003a: Contemporary political geography: intellectual heterodoxy and its dilemmas. *Political Geography* 22, 603–606.
- 2003b: *Geopolitics: re-visioning world politics* (second edition). London: Routledge.
- 2003c: American hegemony into American empire? Lessons from the invasion of Iraq. *Antipode* 35, 871–85.
- Agnew, J.** and **Sharp, J.** 2002: America, frontier nation: from abstract space to worldly place. In Agnew, J. and Sharp, J., editors, *American space/American place: geographies of the contemporary United States*, New York: Routledge, 79–107.

- Amin, A.** 2002: Spatialities of globalisation. *Environment and Planning A* 34, 385–99.
- Anderson, P.** 1977: The antinomies of Antonio Gramsci. *New Left Review* 100, 5–80.
- 2002: Force and consent. *New Left Review* 17, 5–30.
- Appadurai, A.** 2000: Spectral housing and urban cleansing: notes on millennial Mumbai. *Public Culture* 12, 627–51.
- Bacevich, A.** 2002: *American empire: the realities and consequences of U.S. diplomacy*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Bacqué, R.** 2004: Arundhati Roy: une indienne contre les fauves. *Le Monde* 2 (Janvier), 25–32.
- Barawi, T. and Laffey, M.** 2002: Retrieving the imperial: empire and international relations. *Millennium* 31, 109–27.
- Barnett, T.** 2003: The Pentagon's new map. *Esquire* (March). Available at <http://www.nwc.navy.mil/newrulesets/ThePentagonsNewMap.htm> (last accessed 5 April 2003).
- Berg, L. and Longhurst, R.** 2003: Placing masculinities and culture. *Gender, Place and Culture* 10, 341–60.
- Bobbitt, P.** 2003: *The shield of Achilles: war, peace and the course of history*. New York: Knopf.
- Brennan, T.** 2003: The Italian ideology. In Balakrishnan, G., editor, *Debating empire*, London: Verso 97–120.
- Brenner, R.** 2002: *The boom and the bubble: the US in the world economy*. New York: Verso.
- Brown, M. and Staeheli, L.** 2003: 'Are we there yet?' Feminist political geographies. *Gender, Place and Culture: A Journal of Feminist Geography* 10, 247–55.
- Butler, J.** 1993: *Bodies that matter: on the discursive limits of 'sex'*. New York: Routledge.
- 2004: *Precarious life: the power of mourning and violence*. New York: Verso.
- Chaturvedi, S.** 2003: Towards a critical geography of partition(s): some reflections on and from South Asia. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 21, 148–54.
- Clayton, D.** 2000: *Islands of truth: the imperial fashioning of Vancouver Island*. Vancouver: University of British Columbia (UBC) Press.
- Cloke, P.** 2002: Deliver us from evil? Prospects for living ethically and acting politically in human geography. *Progress in Human Geography* 26, 587–604.
- Cooper, F.** 2001: What is the concept of globalization good for? An African historian's perspective. *African Affairs* 100, 189–213.
- Coronil, F.** 2000: Towards a critique of global-centrism: speculations on capitalism's nature. *Public Culture* 12, 351–74.
- Cox, K.R. and Low, M.** 2003: Political geography in question. *Political Geography* 22, 599–602.
- Cox, R. and Narula, R.** 2003: Playing happy families: rules and relationships in au pair employing households in London, England. *Gender, Place and Culture: A Journal of Feminist Geography* 10, 333–44.
- Dalby, S.** 2003: Calling 9/11: geopolitics, security and America's new war. *Geopolitics* 8, 61–86.
- Dent, G. and Davis, A.** 2001: Prison as a border: a conversation on gender, globalization and punishment. *Signs* 26, 1235–41.
- Desbiens, C.** 2004: 'Women with no femininity': gender, race and nation-building in the James Bay Project. *Political Geography* 23, 347–66.
- Desbiens, C., Mountz, A. and Walton-Roberts, M.** 2004: Introduction: reconceptualizing the state from the margins of political geography. *Political Geography* 23, 241–43.
- Dezalay, Y. and Garth, B.G.** 2002: *The internationalization of palace wars: lawyers, economists and the contest to transform Latin American states*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Driver, F.** 2003: The geopolitics of knowledge and ignorance. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geography* NS 28, 131–32.
- Ehrenreich, B. and Hochschild, A.R.** 2003: *Global woman: nannies, maids, and sex workers in the new economy*. New York: Metropolitan Books.
- Ek, R.** 2000: A revolution in military geopolitics? *Political Geography* 19, 841–74.
- Elson, D.**, editor 1979: *Value: the representation of labour in capitalism*. Atlantic Highlands, NJ: Humanities Press.
- England, K.**, editor 1996: *Who will mind the baby?: geographies of child care and working mothers*. London and New York: Routledge.
- 2003: Towards a feminist political geography? *Political Geography* 22, 611–16.
- Falah, G.** 2004: Truth at war and naming the intolerable in Palestine. *Antipode* 36, 596–600.
- Fincher, R.** 2004: From dualisms to multiplicities: gendered political practices in the state, the market and civil society. In Stecheli, L., Kofman, E. and Peake, L., editors, *Mapping women making politics*, New York: Routledge, 129–41.

- Finkelstein, N.** 2003: Prospects for ending the occupation. *Antipode* 35(5), 839–45.
- Flint, C.** 2001: Right-wing resistance to the process of American hegemony: the changing political geography of nativism in Pennsylvania, 1920–1998. *Political Geography* 20, 763–86.
- Freeman, C.** 2000: *High tech and high heels in the global economy: women, work and pink-collar identities in the Caribbean*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- 2001: Is local:global as feminine:male? rethinking the gender of globalization. *Signs* 26, 1007–37.
- Friedman, T.** 1999: *The Lexus and the Olive Tree: understanding globalization*. New York: Farrar, Strauss and Giroux.
- 2002: *Longitudes and attitudes: exploring the world after September 11*. New York: Farrar, Strauss and Giroux.
- 2004: The axis of appeasement. *International Herald Tribune* 17 March, 6.
- Gallagher, C.** 2000: Global change, local angst: class and the American Patriot Movement. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 18, 667–92.
- Gallagher, C. and Froehling, O.** 2002: New world warriors: ‘nation’ and ‘state’ in the politics of the Zapatista and US Patriot Movements: *Social and Cultural Geography* 3, 81–102.
- Giddens, A.** 2000: *Runaway world: how globalization is reshaping our lives*. New York: Routledge.
- Gowan, P.** 1999: *Global gamble: Washington's Faustian bid for global dominance*. New York: Verso.
- 2001a: Neoliberal cosmopolitanism. *New Left Review*, 11, 1–12.
- 2001b: Explaining the American boom: the roles of ‘globalisation’ and United States global power. *New Political Economy* 6, 359–74.
- 2003a: Instruments of empire. *New Left Review* 21, 31–36.
- 2003b: The American campaign for global sovereignty. *Socialist Register: Fighting Identities*, 1–27.
- Graham, B.** 2003: Pentagon to probe remarks made by General Boykin. *The Washington Post* 22 October, A2.
- Graham, S.** 2004: Vertical geopolitics: Baghdad and after. *Antipode* 36, 12–23.
- Gregory, D.** 2003: Defiled cities. *Singapore Journal of Tropical Geography* 24, 307–26.
- 2004a: *The colonial present*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- 2004b: Palestine under siege. *Antipode* 36, 601–606.
- Gregson, N.** 2003: Discipline games, disciplinary games and the need for a post-disciplinary practice: responses to Nigel Thrift's ‘The future of geography’. *Geoforum* 34, 5–7.
- Gregson, N. and Lowe, M.** 1995: ‘Home’-making: on the spatiality of daily social reproduction in contemporary middle-class Britain. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers* NS 20, 224–235.
- Greider, W.** 2002: The end of empire. *The Nation* 23 September, 13–15.
- Grewal, I. and Kaplan, C.** editors 1994: *Scattered hegemonies: postmodernity and transnational feminist practices*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Hall, S.** 1980: Race, articulation and societies structured in dominance. In *Sociological theories: race and colonialism*, Paris: UNESCO, 305–45.
- Hannity, S.** 2004: *Deliver us from evil: defeating terrorism, despotism, and liberalism*. New York: HarperCollins ReganBooks.
- Hardt, M. and Negri, A.** 2000: *Empire*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Hart, G.** 2001: Development critiques in the 1990s: culs de sac and promising paths. *Progress in Human Geography* 25, 649–58.
- 2002: Geography and development: development/s beyond neoliberalism? Power, culture, political economy. *Progress in Human Geography* 26, 812–22.
- 2003: *Disabling globalization: places of power in post-apartheid South Africa*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- 2004: Geography and development: critical ethnographies. *Progress in Human Geography* 28, 113–22.
- Harvey, D.** 2003: *The new-imperialism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Hyndman, J.** 1997: Border crossings. *Antipode* 29, 149–76.
- 2000: *Managing displacement: refugees and the politics of humanitarianism*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- 2001: Towards a feminist geopolitics. *The Canadian Geographer*, 45, 210–22.
- 2004: Mind the gap: bridging feminist and political geography through geopolitics. *Political Geography* 23, 307–22.
- Jacobs, J.** 2003: Home rules. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers* NS 28, 259–63.
- Jamoul, L.** 2004: Palestine – in search of dignity. *Antipode* 36, 581–95.

- Kagan, R.** 2002: Multilateralism, American style. *The Washington Post* 13 September. Available at <http://www.newamericancentury.org/global-091302.htm> (last accessed 7 September 2003).
- 2003: *Of paradise and power: America and Europe in the new world order*. New York: Knopf.
- Kaplan, C., Alarcón, N. and Moallem, M.**, editors 1999: *Between woman and nation: nationalisms, transnational feminisms, and the state*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Katz, C.** 2001: On the grounds of globalization: a topography for feminist political engagement. *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society* 26, 1213–34.
- Katz, C. and Smith, N.** 2003: An interview with Edward Said. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 21, 635–51.
- Kautsky, K.** 1970: Ultra-imperialism. *New Left Review* 59, 43–46.
- Kelly, P.** 1999: The geographies and politics of globalization. *Progress in Human Geography* 23, 379–400.
- 2002: Spaces of labour control: comparative perspectives from south-east Asia. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers*, NS 27, 395–411.
- Kennelly, D.** 2003: Q and A... Thomas P.M. Barnett. *Doublethink* Summer, 17–21.
- Kiernan, B.** 2003: 'Collateral damage' from Cambodia to Iraq. *Antipode* 35, 846–55.
- Kirsch, S.** 2003: Empire and the Bush doctrine. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 21, 1–6.
- Klare, M.** 2002: United States: energy and strategy. *Le Monde Diplomatique* November, 2.
- Klein, N.** 2000: *No logo: taking aim at the brand bullies*. New York: Picador.
- 2002: *Fences and windows: dispatches from the front lines of the globalization debate*. New York: Picador.
- 2003: Privatization in disguise? *The Nation* 15 April.
- Kofman, E.** 2003: Future directions in political geography. *Political Geography* 22, 621–24.
- Laclau, E. and Mouffe, C.** 1985: *Hegemony and socialist strategy: towards a radical democratic politics*. New York: Verso.
- Larner, W. and Le Heron, R.** 2003: The spaces and subjects of a globalizing economy: a situated exploration of method. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 20, 753–74.
- Lawson, V.** 2002: Global governmentality and graduated sovereignty: national belonging among poor migrants in Ecuador. *Scottish Geographical Journal* 118, 235–55.
- Leitner, H.** 1997: Reconfiguring the spatiality of power: the construction of a supra-national migration framework for the European Union. *Political Geography* 16, 123–43.
- Lenin, V.** 1963: Imperialism, the highest stage of capitalism: a popular outline. In Lenin, V., *Selected works in three volumes: volume one*, Moscow: Progress Publishers, 634–31.
- Lind, M.** 2003: The weird men behind George W. Bush's war. *The New Statesman* 7 April. Available at <http://www.newstatesman.com> (last accessed 18 April 2003).
- Lindquist, J.** 2002: *The anxieties of mobility: development, migration and tourism in the Indonesian borderlands*. Stockholm: Department of Anthropology, Stockholm University.
- Marston, S.** 2000: The social construction of scale. *Progress in Human Geography* 24, 219–42.
- Marston, S. and Rouhani, F.** 2001: Teaching and learning the lesson of complexity. *The Arab World Geographer* 4. Available at <http://users.fmg.uva.nl/vmamadouh/awg/forum2/marston.html> (last accessed 22 March 2004).
- McAlister, M.** 2001: *Epic encounters: culture, media and U.S. interests in the Middle East, 1945–2000*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- McDowell, L.** 2002: Unsettling naturalisms. *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society* 27, 815–22.
- McFarlane, T. and Hay, I.** 2003: The battle for Seattle: protest and popular geopolitics in *The Australian* newspaper. *Political Geography* 22, 211–32.
- Meth, P.** 2003: Rethinking the 'domus' in domestic violence: homelessness, space and domestic violence in South Africa. *Geoforum* 34, 317–27.
- Mitchell, K., Marston, S. and Katz, C.** 2003: Introduction: life's work. *Antipode* 35, 415–42.
- Mitchell, T.** 2002: McJihad: Islam in the U.S. global order. *Social Text* 73 20, 1–18.
- Momsen J.**, editor 1999: *Gender, migration and domestic service*. London: Routledge.
- Morrison, T.** 1970: *The bluest eye*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Mountz, A.** 2004: Embodying the nation-state: Canada's response to human smuggling. *Political Geography* 23, 323–45.

- Murphy, A.B.** 2002: Geopolitical folly: the U.S. must examine the consequences of war with Iraq. *The Register Guard* [Eugene/Springfield, OR] 20 October, B1, B4.
- 2003: Geopolitical perspectives on the Iraq war: emerging insights and remaining challenges. *The Arab World Geographer* 6(1). Available at <http://users.fmg.uva.nl/vmamadouh/awg/forum2/murphy.html> (last accessed 22 March 2004).
- Nagar, R., Lawson, V., McDowell, L. and Hanson, S.** 2002: Locating globalization: feminist (re)readings of the subjects and spaces of globalization. *Economic Geography* 78, 257–84.
- Nevins, J.** 2002: *Operation Gatekeeper: the rise of the 'illegal alien' and the making of the U.S.–Mexico boundary*. New York: Routledge.
- Newman, D.** 2003: Barriers or bridges? On borders, fences and walls. *Tikkun* 18, 54–58.
- 2004: The separation fence: security barrier or political border. Paper presented at the Royal Institute for International Affairs. Available at <http://realserver.alchemydigital.com/ramgen/~riia/newman.rm> (last accessed 12 March, 2004).
- Nye, J.** 2002: *The paradox of American power: why the world's only superpower can't go it alone*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Ó Tuathail, G.** 2003: Just looking for a fight: American affect and the invasion of Iraq. *Antipode* 35, 856–70.
- Panitch, L.** 2000: The new imperial state. *New Left Review* 2, 5–20.
- Panitch, L. and Gindin, S.** 2003: Global capitalism and American empire. *Socialist Register*. Available at http://www.yorku.ca/socreg/Panitch%20and%20Gindin%2004.html#_ednref14 (last accessed 8 September 2003).
- Parenti, C.** 2003: Mapping Planet America. *AlterNet* 7 April. Available at www.alternet.org (last accessed 2 April 2004).
- Parrenàs, R.S.** 2001: *Servants of globalization: women, migration and domestic work*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Philo, C. and Smith, F.M.** 2003: Guest editorial: political geographies of children and young people. *Space and Polity* 7, 99–115.
- Pratt, G.** 2003: Valuing childcare: troubles in suburbia. *Antipode* 35, 581–603.
- Pullman, P.** 1996: *The golden compass*. New York: Knopf.
- 1997: *The subtle knife*. New York: Knopf.
- 2000: *The amber spyglass*. New York: Knopf.
- Purcell, M.** 2003: Islands of practice and the Marston/Brenner debate: toward a more synthetic critical human geography. *Progress in Human Geography* 27, 317–32.
- Radcliffe, S.** 1999: Latina labour: restructuring of work and renegotiations of gender relations in contemporary Latin America. *Environment and Planning A* 31, 196–208.
- Rajalakshmi, T.K.** 2004: Sita and her daughters: women workers at an Indian export-processing zone. *Third World Network*. Available at <http://www.twinside.org.sg/title/sita-cn.htm> (last accessed 19 March 2004).
- Roberts, S.** 2004: Global strategic vision, managing the world. In Maurer, B. and Perry, R.W., editors *Globalization under construction: governmentality, law and identity*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Roberts, S., Secord, A. and Sparke, M.** 2003: Neoliberal geopolitics. *Antipode* 35, 886–97.
- Robinson, W.I.** 1996: *Promoting polyarchy: globalization, US intervention and hegemony*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Rofel, L.** 2001: Discrepant modernities and their discontents. *Positions* 9, 637–49.
- Roy, Arundhati** 2001: *Power politics*. Cambridge, MA: South End Press.
- 2003a: *War talk*. Cambridge, MA: South End Press.
- 2003b: Mesopotamia. Babylon. The Tigris and Euphrates. *The Guardian* 2 April. Available at <http://www.guardian.co.uk/Iraq/Story/0,2763,927849,00.html> (last accessed 2 April 2004).
- 2003c: Instant-mix imperial democracy (buy one, get one free). Paper presented at the Riverside Church, New York City, 13 May, permission from arnove@igc.org.
- 2004: An ordinary person's guide to empire. Cambridge, MA: South End Press.
- Roy, Ananya** 2004: Transnational trespassings: the geopolitics of urban informality. In Roy, A. and Alsayyad, N. *Urban informality: transnational perspectives from the Middle East, Latin America and South Asia*, Lanham, MD: Lexington Books, 289–317.
- Roy, Ananya and Alsayyad, N.** 2004: *Urban informality: transnational perspectives from the Middle East, Latin America and South Asia*. Lanham, MD: Lexington Books.
- Ruddick, S.** 2003: The politics of aging: globalization and the restructuring of youth and childhood. *Antipode* 35, 334–63.

- Sakho, H.** 2003: Looking deep into the surface: critical thinking and uncritical geography. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 21, 142–47.
- Scott, D.** 1999: *Refashioning futures: criticism after postcoloniality*, Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Shapiro, M.** 1997: *Violent cartographies: mapping cultures of war*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- 2002: Wanted: dead or alive. *Theory and Event* 5, 1–9.
- Sharp, J.P.** 2000: *Condensing the cold war: Reader's Digest and American identity*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- 2004: Indigestible geopolitics: the many readings of the *Digest*. *Geopolitics* 8, 197–206.
- Sidaway, J.D.** 2000: Postcolonial geographies: an exploratory essay. *Progress in Human Geography* 24, 591–612.
- Silvey, R.** 2003: Spaces of protest: gendered migration, social networks, and labor activism in West Java, Indonesia. *Political Geography* 22, 129–55.
- 2004: Transnational domestication: state power and Indonesian migrant women in Saudi Arabia. *Political Geography* 23, 245–64.
- Sklair, L.** 2001: *The transnational capitalist class*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Slater, D.** 1999: Locating the American century: themes for a post-colonial perspective. In Slater, D. and Taylor, P., editors, *The American century: consensus and coercion in the projection of American power*, Oxford: Blackwell, 17–31.
- 2001–2002: Politics of memory/states of terror. *Soundings* 19 (Winter).
- Smith, N.** 2003: *American empire: Roosevelt's geographer and the prelude to globalization*, Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Smith, N.** and **Mitchell, D.** 1991: The courtesy of political geography: introductory text books and the war against Iraq. *Political Geography Quarterly* 10, 338–41.
- Smith, R.** 2003: World city topologies: *Progress in Human Geography* 27, 561–82.
- Sparke, M.** 2003: American empire and globalization: postcolonial speculations on neocolonial enframing. *Singapore Journal of Tropical Geography* 24, 373–89.
- 2005: *In the space of theory: poststructuralist geographies of the nation-state*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Staeheli, L.** 1996: Publicity, privacy and women's political action. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 14, 601–19.
- Taylor, P.** 1996: *The way the modern world works: world hegemony to world impasse*. Chichester: Wiley.
- Theweleit, K.** 1987: *Male fantasies: volume one, women, floods, bodies and history*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
- Thrift, N.** 2000: Performing cultures in the new economy. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* 90, 674–92.
- Vitalis, R.** 2002: Black gold, white crude: an essay on American exceptionalism, hierarchy and hegemony in the Gulf. *Diplomatic History* 26, 23–49.
- Wallerstein, I.** 2003: *The decline of American power: the U.S. in a chaotic world*. New York: The New Press.
- Walton-Roberts, M.** 2004: Rescaling citizenship: gendering Canadian immigration policy. *Political Geography* 23, 265–81.
- Wills, J.** 2002: Political economy III: neoliberal chickens, Seattle and geography. *Progress in Human Geography* 26, 90–100.
- Wright, M.W.** 1999: The politics of relocation: gender, nationality and value in the Maquiladoras. *Environment and Planning A*, 1601–17.
- 2003: Factory daughters and Chinese modernity: a case from Dongguan. *Geoforum* 34, 291–301.
- Yiftachel, O.** 1999: 'Ethnocracy': the politics of Judaizing Israel/Palestine: *Constellations* 22, 43–75.
- 2000a: Social control, urban planning and ethno-class relations: Mizrahim in Israel's development towns: *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 24, 417–34.
- 2000b: Ethnocracy and its discontents: minorities, protest and the Israeli polity. *Critical Inquiry* 26, 725–56.
- 2003: Relocating 'the critical'? Reflections from Israel/Palestine. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 21, 137–42.
- 2004: Contradictions and dialectics. *Antipode* 36, 607–13.