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This address is dedicated to the memory of Gloria Anzaldúa, who passed away last May. With her death, I lost a friend. The world lost a brilliant theorist of the arbitrariness of borders and the pain that they inflict, of the harsh realities of internal colonization, and of the challenges and delights of embracing multiple psychic locations. Anzaldúa saw the border between the United States and Mexico as “una herida abierta, where the Third World grates against the first and bleeds. And before a scab forms hemorrhages again, the lifeblood of two worlds merging to form a third country—a border culture.”1 She was unwilling to reject any part of herself to stop the contradictory voices that buzzed through her head. (“Me zumba la cabeza con lo contradictorio,” she wrote.) But the miracle of Borderlands/La Frontera is that she transmutes the buzzing into a site of creative energy: she wrote, “En unas pocas centurias, the future will belong to the mestiza. Because the future depends on the breaking down of paradigms; it depends on the straddling of two or more cultures.”2

The last time I spoke with Gloria on the phone, she was helping me pinpoint the location of the fields in which she had picked cabbages and broccoli as a child. I’d been asked to write a book in a new series that Oxford’s trade book division and the National Park Service were launching. Each book would examine landmarks, historic sites, and historic districts on the national register through the lens of the history and culture that informed them. Mine was to be the one book on literature. I welcomed the idea of linking public history and literary history for a popular audience, and liked the fact that they planned to market the book to high schools around the country. I chose some sites Oxford expected me to choose—like the Whitman house in Huntington, Long Island, the New Bedford Historic Whaling District of Melville and Douglass, and Sinclair Lewis’s Main Street in Sauk Centre, Minnesota. But they had not
expected to find chapters focused on the immigration station at Angel Island or Wounded Knee, South Dakota—places that also inspired and shaped key chapters of American literature. They were puzzled from the start by my chapter on literature of the Texas-Mexico border, whose anchor sites were four historic districts on the national register. The Park Service’s records, I was told, didn’t indicate that these sites bore any connection to American literature. I told them I could make those connections even if the Park Service hadn’t. I said that this chapter, focusing on the writers Gloria Anzaldúa, Américo Paredes, Jovita González, Tomás Rivera, and Rolando Hinojosa, would be one of the strengths of the book. Were these writers really important enough to deserve a chapter, Oxford asked? I told them that books like Anzaldúa’s Borderlands/La Frontera and Paredes’s George Washington Gomez were some of the most important works in twentieth-century American literature.

When the final copyedited manuscript came back, however, key passages from a number of primary texts were gone—dozens of bits of the literary past that I had carefully reconnected to the physical landscape that had shaped them—including a major poem of Gloria’s. At first I thought it was just an issue of length, so I made cuts elsewhere to allow the material I cared about to be restored. But I quickly learned that they wanted what they’d cut to stay cut. They had no intention of including the parts of Gloria’s stunning poem “We Call Them Greasers” that they had taken out. The poem is about racism, sexism, and brutality on the border; it culminates in a rape, a murder, and a lynching. Not appropriate for our target audience, they said. In the end, I withdrew the book.

During the last year, I’ve had occasion to think about the sanitized version of American literature that Oxford wanted me to project. It’s just a fantasy, but imagine this: if those young soldiers imbued in our memories forever in those horrible photos of prisoner abuse in Abu Ghraib had had the chance back in high school to read and discuss and really confront Anzaldúa’s shocking poem about wanton brutalization, might one of them have thought twice before perpetrating analogous violence? Oxford’s commercial decision to suppress certain literature for fear of alienating its target audience also allowed me to understand more fully the reasons Mark Twain’s biographer and daughter suppressed certain of Twain’s writings. After Twain’s death, they felt the avuncular, cheerful, heartwarming Twain was the one who should live in the culture’s memory—and in the minds of the book-buying public. So to that end, they carefully suppressed certain passages from Twain’s anti-imperialist writings during the decades following his death. Keeping Anzaldúa’s wrenching poem about life on the border out of my book and burying Twain’s trenchant exposés
of American atrocities in the Philippines for nearly a century accomplish the same thing: these purposeful omissions allow us to avert our gaze from the vexed and often violent places about which these authors wrote—borderlands, crossroads, and contact zones that disrupt celebratory nationalist narratives. Not until Jim Zwick published his remarkable volume *Mark Twain's Weapons of Satire* in 1992 did readers get to confront in one place Twain’s uncensored condemnations of the lies his government told about the Philippine-American war.  

Remember, this is Mark Twain writing with all this outrage—Mark Twain, an American icon, with a cigar named after him bearing the motto “Known by everyone and loved by all.” Mark Twain is blowing the whistle on his government, not because he’s a traitor, but because he genuinely loves his country and feels betrayed by it. So sometimes I wonder, what if *these* writings by Twain had not been suppressed and ignored for so much of the twentieth century? What if Twain’s critiques of imperialism and of his government’s arrogant abuse of power had been front and center in our classrooms all these years? What if *this* Twain were as familiar to us as the Twain who wrote *Tom Sawyer*? Perhaps if we had made discussions of these texts central, not peripheral, to American classrooms, we might have been more prepared to remind those who call critics of the current administration “traitors” that criticizing your country when you know it to be wrong is *as American as Mark Twain.*

Mark Twain had serious doubts himself that there was anything exclusively American. After a long career of carefully observing his countrymen, Twain concluded in 1895, “I think that there is but a single specialty with us, only one thing that can be called by the wide name ‘American.’ That is the national devotion to ice-water.” If a Martian teleported into this conference, sampled half a dozen sessions randomly, and tried to figure out what they had in common, he might come up with a similar answer: a devotion to ice water, regardless of the topic under discussion. The scholars presenting their work at this conference are as diverse as the subjects being discussed. We study or teach on almost every continent on the globe.  

We may be trained in American studies, ethnic studies, women’s studies, literature or history; music, art, or anthropology. Some of us have never left the United States. Some of us are visiting the United States for the first time this week. There probably are as many definitions of American studies in this room as there are scholars; indeed, one of the reasons many of us were attracted to American studies in the first place was its capaciousness, its eschewal of methodological or ideological dogma, and its openness to fresh syntheses and connections. I honor that openness in my talk tonight, as I probe some of the syntheses and connections being made in the field today and where they might take us.
The headline of an article in the *Guardian* last August about the decline of American studies programs in Britain read: “A Degree in Bullying and Self-Interest? No Thanks. The Decline of American Studies Reveals our Increasing Dislike of the U.S.” It is unfortunate that the British students whom the article cited as rejecting American studies as a field of study failed to recognize that American studies is a site where we do not celebrate a stance of “bullying and self-interest” but interrogate it and critique it. The goal of American studies scholarship is not exporting and championing an arrogant, pro-American nationalism but understanding the multiple meanings of America and American culture in all their complexity. Today American studies scholars increasingly recognize that that understanding requires looking beyond the nation’s borders, and understanding how the nation is seen from vantage points beyond its borders. At a time when American foreign policy is marked by nationalism, arrogance, and Manichean oversimplification, the field of American studies is an increasingly important site of knowledge marked by a very different set of assumptions—a place where borders both within and outside the nation are interrogated and studied, rather than reified and reinforced. A former student, expressing some bewilderment and despair over the election, asked me whether what we do as American studies scholars has any relevance at all any more. I told him that it has more relevance than ever. It is up to us, as scholars of American studies, to provide the nuance, complexity, and historical context to correct reductive visions of America. Whenever people with power act on visions of America that rest on oversimplification, myth, and a blind faith that America is always right—or, for that matter, always wrong—that is a call to us as American studies scholars to do our work.

In many of its earliest incarnations American studies aspired to overarching generalities about the United States. The field had little room for the dissenting voices of minorities and women, and a fixation on American innocence blinded many scholars to the country’s ambitious quest for empire. But since the 1960s the field of American studies has increasingly become infused with understandings of American culture shaped by the anti-Vietnam War movement, the civil rights movement, the women’s movement, and other movements for social justice and social change in American society. The field has been dramatically transformed over the last four decades as scholars recovered the voices of women and minorities and replaced earlier exceptionalist visions of unsullied innocence with a clear-eyed look at the lust for empire that America shared with other Western powers. But the national paradigm of the United States as a clearly bordered geographical and political space remained intact. As Amy Kaplan has observed, some scholars like herself, who had pioneered
in the early 1990s in getting the academy to even recognize that America had an empire, felt a sense of irony and dismay as they watched political figures during the last few years unabashedly champion the idea of American empire. The left in the academy and the right in the political world found themselves odd bedfellows in their focus on the workings of the nation’s unilateral projection of power and hegemony over the rest of the world. The world was still divided into “us” and “them,” the “domestic” and the “foreign,” the “national” and “international.” The complexity of our field of study as we understand it today, however, requires that we pay as much attention to the ways in which ideas, people, culture, and capital have circulated and continue to circulate physically, and virtually, throughout the world, both in ways we might expect, and unpredictably; it requires that we view America, as David Palumbo-Liu put it, as a place “always in process itself.”

It requires that we see the inside and outside, domestic and foreign, national and international, as interpenetrating. Some years ago, Russell Reising asked, in The Unusable Past, how the American Renaissance would look if Frederick Douglass were at its center. In a similar vein, Mary Ileen Washington asked in her ASA presidential address what American studies would look like if African American studies were at its center. And Nina Baym asked, in Women’s Fiction, what nineteenth-century American literary history would look like if a sewing-circle were considered as much an emblem of the human community as a whaling ship. During the last decade many American studies scholars recognized that answering these questions required remaking the field as we had known it—and these important projects remain works in progress. Today another generative question in the spirit of those others is becoming increasingly salient: What would the field of American studies look like if the transnational rather than the national were at its center—as it is already for many scholars in this room?

My comments tonight build on those of past presidents of the ASA and the many others who have theorized in articles and books about the need for seeing “America,” as Paul Lauter put it, as part of “a world system, in which the exchange of commoditics, the flow of capital, and the iterations of cultures know no borders.” Over the last ten years a web of contact zones has increasingly superseded “the nation” as “the basic unit of, and frame for, analysis.” Taking cues from borderlands scholars like José David Saldivar who focus on spaces that resist being reduced to a “national tradition,” scholars are increasingly paying attention to the ways in which analogous hybridities and fluidities shape other spaces less territorially and culturally “stable” than we may have thought. What topics and questions become salient if we recon-
ceive our field with the transnational at its center? What roles might comparative, collaborative, border-crossing research play in this reconfigured field? If national borders no longer delimit the subject of our study, then how can we allow them to delimit the scholarship that demands our attention? These are some of the issues I'll explore tonight.

I don't want my remarks here to suggest that everyone needs to do transnational work. There's important work that scholars in American studies are doing that is not transnational—on American history, literature, race, religion, social movements, communities, gender and sexuality, politics, material culture, and visual culture. Indeed a quick perusal of the books honored at the celebration of ASA authors in Atlanta suggests the richness of that work. What I am doing is focusing on one trajectory of research in American studies that is becoming increasingly important and that offers intriguing insights across a range of the subject areas in which we work. For every piece of scholarship that I cite, I could cite half a dozen more.

As the transnational becomes more central to American studies, we'll pay increasing attention to the historical roots of multidirectional flows of people, ideas, and goods and the social, political, linguistic, cultural, and economic crossroads generated in the process. These crossroads might just as easily be outside the geographical and political boundaries of the United States as inside them. We will increasingly interrogate the "naturalness" of some of the borders, boundaries, and binaries that we may not have questioned very much in the past, and will probe the ways in which they may have been contingent and constructed. Let me give an example using a passage from *Borderlands/La Frontera*:

In the fields, *la migra*. My aunt saying, "*No corran, don't run. They'll think you're del otro lado." In the confusion, Pedro ran, terrified of being caught. He couldn't speak English, couldn't tell them he was fifth generation American. *Sin papeles*—he did not carry his birth certificate to work in the fields. *La migra* took him away while we watched. *Se lo llevaron*. . . They deported him to Guadalajara by plane. The furthest he'd ever been to Mexico was Reynosa, a small border town opposite Hidalgo, Texas, not far from McAllen. Pedro walked all the way to the Valley. *Se lo llevaron sin un centavo al pobre. Se vino andando desde Guadalajara."

When a crafty Anglo lawyer defrauded Gloria's grandmother of her land—a story that repurposed itself in the Texas borderlands again and again—her children and her children's children became sharecroppers or landless migrant workers like Pedro. "*Tejanos* lost their land, and, overnight became the foreigners," Gloria writes. But who is "alien" and who's "illegal"? And when and
how did those legal constructs take shape? What does it mean to be "included" in or "excluded" from the nation? What implicit and explicit ideals of what and who the United States should be shaped these exclusions? What role did race and racism play as these policies developed? What is the meaning of "citizenship" when la migra speaks English Only and deports a fifth-generation American to Mexico when he’s picked up sin papeles? As the transnational figures more prominently in American studies, questions like these will, too.20

As the transnational becomes more central to American studies the comparative study of race and racism will become more central to the field, enriching our understanding of the ways in which comparative analysis of particular national and transnational histories reveals phenomena that strike one society as "natural" or "given" to be, instead, highly constructed and contingent. Werner Sollors’s comparative studies of interracial literature around the globe offer such perspectives, as do comparative studies like George Frederickson’s pioneering books on antiblack racism in the United States and South Africa, Yukiko Koshiro’s work on trans-Pacific racisms and the U.S. occupation of Japan, James Gump’s examination of the subjugation of the Zulu and the Sioux, and Rebecca Scott’s forthcoming book comparing Louisiana and Cuba after slavery.21 We will also value work like Alessandro Portelli’s essay on the "color-blind" discourse of race in Italy as a piece that adds an important comparative dimension to any American studies conversation about the construction of "white" identity.22 As Henry Yu reminds us in his illuminating article “Los Angeles and American Studies in a Pacific World of Migrations,” in American Quarterly, understanding the genealogies of racism in different locales within the borders of the United States requires that we pay attention to the comparative histories of labor migrations from China, Japan, Korea, India, the Philippines, and Mexico.23 A work in progress such as Ana Rosas’s border-crossing study of bracero families’ experiences—a study that uses oral history and photography, as well as Mexican and U.S. government documents—are promising examples of this kind of research.24 It fleshes out with personal narrative the kind of data that Mae Ngai presents in her book Impossible Subjects: Illegal Aliens and the Making of Modern America, an ambitious investigation of race, labor, immigration, and citizenship.25 Meanwhile, Catherine Ceniza Choy’s book Empire of Care: Nursing and Migration in Filipino American History, tackles transnational reinscriptions of racism and sexism in the context of the global labor migrations.26

As the transnational becomes more central to American studies, we will probably make more of an effort to seek out the view from el otro lado. For perspectives on the war that the United States calls the “Mexican War,” we
could turn to a recently published anthology of primary documents such as *La Ocupación Yanqui de la Ciudad de México, 1847–1848*, edited by María Gayón Córdova, or to a recent study such as *Las Invasiones Norteamericanas en México* by Gastón García Cantú.27 We might reexamine other wars, as well, from multiple vantage points, probing the range of ways in which U.S. military action has shaped societies around the world. For some Filipino perspectives on the war that so disillusioned Mark Twain about his country’s role in the world, we could turn to *Vestiges of War: The Philippine-American War and the Aftermath of an Imperial Dream, 1899–1999*, edited by Angel Velasco Shaw and Luis H. Francia.28 As we try to probe the gaps between U.S. rhetoric and reality we might consult Yoshikatsu Hayashi’s study of the contrast between the rhetoric and the conduct of America at war.29 And we will particularly appreciate the intriguing picture of the U.S.–Korean war of 1871 that Gordon II. Chang was able to give us after consulting both Korean and U.S. archives: each side accused the other of barbarism and treachery, each side discharged significant firepower (although the United States more than the Koreans), and then each side declared victory and went home.30

As the transnational becomes more central to American studies, we are likely to focus not only on the proverbial immigrant who leaves somewhere called “home” to make a new home in the United States, but also on the endless process of comings and goings that create familial, cultural, linguistic, and economic ties across national borders.31 We are likely to focus less on the United States as a static and stable territory and population whose most characteristic traits it was our job to divine, and more on the nation as a participant in a global flow of people, ideas, texts, and products—albeit a participant who often tries to impede those flows. Our continued focus on local spaces will attend to the ways in which these spaces participate in global phenomena—“internal” and “external” migrations, the diffusion of cultural forms, the spread of capital and commodities—and all the attendant consequences. As Lisa Lowe observes, “The sweatshops of the garment industry located in San Francisco and Los Angeles . . . employ immigrant women from Mexico, El Salvador, Guatemala, Hong Kong, South Korea, Thailand, and the Philippines, while in these countries of origin, U.S. transnational corporations are also conducting garment assembly work.”32 Despite “national, cultural, and linguistic differences,” Lowe writes, “there are material continuities between the conditions of Chicanas and Latinas working in the United States and the women working in *maquiladoras* and low-cost manufacturing zones in Latin America, and Asian women working both within the United States and in Asian zones of assembly and manufacturing.”33 Those continuities require that
our research cross borders as readily as consumer goods do. Research that does includes articles such as “Si(gh)ting Asian/ American Women as Transnational Labor,” by Laura Hyun Yi Kang, and “(Dis)assembling Rights of Women Workers Along the Global Assembly Line: Human Rights and the Garment Industry,” by Laura Ho, Catherine Powell, and Leti Volpp, and the book No Sweat: Fashion, Free Trade, and the Rights of Garment Workers, edited by Andrew Ross. This topic was also addressed at the panel on “Migrating Subjetivities: Distanced Relations in the Wake of the Global Economy,” at which papers mapped transnational crossroads created by the global reach of the North Carolina tobacco industry, and by the traveling cultures of domestic service. As our interest in transnational issues develop, we will also appreciate an innovative study such as Cindi Katz’s Growing Up Global: Economic Restructuring and Children’s Everyday Lives, which provides a comparative view of labor, childhood, place, and race in East Harlem and a village in the Sudan.

As the transnational becomes increasingly central to American studies, we may well seek to recover chapters of the past that have eluded any archive despite their importance. For example, in Mark Twain’s powerful satire on racism toward the Chinese, serialized in 1870 and 1871, a fictional immigrant in California named Ah Song-Hi writes to his friend Ching-Foo back in China. Twain makes it clear that his narrative of the treatment of the Chinese in the United States was based on his observations of real people. But where are the voices of the real Ah Song-Hi and his brothers? Many of the immigrants were illiterate, but some of them probably dictated letters through literate scribes and sent them home to China—which is where they stayed. To the best of our knowledge, no library in the United States has even a photocopy of a letter sent to China by anyone who worked on the railroad. Are there caches of family papers in Guangdong Province where one might find some of these letters? My university was founded with the fortune that Leland Stanford made from railroads largely built by Chinese workers—but those workers’ voices have yet to be recovered. If such letters are an example of primary sources that have eluded any archive, there are other sources readily available in China that Americanists in China are positioned to recover, translate, and analyze. For example, the decision by the United States in 1904 to extend indefinitely the Chinese Exclusion Act of 1882 that made the Chinese ineligible for citizenship sparked not only a massive boycott of U.S. goods the following year in China, but also a vast body of Chinese protest literature. In 1960 a huge, multigener compilation of this literature was published in China. But to this day only one small excerpt from this compilation has been translated into English. Still untranslated is Kuxuesheng, a novella written in Chinese and set
in Chinese America that predates the book widely considered the first Chinese American novel set in Chinese America by more than half a century.  
The novella could provide a fascinating glimpse of one writer’s vision of how one might meld Chinese and American identities at the dawn of the twentieth century. Perhaps a collaboration between scholars based in China and the United States would allow the book to be translated and contextualized as a potentially important work in American studies. Xiao-huang Yin’s monograph Chinese American Literature Since the 1850s draws our attention to other examples of American literature in Chinese that we have yet to fully assimilate into American studies.

This is the kind of research agenda signaled by the pioneering Multilingual Anthology of American Literature edited by Marc Shell and Werner Sollors—a book that introduces us to American literature in Italian, Arabic, Spanish, German, Polish, Russian, Welsh, Yiddish, Swedish, Norwegian, Navaho, Hebrew, Danish, Chinese, Hungarian, and Greek. A number of scholars on the program at this conference—including Matthew Frye Jacobson, Gonul Pultar, Xiao-huang Yin, Doris Sommer, and Ilana Wirth-Nesher—contributed to the collection of essays Sollors edited, titled Multilingual America: Transnationalism, Ethnicity, and the Languages of American Literature, which pointed to some of the intriguing places that attention to this neglected body of literature can take us if we recognize that insistence on “English Only” has as little place in our scholarship as it does elsewhere in our society.

Three-quarters of a century before the publication of these recent anthologies, Arthur Alfonso Schomburg was making multilingual American literature integral to his collection, tracking down obscure work by the nineteenth-century New Orleans–born African American playwright, poet, and fiction writer who wrote American literature in French, Victor Séjour. Yet Schomburg, an autodidact and collector rather than a scholar or writer, whose first language was Spanish, has been relatively marginalized as a figure in American studies. As the transnational becomes more central to American studies, Schomburg will be, as well. The field of American studies today is struggling to reach the place that Schomburg lived, intellectually, during the first decades of the twentieth century—a place where diasporic imaginations are valued for the dazzlingly hybrid syntheses they produce; a place where the term “American” is understood in its broadest hemispheric sense; a place where it is recognized that there is an important body of American literature written in languages other than English; a place where the cultural work done by American writing outside the United States is a valid subject of study, as well.
Schomburg collected a Swedish translation of a work by Frederick Douglass, a German edition of the *Narrative of Olaudah Equiano*, and a Danish edition of *Uncle Tom's Cabin*. His papers include letters to him in Spanish, French, English, and German, from correspondents in Paris, Rome, Port-au-Prince, London, Trinidad, Seville, St. Kitts, and Guatemala City, all confident of receiving answers in their own tongues. He shared his knowledge by publishing essays and edited volumes of his own. By answering the staggering array of research queries that reached his desk, by lecturing widely to community groups, and by making his extraordinary collection available to a broad general public in the library and through loans to other institutions.44

As American studies embraces the transnational, it will embrace Schomburg's first language, as well. The United States is close to becoming the third-largest concentration of Spanish-speaking people in the world.45 Yet Spanish-language literary traditions rarely figure prominently in discussions of American literature. The seminal work of Arte Público Press's project on *Recovering the Hispanic Literary Heritage of the United States* is, of course, an important exception to this rule, as is Kirsten Silva Gruesz's book *Ambassadors of Culture: The Transamerican Origins of Latino Writing*, which, among other things, recovers a neglected U.S. print culture in Spanish. Other exceptions are the volume titled *Do the Americas Have a Common Literary History?* edited by Barbara Buchenau and Annette Paatz, and Anna Brickhouse's book, *Transamerican Renaissance: The Hemispheric Genealogies of U.S. Literature*, as well as Rachel Adams's fascinating article in *American Literary History*, "I Hipsters and jipitecas," which examines how changing Pan-American relations shaped countercultural writing in the United States and Mexico in the 1960s.46 A 2004 ASA conference session on "Recovering the Nineteenth-Century Borderlands," which included a paper by Nicolas Kanellos on a *Tejano-Cubano* writing on nineteenth-century *Tejas*, and a session on "From CA and DC: (Central) American Studies from the District of Columbia and California" charted some of this territory, as well, with papers on U.S. Salvadoran translocalities and U.S.-Guatemalan writing.47 Knowledge of Spanish is essential not only if we want to explore hemispheric literary and historical comparisons and contexts, but also if we want to read a book like *Borderlands/La Frontera*, in which Anzaldúa purposefully tantalizes and frustrates the non-Spanish speaking reader not only with numerous entire poems as well as epigraphs in Spanish, but also with passages that can be understood in only truncated ways by readers with English Only limitations.48 Can a country in which, according to Census 2000, nearly one in five inhabitants speaks a language other than English at home be studied effectively in all its complexity by scholars who know only English?49
The volume *Not English Only*, edited by Orm Øverland, suggests some of the reasons why this question deserves to be answered in the negative, as does Brent Hayes Edwards’s impressive *The Practice of Diaspora: Literature, Translation, and the Rise of Black Internationalism*, a book in which French sources play a pivotal role. French, of course, is to the northern border of the United States what Spanish is to our southern one; both the Quebeçois and New England culture and economy have been shaped by the cross-border transits of French-speaking Canadian workers.

As the transnational becomes more central to American studies, we will pay more attention—as Schomburg did—to chapters of African American history lurking in archives outside the United States as well. Michel and Geneviève Fabre, Paul Gilroy, Kate Baldwin, and others have looked at prominent African Americans in France, Germany, and the Soviet Union, but the story of Richard Greener in Russia—a chapter in both African American history and diplomatic history—remains to be unearthed. Greener, Harvard’s first black graduate, was also the first U.S. diplomat to be posted to the city now known as Vladivostok, where he became the U.S. government’s eyes and ears on the ground during the Russo-Japanese War. Margarita Marinova has done some preliminary work in Russian sources on this fascinating topic. In a related vein, attention to the impact of international relations on black communities in the United States animates recent books like Mary Dudziak’s *Cold War Civil Rights* and Thomas Borstelmann’s *The Cold War and the Color Line, 1935–1960*, as well as Penny Von Eschen’s *Race Against Empire: Black Americans and Anti-Colonialism, 1937–1957*, and Satchmo Blows Up the World, and Brenda Plummer’s *Rising Wind: Black Americans and U.S. Foreign Affairs, 1935–1960*.

Transnational research linking African traditions to American culture has been central to American studies for some time in work by art historian Robert Farris Thompson; historians John Edward Philips, William Piersen, Gwendolyn Midlo Hall, and Sterling Stuckey; dance historian Brenda Dixon Gottschild; and literature scholars Henry Louis Gates Jr., Viola Sachs, Eric Sundquist, and myself. More recently, Joel Dinerstein in *Swinging the Machine*, and the contributors to *African Roots/American Cultures: Africa in the Creation of the Americas*, edited by Sheila Walker, extend these discussions in fruitful ways. Transnational questions about culture traveling in the opposite direction—about the impact of African American culture on Africa and Europe, for example—are increasingly being asked as well. James T. Campbell, for example, in *Songs of Zion: The African Methodist Episcopal Church in the U.S. and South Africa* explored the ways in which the AME church was appropriated and transformed in a range of South African contexts. The influence
of African American music on Europe is the focus of Josef Jařab’s article “Black Stars, the Red Star, and the Blues,” of several chapters of Heike Raphael-Hernandez’s book Blackening Europe: The African American Presence, and of several pieces in the collection “Here, There, and Everywhere,” edited by Reinhold Wagnleitner and Elaine Tyler May—including Michael May’s article “Swingin’ under Stalin,” Elizabeth Vihlen’s “Jammin’ on the Champs-Elysées,” and Christoph Ribbat’s “How Hip-Hop Hit Heidelberg.” As Campbell put it, scholarship limited to nation-based models “has left us ill-equipped to understand, and in some cases even to see, phenomena that do not conform to the borders of the nation state.”

Analogous trajectories might be mapped for other ethnic groups, as well. For example, Kun Jong Lee’s work on the role of Korean shamanistic traditions as a context for Nora Okja Keller’s novel Comfort Woman, along with Boo Eung Koh’s semiotic reading of a billboard in L.A.’s Koreatown or Sung-Ae Lee’s examination of common cultural threads linking four recent novels by Korean American women writers reminds us of the importance of being conversant with Korean religious, linguistic, social, and cultural traditions if one wants to understand the literature and landscape of Korean America. Given that by the most recent estimation, “approximately 7.2% of all Koreans live outside Korea,” Sung-Ae Lee notes that Koreans are now “proportionately, the world’s second largest diasporic people.” What role does literature by Korean Americans play in Korea? What kinds of diasporic dialogue between the two countries is going on among contemporary writers? Analogous questions might be asked about authors writing other diasporas, as well: Niaz Zaman’s study of Pakistani responses to work by Pakistani-American writer Bapsi Sidhwa, and Sau-ling Cynthia Wong’s and Sāmi Ludwig’s examinations of Chinese responses to work by Chinese-American writer Maxine Hong Kingston suggest the richness of this line of investigation.

Transnational questions and approaches can complicate Native American issues in American studies in fascinating ways, as Annette Kolodny’s research on Viking contact with native tribes in Canada and Maine demonstrates. Kolodny first read Norse sagas when she was studying in Oslo in 1960 on a grant from the International Institute for Education. Her new work makes the case that North American literary history begins not with the European exploration narratives customarily taken as its start but rather with “contact texts” culled from the pictographic scrolls of tribes in the Algonquian-speaking Wabanaki confederacy and the Norse sagas with which Kolodny believes they intersect. Discussions with a professor at the University of Oslo whom she had met years earlier at an ASA conference, as well as with other Norwegian
colleagues and members of several Central and Eastern Algonquian-speaking tribes in the United States and Canada were key to linking cultural narratives passed on in Old Norse with the birch-bark scrolls of the Mi’kmq. Kolodny’s groundbreaking research will be published in a book titled *In Search of First Contact: The Peoples of the Dawnland, the Vikings of Vineland, and American Popular Culture*. Kolodny presented a preview of that work in a conference plenary.63

Timothy Fulford’s forthcoming book on Native Americans as observed by the British and as travelers in Britain is another good example of how the transnational can reshape our understanding of Native American history and culture. He demonstrates, for example, the ways in which Scottish writer Thomas Campbell displaced “highland resentment over Scotland’s colonisation within Georgian Britain” onto idealized American Indian warriors who fought “English imperialists and their corrupt allies” in the New World. He also provides an intriguing portrait of Captain John Norton, an Edinburgh-educated part Scot who was also Teyoninhokarawen, a Mohawk chief from Canada, who led British and Indian soldiers against the United States in the war of 1812, and who translated both the Gospel and work by Sir Walter Scott into Mohawk. Fulford tells us that Teyoninhokarawen “translated the gospel to give Mohawks a moral code for a future that would inevitably involve interaction with white society. And he translated Scott to remind them that many Britons revered the warrior and clan ethics for which Mohawks had long stood. In addition, he wanted to unsettle the prejudices of Britons who assumed Indians to be innately savage.”64 Yet a third example is the series of photographs taken by German photographers Andrea Robbins and Max Becher in the late 1990s titled “German Indians.” Read alongside Philip Deloria’s book *Playing Indian* and Shari Huhndorf’s *Going Native*, the images presented in “German Indians” raise a number of interesting questions about constructions of Indians and Indian culture in a global context.65

As the transnational becomes more central to American studies, we will pay more attention to figures who have been marginalized precisely because they crossed so many borders that they are hard to categorize. I’m thinking of someone like Nancy Cunard, for example, who was left out of black history because she was white, left out of the history of the left because of her class origins, and left out of American literary history because she was British. Yet Cunard—whom Jane Marcus is recovering with empathy and insight—is a figure who is absolutely central to a transnational American studies. Her extraordinary *Negro Anthology* was a remarkable feat uniting writers, artists, and intellectuals from Africa, the Caribbean, Europe, and the United States in one
of the first great collaborative meditations on race and culture. As the transnational becomes more central to American studies, Nancy Cunard will be, too.66

And as the transnational becomes more central to American studies, we will pay more attention to places hard to categorize as well, such as legal borderlands both inside and outside the United States, the focus of a forthcoming special issue of American Quarterly.67 Prisons in the United States and run by the United States abroad are one kind of legal borderland that may increasingly attract our attention. Several years ago Mary Helen Washington wrote an article in the ASA newsletter titled “Prisons as a Part of American Studies,” urging American studies scholars to pay more attention to the workings of the prison-industrial-complex in our society, particularly from the standpoint of race.68 And at the 2004 ASA conference roundtable on the “U.S.–Abu Ghraib Continuum,” Ruthie Gilmore and her fellow panelists explored the links between the domestic and the foreign, probing the nature of prison complexes both outside the United States and around the corner. As the transnational becomes more central to American studies, scholars will probably seek new ways to study prisons in the United States, and on U.S. military bases and in U.S. territories. The impact the U.S. military has on societies around the world when it’s off-duty as well as on-duty, is likely to be studied increasingly as well, as transnational concerns play an ever-larger role in scholars’ research agendas. The impact and experience of American bases in Europe from 1945 to 2004 is a key topic currently being studied in a collaborative research project involving scholars from the United Kingdom, Portugal, Italy, the United States, and Germany.69 And the contact zones surrounding U.S. military bases are also addressed in Beyond the Shadow of Camptown by Ji-Yeon Yuh and Let the Good Times Roll: Prostitution and the U.S. Military in Asia by Saundra Pollock Sturdevant and Brenda Stoltzfus.70

As the transnational moves to the center of our field, we will probably increasingly address the global environment and the ways in which U.S. environmental policies both impact and respond to environmental problems around the world, since pollution knows no borders.71 We will also have to look at issues of environmental justice, both at border sites and around the world, a topic that Anzaldúa addressed when she looked at the ways in which agribusiness and multinational capital conspired to destroy the environment surrounding her family’s land in Hidalgo County, Texas.72 Border-crossing issues of environmental justice also get addressed in a special issue of Urban Geography devoted to environmental racism edited by Laura Pulido.73
Bringing the transnational into American studies creates space for the comparative study of a range of social movements in different locations: Catherine Collomp’s comparative study of U.S. and Canadian labor movements comes to mind, as does Ryoko Kurihara’s comparative work on the U.S. and Japanese suffrage movements, and Laura Hein’s comparative discussion of reparations movements in Japan and the United States.74

As the transnational grows more central to American studies we will welcome investigations of the broad array of cultural crossroads shaping the work of border-crossing authors, artists, and cultural forms that straddle multiple regional and national traditions. One example from literature would be Ursula Heise’s recent look at the ways in which novels by Karen Tei Yamashita, a Japanese American writer who spent almost a decade in Brazil, “weave their storylines around transfers and migrations between the United States, Latin America, and Japan and draw on North American multicultural writing and Latin American magical realism as well as, to a lesser extent, on the technopostmodernism that flourished in both the U.S. and Japan from the 1980s onward.”75 In the visual arts, one might point to Therese Steffen’s work on artist Kara Walker’s subversive hybrid, transnational historiographies in silhouettes blending African American and German silhouette art traditions.76 We are also likely to attend to the cross-fertilization, transfer, and reinterpretation involved in border-crossing movements in the arts. Heinz Ickstadt’s essay on transatlantic modernism, for example, points in this direction, as do a number of other pieces in the collection in which this article appears.77

As the transnational becomes increasingly central to American studies, we will also welcome research focusing on the cultural work that American literature does in a range of social and political contexts around the world. For example, we learn from Leo OuFan Lee that Lin Shu, who translated Uncle Tom’s Cabin into Chinese in 1901, presented the book to Chinese readers as a cautionary tale about America’s treatment of people of color, telling his readers that “recently the treatment of blacks in America has been carried over to yellow people.”78

As the transnational figures more prominently in American studies, we will welcome studies that probe the cultural work of American literature outside the United States for insight into the non–U.S. cultures—as well as into the American texts themselves. In a book coming out next year, for example, Tsuyoshi Ishihara explores what a 1939 adaptation of Mark Twain’s Prince and the Pauper—a samurai novel by Jiro Osaragi titled Hanamaru Kotorimaru—reveals about the rigidity of class hierarchy and patriarchy in imperial Japan; Ishihara also examines what the changes and cuts made by Japanese transla-
tors of *Tom Sawyer* and *Huck Finn* during the American occupation after World War II show about “postwar moral confusion.”

If Mark Twain provided the Japanese with a way to explore issues of hierarchy, freedom, tradition, and morality in their own society, Walt Whitman turns out to have acted as an intermediary who helped reattach a noted Chinese writer to his own Taoist roots, and also played a role in shaping Chinese literary modernism. Biographies of famous figures in American history can do cultural work in a transnational context as well, as we learn from Scott Wong’s intriguing discussion of the biography of George Washington in China. Wong’s deft understanding of both Chinese and U.S. sources allows him to generate surprising insights into how Washington’s life story was pressed into the service of a range of political agendas in China from the 1850s through the end of the nineteenth century.

We need to understand the cultural work that forms originating in the United States do in cultures outside this country, studying their reception and reconfiguration in contexts informed by a deep understanding of the countries where that cultural work is taking place. One interesting model for this kind of work is Aviad Raz’s study of the ways in which the Japanese “Japanized” Disneyland. Priya Joshi’s recent prize-winning book on the impact that nineteenth-century British books exported to India had on twentieth-century Indian writing suggests the value of pursuing analogous work regarding the impact of American literature on a range of cultures in which it was available. Although there has been no systematic study of the influence of American literature on Indian writers comparable to Joshi’s work on the influence of British writers, there is at least one article on the topic by Kaiser Haq, which looks at the influence of American writing on “Bengali and Indo-Anglian Poetry.” The cultural work done by U.S. popular culture abroad—how American television, film, the internet, rock, and popular music help societies outside the United States negotiate aspects of their own cultures—is a topic that will increasingly interest us as well. Cultural imperialism turns out to be too simple a model to understand how culture works, as much of the scholarship I cite here conveys.

As the transnational increasingly attracts our interest, American studies scholars will welcome investigations of public memory and monuments in comparative perspective. One lucid model here is James Young’s book *The Texture of Memory,* which examines Holocaust monuments and museums in Austria, Germany, Israel, and the United States, comparing how each nation memorializes the Holocaust according to its own traditions, ideals, and experiences, as well as Young’s *At Memory’s Edge: After-Images of the Holocaust in Contempo-
ratory Art and Architecture, which compares the construction of Holocaust monuments around the world by artists born after 1945. Other useful examples of the comparative study of monuments and memory are the article by James Horton and Johanna Kardux on “Slavery and the Contest for National Heritage in the United States and the Netherlands” and Sanford Levinson’s book Written in Stone: Public Monuments in Changing Societies, which includes comparative discussions of how Eastern European societies deal with Soviet-era monuments and how various cities in the American South deal with monuments to the Confederacy.

As the transnational becomes increasingly central to American studies, we will value contemporary scholarship that probes the vectors of tourism and the commodification of culture and heritage from multiple vantage points, examining the matrix of factors that produce any given interaction and that shape its impact. In her new book Longfellow’s Tatoos: Tourism, Collecting, and Japan, for example, Christine Guth probes visual and material culture to explore how American travelers to Japan in the 1860s and 1870s appropriated Japanese products to fashion themselves as Americans, and offers new perspectives on American and Japanese constructions of masculinity. A good example of transnational American studies focused on late-twentieth-century travel and tourism is Night Market: Sexual Cultures and the Thai Economic Miracle by Ryan Bishop and Lillian Robinson, which examines the “cultural, historical, material, and textual roles the U.S. played in the establishment of the international sex tourism industry in Thailand, an industry central to that country’s ‘economic miracle.’” As the transnational becomes more central to American studies, more of us might explore the consumption of culture-specific cuisines in global contexts as well, looking at the culinary sphere as a terrain on which a range of values are negotiated. Berndt Ostendorf reads New Orleans’ place in a “Caribbean system of cultural exchange” through a history of the creolization of its food, while Sangmee Bak explores the construction of Korean identity by studying responses to McDonald’s in Seoul. Rudiger Kunow examines the Indian diaspora in the United States by studying the ways in which food functions in a range of contemporary texts as a “janus-faced signifier, pointing to the ‘here’ of diasporic life worlds as at the same time as it gestures to the ‘there’ of a home” to which one really cannot return. And Kristin Hoganson looks at bourgeois U.S. kitchens during the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries as key sites of transnational encounter, a vantage point from which one can view the domestication of the “foreign” through what she calls “the popular geography of food.” The conference session on “Authentic Faring: In Search of The Real Thing” addressed some of these issues as well.
As the transnational takes on greater importance in American studies, we will welcome opportunities to understand how visions of American democracy and American citizenship shape and are shaped by conversations outside the United States. Rob Kroes explores some of these questions in *Them and Us: Questions of Citizenship in a Globalizing World*, as does Helle Porsdam in “‘Rights Talk’ in Europe: The Influence of Rights Talk, American Style, on Danish Democracy and Welfare.” They are also central to a memorable issue of the *Journal of American History* devoted to the translation and reception of the Declaration of Independence outside the United States, which offers intriguing readings of the cultural work this founding document performed in Spanish, Russian, Hebrew, Japanese, German, Polish, and other languages. We will also need to take a critical and comparative look at the technologies of American democracy—how they work in this country, and the how they translate in a range of cultures very different from that of the United States. Siva Vaidhyanathan’s current work on a comparative global history of voting technologies should be a valuable contribution to this conversation.

Transnational perspectives may also help us comprehend aspects of American culture that continue to puzzle us—such as the political power of homophobia to trump poor people’s sense of their own economic interests. Anzaldúa’s outspoken critiques of homophobia in Latino culture should have put us on notice about the importance of this issue to Latino voters. As is the case with racism, comparative transnational work on homophobia might help us better understand how it functions in the United States. For example, we might look to Louis-George Tin’s recent *Dictionnaire de l’Homophobie*, which includes comparative discussions of a number of countries.

Back in 1831 De Tocqueville bluntly noted that most Americans live “in a state of perpetual self-adoration.” Nearly a century later, Sinclair Lewis suggested that for the residents of hometown, USA, his “Gopher Prairie,”

Main Street is the climax of civilization. That this Ford car might stand in front of the Bon Ton Store, Hannibal invaded Rome and Erasmus wrote in Oxford cloisters. What Ole Jenson the grocer says to Ezra Stowbody the banker is the new law for London, Prague, and the unprofitable isles of the sea; whatever Ezra does not know and sanction, that thing is heresy, worthless for knowing and wicked to consider.

American studies scholars in the United States smirk at a passage like this one, confident that it has nothing to do with us. After all, haven’t the last decades of scholarship challenged that whole “climax of civilization” complex? But there is a part of Lewis’s description that may apply to us as well: the smug confidence that what the residents of Gopher Prairie don’t know couldn’t pos-
sibly be worth knowing. While most Americanists in the United States today reject celebratory narratives of American exceptionalism and nationalism, viewing earlier proponents of them as blinkered and benighted, many have a curious complacency about something that may strike future generations as equally benighted: an intellectual provincialism that is just as problematic. If the old exceptionalist, nationalist scholarship privileged the United States as a unique repository of progress and wisdom, many today privilege the work of U.S.-based scholars in an analogous way. As John Carlos Rowe has noted, “Even when we are dealing with international phenomena, such as imperialism, economic trade, and immigration and diaspora, we continue to rely on examples and authors from within the continental United States.” If the citations in the books and articles we publish refer to nothing published outside the United States, if our syllabi include no article or book by a non-U.S.-based scholar, if the circle of colleagues with whom we regularly share our work all live in the United States, if we assume that the subject of our study is by definition what transpires within U.S. borders, and if all are comfortable reading or speaking no language but English, many of us see nothing amiss. We may snicker at the residents of Gopher Prairie for their conviction that “Main Street is the apex of civilization.” But shouldn’t we recognize the hint of a similar arrogance and ignorance at work when we assume that the United States represents the apex of American studies scholarship, and that whatever American academics “do not know” can’t possibly be worth knowing? One of my favorite Yiddish proverbs is: “Der vor(e)m in khreyt denkt az s’iz zis” (The worm in horseradish thinks [his life] is sweet). How can U.S.-based scholars have any perspective on their subject of study if they talk only to themselves? I do not want to privilege or essentialize location as a key determinant of the kind or quality of scholarship a person is likely to produce. What I do want to do, however, is interrogate the privileged position that U.S.-based scholars and publications enjoy in the field of American studies.

For example, there are four ambitious, established book series published in the Netherlands, Germany, and the U.K. that have been responsible for a tremendous amount of seminal research in American studies for decades—including some of the richly comparative, transnational scholarship to which I’ve referred tonight. Most of these books barely register on the radar screens of American studies scholars in the United States. Despite the fact that they are widely available, they are relatively rarely cited and even more rarely taught. Many of the books in these series were in my university’s library. But I am embarrassed to confess that in more cases than I care to admit, I am the first person to have checked them out. I refer to the American Studies monograph
series sponsored by the German Association for American Studies, the European Contributions to American Studies monograph series sponsored by the European American Studies Association and the Netherlands American Studies Association, the Forecaast series sponsored by the Collegium for African American Research, and the BAAS American Studies paperback series sponsored by the British Association of American Studies. The more than 150 books that have appeared in these series have received much less attention than they deserve.

America: The Cultures of the American New West; Jazz in American Culture, Religion in America to 1865; American Exceptionalism; Political Scandals in the USA; and The American Landscape: Gender, Ethnicity, and Sexuality in American Film. These series may well be in your library. If not, you might request some of the books from interlibrary loan, and ask your library to order them from now on. The conferences that led to many of these books—and the books themselves—included scholars from Europe, the United States, and other parts of the world, reflecting the admirable openness of these international American studies associations.

There are many other interesting American studies anthologies published outside the United States as well—books like Transatlantic Connections, edited by Rodica Mihaila and Irina Grigorescu Pana, published in Bucharest in 2000. In addition to Mihaila’s lucid overview of the discourse of transnationalism in American studies that introduces the volume, I was impressed by Mihai Mindra’s comparative essay on Jewish-Romanian and Jewish-American fiction. The volume Rediscovering America, edited by Kousar J. Azam and published in 2001 in New Delhi, includes a stimulating discussion of the internationalization of American studies from an Indian perspective by Azam, as well as such interesting contributions as Prafulla Kar’s overview of American studies in India; R. S. Sharma’s discussion of the global impact of the World’s Parliament of Religions at the World Columbian Exposition; Sukhbir Singh’s look at the influence of Hinduism on several postmodern American novelists; Isaac Siqueira’s reading of the rituals of the Super Bowl; Rui Kohiyama’s study of American Christian women’s campaign to establish women’s colleges in China, India, and Japan in the 1910s and 1920s; and Tatiana Venediktova’s imaginative effort to put roughly contemporaneous work by Nathaniel Hawthorne and Nikolai Chernishevksi in dialogue with one another. Another interesting book, Crossed Memories: Perspectives on 9/11 and American Power, edited by Laura Hein and Daizaburo Yui and published in Tokyo in 2003, includes Yusheng Yang’s examination of Mao Tse-tung’s views of the United States and Yujin Yaguchi’s article on Japanese responses to the Arizona Memorial at Pearl Harbor. Important bibliographies in American studies are sometimes published outside the United States as well. For example, what is probably the most extensive annotated bibliography on the Japanese in North America, the 1,038-page Japaner in der Neuen Welt, was published in Germany.

There are also many American studies journals published outside the United States of which U.S.-based Americanists need to be more aware. Many are in your university library, and some are available online. One of the most impor-
tant publications on Mark Twain this year is the inaugural issue of a new Japanese journal called *Mark Twain Studies*, edited by Takayuki Tatsumi, that came out in October 2004. In a fascinating article in the journal titled “‘Was Huck *Burakumin*? Writing and Teaching Twain in Asian Pacific World Literature,” Mary Knighton probes how Japanese novelist Kenzaburo Oe recasts Twain’s novel *Huck Finn* in his novella “Prize Stock” in ways that engage Japan’s treatment of the *burakumin*, a formerly discriminated-against and segregated outcast class. The journal also includes Tatsumi’s discussion of the role that Twain’s novel *Connecticut Yankee plays* in an important Japanese nonfiction novel about the Vietnam War. It was an honor to have the editors of American studies journals published in Britain, France, Georgia, Germany, Japan, Korea, Scandinavia, South Africa, Spain, Turkey, and many other places with us in Atlanta. It is my sincere hope that meetings and workshops at the conference will lay the groundwork for collaborations that will allow us all to be more aware of the work coming out in these journals in the future.

Günter Lenz has observed that “envisioning American studies in truly international perspective means enacting the transnational and intercultural discourses in real dialogues and debates among scholars from different parts of the world.” Conversation and collaboration across borders is only one dimension of making American studies more transnational. But this is one area where we can do much to improve and build on existing institutional structures. Some models require substantial funding and institutional backing; others cost nothing but our time. In the first category are programs like the Longfellow Institute at Harvard directed by Werner Sollors and Marc Shell, supported by a grant from the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation; the International Forum for U.S. Studies at the University of Iowa, run by Jane Desmond and Virginia Domínguez, supported by a grant from the Rockefeller Foundation; and a three-year initiative called “Reshaping the Americas: Narratives of Place,” sponsored by the Ford Foundation at the University of California Humanities Research Institute. Or there is the Gottingen Project on Inter-American Literary Historiography supported by the German Research Council, The Netherlands Institute for Advanced Study in the Humanities and Social Sciences project on American mass culture in Europe, the Salzburg Seminar, and Paul Lauter’s Heath Anthology for Asia project.

A government-supported entity like the Fulbright Program continues to be a potentially excellent resource for U.S. and international scholars—both the traditional program and the relatively new Senior Scholars program, which deserves to be better known. An increased awareness of the impressive array of important work being done in American studies outside the United States
should make U.S.–based scholars traveling abroad on Fulbrights welcome the chance to listen and learn rather than pontificate as “expert witnesses” on the United States just because we happen to live here; foreign hosts and students may know more on specific topics than we do. International scholars who have come to the United States on Fulbrights are producing some of the most interesting books coming out of U.S. university presses—like Etsuko Take-tani’s 2003 book *U.S. Women Writers and the Discourses of Colonialism, 1825–1861*, or Tsuyoshi Ishihara’s *Mark Twain in Japan*, to be published next year.  

Other forms of student-faculty exchanges can also do much to foster transnational collaboration. For example, Siva Vaidhyanathan of New York University has been running a course on comparative cultural policy and business culture in conjunction with the University of Amsterdam that brings European students and NYU students together in both New York and Brusselsto compare American media firms and policies to European media systems in the context of Europeanization, globalization, and the steady privatization of public service broadcasting. And Jay Mechling of the University of California, Davis, is teaching a freshman seminar on “Violence and Culture in the U.S. and Japan” simultaneously at UC Davis and Hosei University in Tokyo, using instructional technology for distance learning; the readings and the students come from both Japan and the United States, and students in both countries share their thoughts through electronic discussion postings. The study abroad programs run by many U.S. universities are neglected sites of potentially fruitful cross-border communication. Many American studies majors, like many other students, take a semester or year abroad; but often what they study has little connection to their major. It may be possible, however, to help them frame research projects that allow them to explore transnational issues in American studies during their year abroad. For example, Stanford undergraduate Brian Goodman is currently using a study-abroad term in Prague to research an honors thesis on poet Allen Ginsberg’s relationship to Czech political dissent, probing the role that his notorious and celebrated 1965 visit to Prague played in the Czech student movement. Goodman, who had already looked at the CIA’s and FBI’s files on Ginsberg, is working with Czech scholars to translate information the Czech secret police were collecting on this transnationally transgressive poet who managed to get himself kicked out of both Cuba and Czechoslovakia within a matter of months. Then there is the no-budget high-tech strategy I call “synchronized syllabi,” something I tried for the first time last quarter with a colleague in Japan, in which our students read the same text during the same week, and then engaged in a conversation with each other about it via email.
This year we celebrate the tenth anniversary of the ASA’s Electronic Crossroads Project, and I congratulate Randy Bass for being the visionary midwife who brought Crossroads into being. I hope that Crossroads will continue to play a key role in connecting scholars around the world in the years to come. Other internet resources, like H-AMSTDY, the Classroom Connector, and distance learning specialists at your universities can help scholars collaborate across borders on research and teaching as well. The ASA International Partnership grants are also designed to foster collaboration and communication between American studies programs within and outside of the United States.116

A new round of ASA international partnership grants was approved last fall between the University of California at Berkeley and Universitat Pompeu Fabra in Barcelona, between Utah State University and the University of Innsbruck in Austria, between Rutgers University and Universidad de Leon in Spain, and between the University of Texas at Austin and the European University in St. Petersburg. These grants support everything from sharing books, videos, and curricular materials to developing student and faculty exchanges, collaborative courses, joint degree programs, and collaborative research projects. For example, UT is working with the European University in St. Petersburg to develop the first M.A. program in American studies in Russia. Meanwhile UC Berkeley faculty and faculty at Universitat Pompeu Fabra in Barcelona are embarking on a collaborative, comparative research project titled “Migration and Gender in Times of Globalization: Moroccan Women in Cataluña and Mexican Women in California.” It is my sincere hope that the international partnership program will help stimulate other innovative collaborative ventures in the future.117

All of these efforts will be unnecessarily limited unless we also manage to change the culture of the profession. U.S.-based scholars have to engage with scholarship published outside the United States, and we need to require our students to do the same. We need to encourage them to seek out American studies research in the language in which they have satisfied their language requirement, and we need to reward students who make good use of foreign-language sources in their research. We also need to seek opportunities to interact with scholars outside the United States in person. Exchanges at conferences can be incubators for collaborative research projects, publications, and courses. We cannot predict which conversations, correspondence, or encounters will plant seeds that will bear fruit some day. What we can do is remain open to what Annette Kolodny calls “the serendipity of scholarship” as we struggle to understand the transnational crossroads of cultures that confront us in American studies.118 And we can work against government policies that
hamper the free flow of information, people, and ideas, which is the lifeblood of our profession.

Marial Iglesias Utset, of the Universidad de La Habana, was prevented from joining us in Atlanta to present her paper on “The Construction of Cuban National Identity: Symbolic Forms of Transition from Colonial to Republican Cuba under the U.S. Military Domination, 1892–1902,” because the U.S. government failed to grant her a visa. It was nothing personal: sixty-five other scholars from Cuba encountered the same treatment recently when they tried to attend a Latin American Studies Association conference. The ASA council voted to join with LASA in protesting the widespread denial of visas to Cuban scholars. It was also extremely disappointing that another scholar scheduled to speak at the 2004 ASA annual meeting, Mohammed Dajani from Al-Quds University, West Bank, received his visa two weeks after the conference had taken place. Visa bottlenecks are also taking their toll on international student enrollments at U.S. universities, a development we need to monitor and address.

Other obstacles, as well, can make fostering collaborative, comparative, transnational research in American studies across borders especially challenging. Outside the United States, American studies is sometimes construed as being centered on the social sciences—economics, politics, foreign relations—while inside the United States it is dominated by the humanities. Outside the United States, some scholars still view the project of trying to identify and investigate traits they associate with the United States as a nation as the principal task of American studies, while inside the United States the idea that there could be universal, national characteristics is widely viewed with suspicion. Outside the United States, students sometimes study American studies as a shrewd career move that will help them succeed economically in their own country, while inside the United States students are more likely to study American studies to develop critical analyses of American culture and society. As John Carlos Rowe has noted, we need to recognize “the different social, political, and educational purposes American studies serves in its different situations around the globe.” U.S.–based Americanists should eschew imperial ambitions in our scholarship as readily as we condemn them in U.S. politics; reluctant to impose our own perspectives on others who may not share them, we should learn to listen more and talk less. I never said doing this would be easy—only that it would be worth it. U.S.–based American studies scholars need to make an effort to connect with scholars outside the United States through all of these channels—in print and in person.
I have a personal reason for wanting to see that happen. It has to do with the debt I owe to scholars and writers outside the United States who have been central to my own research and teaching in the field. When my book *Was Huck Black? Mark Twain and African American Voices* came out, some of the most insightful reviews I received were from British scholars Tony Tanner, Stephen Fender, Peter Messent, and Malcolm Bradbury. My research on the erasure of what Africa gave to America was enriched by conversations at a conference in Austin with Jesús “Chucho” García, president of Venezuela’s *Fundación Afroamerica*, and by conversations with my students at U.N.A.M. in Mexico City about how racism works in a culture where the idea of *mestisaje* is enshrined as part of the national origins narrative. A conversation with Masako Notoji at an international committee reception of the ASA totally derailed my research agenda in enormously fruitful ways. My book *Lighting Out for the Territory* was the result. Key parts of that book came directly out of conversations I had with Japanese novelist Kenzaburo Oe and Nigerian novelist Ben Okri; the book was also shaped by correspondence with scholars in China, Argentina, the United Kingdom, Israel, Greece, Brazil, India, Saudi Arabia, and Japan.123

The United States is and has always been a transnational crossroads of cultures. And that crossroads of cultures that we refer to as “American culture” has itself generated a host of other crossroads of cultures as it has crossed borders. Reading Thoreau helped inspire Gandhi to develop his own brand of civil disobedience, which crossed the Pacific to inspire the civil rights movement; the idea of dissent through civil disobedience as particularly American surfaced in Asia when Tiananmen Square protesters used the Statue of Liberty as a symbol. African, African American, and Eastern European musical traditions met and mixed in the United States to produce jazz, which traveled back to Europe to shape, among other things, a large swath of twentieth-century Czech poetry and the architecture of Le Corbusier. The story of these apparently “American” phenomena—civil disobedience and jazz—are stories of transnational flow, as is the story of America itself. “To survive the Borderlands,” Anzaldúa wrote, “you must live sin fronteras/be a crossroads.”126 In the twenty-first century, American studies is increasingly doing justice to the transnational crossroads that we are and, indeed, that we always have been.
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Appendix
We Call Them Greasers

I found them here when I came.
They were growing corn in their small ranchos
raising cattle, horses
smelling of woodsmoke and sweat.
They knew their betters:
took off their hats
placed them over their hearts,
lowered their eyes in my presence.

Weren't interested in bettering themselves, 
why they didn't even own the land but shared it.
Wasn't hard to drive them off,
cowards, they were, no backbone.
I showed 'em a piece of paper with some writing
tole 'em they owed taxes
had to pay right away or be gone by mañana
By the time me and my men had waved
that piece of paper to all the families
it was all frayed at the ends.

Some loaded their chickens children wives and pigs
into rickety wagons, pans and tools dangling
clanging from all sides.
Couldn't take their cattle—
during the night my boys had frightened them off.
Oh, there were a few troublemakers
who claimed we were the intruders.
Some even had land grants
and appealed to the courts.
It was a laughing stock
them not even knowing English.
Still some refused to budge,
even after we burned them out
And the women—well I remember one in particular.

She lay under me whimpering.
I plowed into her hard
kept thrusting and thrusting
felt him watching from the mesquite tree
heard him keening like a wild animal
in that instant I felt such contempt for her
round face and beady black eyes like an Indian's.
Afterwards I sat on her face until
her arms stopped flailing,
didn't want to waste a bullet on her.
The boys wouldn't look me in the eyes.
I walked up to where I had tied her man to the tree
and spat in his face. Lynch him, I told the boys.