United States nor comfortably a part of it. The foreign both remains lodged within the "domestic sense" of the American nation and casts a dark shadow across its unstable borders.

The production of these elaborate fears and anxieties and the need to control and manage their disruptive potential is a key cultural process that interests me in this book. The language of *Downes* demonstrates that underlying the dream of imperial expansion is the nightmare of its own success, a nightmare in which movement outward into the world threatens to incorporate the foreign and dismantle the domestic sphere of the nation. The justices represented a double vision of U.S. imperialism as both expansive and contracting, on the one hand, constitutionally capable of boundless expansion, and on the other, narrowly protective of its own borders. As this Supreme Court case makes evident, imperialism does not emanate from the solid center of a fully formed nation; rather, the meaning of the nation itself is both questioned and redefined through the outward reach of empire.

This confounding of the borders between the foreign and the domestic lies at the heart of what I mean by my title, *The Anarchy of Empire in the Making of U.S. Culture.* "The Anarchy of Empire" comes from a poem by W. E. B. Du Bois, "A Hymn to the People," on the last page of his book entitled *Darkwater: Voices from Within the Veil,* the subject of my final chapter.[26] On the occasion of the Universal Congress of the Races in 1911, Du Bois composed the poem as a recasting and commentary on Kipling's "Recessional" (1897), a hymn seeking moral sanction for the British Empire. For Du Bois "The Anarchy of Empire, the doleful Death of Life!" refers to the violent destruction and havoc wreaked on the peoples and lands subject to colonial conquest and domination. In his poem, "The Anarchy of Empire" breaks down national boundaries to connect peoples subject to racial exploitation all over the globe, "Foreshadowing the union of the World."

In rewriting Kipling, Du Bois contested a common imperial trope that posits anarchy abroad as the prime cause of imperial intervention. "Anarchy" has often been used by imperial powers as a euphemism for revolution or independence struggles in order to justify their suppression by military intervention and colonial subjugation. In "Recessional," anarchy is embodied in the "lesser breeds without the law,"

like the Puerto Ricans in *Downes,* whose perceived chaotic qualities generate the need for the iron law of empire. While Du Bois saw empire itself as the prime cause of anarchy throughout its dominion, Kipling and other imperialists believed that the anarchic qualities of nonwhite peoples called forth the need for imperial rule. Indeed, Kipling dedicated "The White Man's Burden" to Theodore Roosevelt, to urge the United States to annex the Philippines. In advocating that the United States annex the territories acquired from Spain in 1898, Theodore Roosevelt warned that "if we had driven out medieval tyranny only to make room for savage anarchy, we had better not have begun the task at all."[27] Roosevelt's discourse, like that of the justices in *Downes,* produced the threat of "savage anarchy" to justify U.S. dominance, a role he also differentiated from the tyranny of Old World empires. The exceptional quality of the American Empire, in this way of thinking, transcends the ancient polarity between anarchy and tyranny.

Both Roosevelt and Du Bois posit a direct cause-and-effect relation between anarchy and empire, albeit opposing ones. I am interested in "the anarchy of empire" as an oxymoron of sorts, a contradiction in terms. The Oxford English Dictionary defines "empire" as a "supreme and extensive political dominion," and "anarchy" as a "state of lawlessness due to the absence or inefficiency of the supreme power; political disorder." If empire is identified with "an extensive territory," the meaning of anarchy is rarely rooted in geographic locations; instead, it conveys a sense of spatial dispersion and dislocation. Anarchy is also defined as a state of "absolute liberty," as the "non-recognition of moral law" and as "unsettledness or conflict of opinion." The oxymoron "the anarchy of empire" thus suggests the breakdown or defiance of the monolithic system of order that empire aspires to impose on the world, an order reliant on clear divisions between metropolis and colony, colonizer and colonized, national and international spaces, the domestic and the foreign. I am interested in the way anarchy becomes an integral and constitutive part of empire, central to the representation of U.S. imperialism in dispersed locations and at different historical moments. Anarchy is conjured by imperial culture as a haunting specter that must be subdued and controlled, and at the same time, it is a figure of empire's undoing.

The "anarchy of empire" thus suggests ways of thinking about impe-

rialism as a network of power relations that changes over space and time and is riddled with instability, ambiguity, and disorder, rather than as a monolithic system of domination that the very word "empire" implies. If "the anarchy of empire" refers to the destruction and exploitation inflicted on the colonized world, it also suggests the internal contradictions, ambiguities, and frayed edges that unravel at imperial borders, where binary divisions collapse and fractured spaces open. In this understanding of imperialism, I am indebted to the insights of anthropologists and historians of empire as well as to postcolonial theorists who have radically challenged the traditional notion of imperialism as a unilinear assertion of power in remote colonies. In highlighting what Frederick Cooper and Ann Stoler have called the "tensions of empire," scholars have remapped imperial spaces as contact zones and sites of encounter. They have shown how imperial relations entail not only violent force but also conflict, negotiation, discipline, and fantasy, which together reshape the colonized world and the imperial metropolis.[28] These engagements, they insist, occur within political and social structures of power and domination that both form and are transformed by these colonial encounters. In the arena of representation, critics have shown how stereotypes do not simply impose hierarchies between the civilized and the savage, the colonizer and colonized, but how stereotypes themselves become unstable sites of ambivalence that distort and challenge the bedrock divisions on which they are founded.[29]

My work has also built on theories of empire and culture elaborated by Edward Said and more recently by Michael Hardt and Antonio Negri. I depart from their approaches, however, where they implicitly contribute to a paradigm of American exceptionalism by rendering imperialism a distinctly European phenomenon. Said's *Culture and Imperialism* powerfully demonstrates how the treasures of European high culture bear the traces of their foundation in the remote geographies of colonial violence and exploitation.[30] His title comments directly on Matthew Arnold's *Culture and Anarchy*, to contest the English writer's notion of culture as an autonomous sphere that transcends and ameliorates the anarchy of class conflict. On the contrary, argues Said, this concept of culture became a lethal weapon in abetting the power of the nation-state both at home and in the colonies, where Arnold's cultural canon took shape through the educational institutions of the

British Empire. In Said's revision of Arnold, the anarchy inflicted on colonial subjects bestows coherence and aesthetic value upon the order of European culture, thus masking its imperial origins. Said's approach emphasizes the distance, both geographic and conceptual, between Europe and its colonies, a model that cannot take into account the history of U.S. imperialism, where colonialism and anticolonialism, nation-building and empire-building joined together in geographic dominion over Native Americans, and where slavery and immigration brought people subject to imperialism to settle inside national borders. Furthermore, overseas expansion, as I have shown, relied on the creation of ambiguous spaces that were not quite foreign nor domestic, and it also created vast deterritorialized arenas in which to exercise military, economic, and cultural power divorced from political annexation. While my method borrows much from Said's reading of imperial culture, I emphasize the collapse of boundaries between here and there, between inside and outside, and the incoherence as much as the coherence that the anarchy of empire brings to the making of U.S. culture.

My idea of the anarchy of empire has more in common with Hardt and Negri's description of Empire than with their description of imperialism, even though they use "Empire" for our contemporary world order of globalization, where "in contrast to imperialism Empire establishes no territorial center of power and does not rely on fixed boundaries or barriers. It is a decentered and deterritorializing apparatus of rule that progressively incorporates the entire global realm within its open, expanding frontiers."[31] According to the authors, this new system has its basis in the U.S. Constitution, a foundation radically different from that of European imperialism. They therefore regard Theodore Roosevelt as pursuing an old-style European imperialism, and Woodrow Wilson with his League of Nations as foreshadowing the emergence of today's postmodern regime, in which the sovereignty of the nation dissolves in the borderless world of Empire. I would argue that these two tendencies are not as distinct as Hardt and Negri contend, but that both are at work in varied configurations throughout the history of U.S. imperialism. The American Empire has long followed a double impetus to construct boundaries and patrol all movement across them and to break down those borders through the desire for unfettered expansion. To separate Empire from imperialism

is to foreclose the history of American imperialism and breathe new life into the belief in American exceptionalism.[32]

A key paradox informs the ideology of American exceptionalism: it defines America's radical difference from other nations as something that goes beyond the separateness and uniqueness of its own particular heritage and culture. Rather, its exceptional nature lies in its exemplary status as the apotheosis of the nation-form itself and as a model for the rest of the world.[33] American exceptionalism is in part an argument for boundless expansion, where national particularism and international universalism converge. The cultural expressions I analyze reveal an anxiety about the anarchic potential of imperial distension underlying this exceptionalist ideal. If the fantasy of American imperialism aspires to a borderless world where it finds its own reflection everywhere, then the fruition of this dream shatters the coherence of national identity, as the boundaries that distinguish it from the outside world promise to collapse.

The Anarchy of Empire in the Making of U.S. Culture sets these varied approaches in dialogue with the field of American studies to contribute to the current effort to remap that field from broader international and transnational perspectives. My focus, however, is less on the contact zones themselves than on what Lora Romero has called the "home fronts" of imperial culture.[34] A "home front" implies a line that seals off domestic space from a foreign battlefield, but as a front, it also provides a formidable line of attack and engagement. I am interested in how dominant representations of national identity at home are informed and deformed by the anarchic encounters of empire, even as those same representations displace and disavow imperialism as something remote and foreign to U.S. nationhood. The chapters that follow are all guided by a central question. How can the framework of the "anarchy of empire" challenge and decenter the national focus of some of the key paradigms that have shaped the study of U.S. culture? How might the contours of these fields of inquiry change, when viewed not solely from within the confines of U.S. borders, but from an international context of imperial encounters?

Historically, the examples I have selected range over a hundred years, from Catharine Beecher's *Treatise on Domestic Economy* to Orson Welles's *Citizen Kane*, from John O'Sullivan's concept of "Manifest Destiny" to Henry Luce's designation of the "American Century." The par-