

INTRODUCTION

Globalization and the Transformations of Race

DEBORAH A. THOMAS AND KAMARI MAXINE CLARKE

It has become commonplace to speak of the contemporary intensification of processes of globalization and the ways in which they are continually reconfiguring the structures of everyday life. Late capitalist processes of production, circulation, and consumption have altered interactions among economic, political, social, cultural, and legal spheres and have generated complex deterritorialized practices. While scholarly analyses of globalization have proliferated, and while there have been recent attempts within the social sciences to consider the articulations among ethnicity, gender, and sexuality within a global frame of analysis (Verdery 1996; Povinelli and Chauncey 1999; Schein 2000), race and processes of racialization are not usually considered central issues in academic discussions of global economic and political transformations. Yet, because globalization today is facilitated by the transmission and reproduction of deeply embedded social prejudices rooted in a past characterized by territorial concepts of belonging that both generated and were generated by racial inequalities, the contemporary redistribution of wealth has exacerbated historically entrenched racial hierarchies. These are hierarchies that also articulate with ideas about ethnic, gendered, and cultural difference.

If we know that racial formations dynamically reflect and shape global processes and are not merely effects of them, why, then, have contemporary

accounts of globalization tended to render insignificant a macroanalytics of racialization? In part, this appears to be the result of the anti-essentialist impulse in much of the progressive scholarship on race and racial identity, which though moving us away from biological notions of difference has also mitigated against generalized formulations of racial processes across time and space. The assumption here is that to make assertions about race in relation to globalization is to essentialize it because once we have “gone global” race cannot hold local epistemological purchase, except insofar as individual instantiations of race in specific locations can be exposed as fictions when bumped up against other iterations of race and racial difference. Therefore, invoking race in a global context seems to conjure up Western experiences of difference or generalized concepts such as white racial supremacy, concepts that reek of a kind of ontological approach to whiteness and blackness—an absolute truth about racial difference everywhere—that the constructionist approach disavows. The disconnect between our de-essentialization of race and our fetishization of the global, therefore, seems rooted in the difficulty of making an argument that gives race explanatory power once it has been established that race operates differently in different contexts.¹ Moreover, the analytic shift toward transnationalism as an interpretive framework in the social sciences and humanities, while providing a broader sense of peoples’ networks across territorial boundaries and the ways these networks are both constituted by and constitutive of a changing global political economy, has tended to obscure the role of racial categorizations and racisms in contemporary social fields. This has been the case even though the transnational analytic has generated critical insights into the ways racial meanings circulate and how transnational political action has undergirded important social movements.

Yet the complexity of contemporary global processes can never be fully grasped without a deep understanding of the historically specific and dynamic ways race has both constituted and been constituted by global transformations. This volume intervenes in the debates between those interested in the political economy of contemporary global transformations and those who take a more culturalist approach to racial processes in the twenty-first century by foregrounding the ways that histories, institutional sites, and popular cultural imaginations are racialized. By compiling a volume that details the various ways that people traditionally classified as “black” or of “African descent” are actively transforming racial meanings, we have sought to develop an apparatus for thinking through the ways and extent to which

contemporary global transformations are producing new forms of subjectivity, cultural practice, and political action that also move us beyond racism. Our goal is to build upon recent historical and ethnographic theorizations of transnationalism, diaspora, and globalization that chart contemporary processes not merely from the top down but also from the inside out in relation to historically complex and uneven regional formations.

Rethinking Race through the Geopolitics of Globality

How might we recuperate the power of race as a central category of social analysis without either falling into essentialisms or forestalling the possibility of developing a critical analysis that overarches the specificities of location? Of late, ethnographic approaches to globalization have made significant contributions to understanding how new developments at local, regional, national, and transterritorial levels have generated shifts in ideas about and experiences of citizenship, belonging, and racial difference. Scholars who use ethnographic methods—such as anthropologists, sociologists, oral historians, and cultural studies theorists—are in a unique position to bring to light such processes because long-term field research can enable complex insights into global-local interrelationships. As Leith Mullings has argued, “with its emphasis on underlying social relations and the informal workings of structures, networks, and interactions that produce and reproduce inequality, anthropology has a set of theoretical perspectives and a methodological tool kit that lends itself to the interrogation of new forms of structural racism and to unmasking the hidden transcripts of the process through which difference is transformed into inequality” (2005).

Furthermore, the more recent turn to multisited ethnographic research has reflected a growing insistence that these interrelationships must always be contextualized within wider webs of power and change over time (K. Clarke 2004; Clifford 1997; Gupta and Ferguson 1997; Marcus 1995; Matory 1994). Increasingly, therefore, anthropological accounts of global processes have offered a simultaneous focus on the specificities of particular locations (and hierarchies of locations)—whether these locations be villages, invented communities, nation-states, networks, or imaginative processes—and on the particular institutional and ideological matrices that exist at national, regional, and global levels, influencing and being influenced by local developments. By using terms like racial formation (Brodkin 2000; Omi and Winant 1986; Winant 2001) and racialization (Small 1994) to talk about processes that are

having similar effects across a wide range of locations, without intimating that these processes are enacted everywhere in the same way, various scholars have demonstrated that “race” is neither fiction nor fixed. Instead, they theorize the ways people understand, perform, or subvert racial identities by mobilizing knowledges gleaned both from the particularities of their local circumstances and from the range of ideas and practices that circulate within their public spheres, showing that racial subjectivities are always “coalitional, contingent, and performative” (Visweswaran 1998: 77).

What we seek to do in this volume is to highlight contemporary work on the changing meanings and politics of blackness and in doing so to give readers a sense not only of how one dimension of racial politics in the twenty-first century is changing but also of how new theoretical approaches to contemporary processes of globalization are both shaping and being shaped by these changes. Many questions confront us: What are the qualitative shifts in forms of socioracial identification and subject formation that have been generated by new global circulations? How have modern conceptions of racial biology been replaced by new attachments of social value by which other measurements of human differentiation prevail? How has a changing global political economy generated dynamic ideas about belonging, “progress,” “tradition,” and “modernity”? Where do visions and invocations of “Africa” as an index of black origins stand in relation to the contemporary cultural politics of race? What constitutes blackness in the twenty-first century, and to what extent are American black hegemonies restructuring everyday practices in a range of global sites? What is the role of popular media and popular culture in generating and disseminating new conceptualizations of citizenship or community among people of African descent in the diaspora? What are the competing visions of community promoted within popular cultural forms? How do these articulate with those promoted by other social institutions and organizations, and how have they changed?

Combined, the essays identify some of the contemporary ways blackness is being reconceptualized, a reconceptualization that requires new forms of interdependence and autonomy and that is grounded in new ideologies, practices, and modes of communication. By examining both the particularities of global movements and the ways that these flows are mediated by historical processes, legal and scientific knowledges, and various forms of mass media and popular culture, we can learn much more about the complex ways individuals both adapt to and contest the hegemony of the nation. We can also examine the complexities of globalization in relation to locally spe-

cific processes of racial formation that in turn shape national and global public spheres. We present this work in order to begin to generate more accurate vocabularies to describe differences, to develop new analytics for understanding the globalizing forces of capital, labor, and technologies, and to situate current hierarchies in the making within histories of racial ordering. In doing so, we hope to demonstrate the ongoing power of blackness while still debunking racial essentialisms.

What Do We Mean by Globalization?

Social scientists, cultural critics, and historians have been engaged in heated debates concerning how to define the characteristics of globalization today and whether these characteristics actually signal the dawn of a new era (F. Cooper 2001; J. Friedman 1994; Hardt and Negri 2000; Maurer 2000; Tsing 2000). Though processes of racialization are not central to these analyses, they inspire us to think about ongoing transformations in the relationships among racial ideologies, trade networks, capital mobility, and governance. They call us to consider how the new ideas and practices that confront us are deeply grounded in centuries of movements—of capital, people, products, and ideas. They also demonstrate the ways the unevenness of these transnational movements has served the related processes of modern state formation and capitalist development and has reflected ongoing (re)organizations of social divisions and (re)classifications of human value in relation to changing social conditions. In other words, analyses of globalization that are grounded in a certain skepticism about its newness compel us to consider both continuity and change over time. Nevertheless, a substantial and growing contemporary literature has charted the diverse ways global transformations in the late twentieth century, and particularly after the cold war, have been different from earlier periods, particularly in the ways they have influenced—and been influenced by—racial, gendered, and class practices at national and local levels.²

Over the past three decades, the massive decentralization of capital accumulation worldwide has resulted in the growth of new centers of economic expansion, while older imperial centers and sites of power have declined. Simultaneously, rapid advances in information and transportation technology, as well as the circulation of new technologies of knowledge and communication, have changed the ways in which notions of space and place are both conceptualized and experienced. Moreover, the postcolonial and post-cold war decline of particular models of empire, and the subsequent remobi-

lization of ethnic and national groups, has fundamentally reorganized global political spaces and economic configurations. The intensified mobility of postcolonial subjects has been spurred by a process whereby notions of racial and ethnic belonging have become increasingly dislodged from place, and once neocolonial subjects are “speaking back” to empire in complex ways.

Within the fields of anthropology and cultural studies, much of the early research on these processes tended to celebrate globalization as a postmodern liberation from the prisons of nationalism and other territorially rooted structures of domination. These scholars focused more on “flows” of people, culture, and capital within and between states and less on parsing the ways in which these flows were actually quite differentiated depending on one’s point of reference. As a result, some early accounts offered unbounded elaborations of imaginative and circulatory processes generated by increasingly nomadic and cosmopolitan subjects, implying that everyone could equally avail themselves of the opportunities of (and for) mobility (e.g., Appadurai 1990, 1996, 2001; Featherstone 1990; Hannerz 1996). Other scholars have critiqued this model, calling for a more moderate detailing of the limits and possibilities in which these flows circulate. In other words, they have parsed how the mobility of some has been contingent upon the immobility or homelessness of others (e.g., de la Fuente 2001; Ferguson 1999; J. Friedman 1994; García Canclini 1999; Glick Schiller and Fouron 2001; Ong 1999; Trouillot 2003). These scholars have been intent to challenge universalist and celebratory analyses of globalization, paying specific attention to the sites where linkages are *not* being forged, where mobility is being restricted, and where forms of racism are intensifying.

More recently, scholars have also critically reflected upon the structural effects of neoliberalism, both within and between nations. They have demonstrated how worldwide deindustrialization and the rise of the service and informal economic sectors, the proliferation of information technologies, and (throughout the Third World) the implementation of structural adjustment policies have widened the gaps between rich and poor, developed and underdeveloped, north and south. What these processes have generated has not been, as several more triumphalist accounts of globalization would have it, an integration of the world economy (Fukuyama 1992) but rather a “fragmented globality” (Trouillot 2001: 129). In other words, the processes associated with globalization have been profoundly uneven and contradictory, and the result has been an intensified polarization of capital, labor, and consumer markets between and within countries.

While capital has become increasingly flexible, this flexibility has primarily benefited the new regional centers of the global economy—North America, Asia, and western Europe (Trouillot 2001; Ferguson 2002). Workers have not enjoyed globally standardized wage measures and integrated labor markets but instead have become increasingly differentiated across sectors and across national boundaries. The new transnational political economy, therefore, has worked through the persistence of an old racial order organized through socially entrenched divisions of labor in which a global working class not only remains in place (as compared to capital, which moves) but also remains segmented along racial, gender, ethnic, and national lines. And finally, though there has been an expansion of consumer markets throughout the world, this expansion has been facilitated by the economic, political, and military hegemony of the United States and has therefore privileged American styles and tastes (Jameson 1998; Lomnitz 1994; Trouillot 2001). For many scholars, then, the “planetary integration” of global consumer markets, especially among youth, has exacerbated tensions within and between nations due to the “limited means available to satisfy those new desires, and the always-specific discrepancies between global models and local ones” (Trouillot 2001: 129).

These transformations have generated an increased concern among scholars and policy-makers about the power and will of states to meet citizens’ needs, especially postcolonial states throughout the global South. However, states have not become irrelevant and we are not living in a postnationalist era (K. Clarke 2004; Comaroff and Comaroff 2001; Glick Schiller and Fouron 2001; Sassen 1994, 2000b; Trouillot 2001). National governments continue to intervene in economic processes and state power is being redeployed in a range of sometimes unexpected sites, such as nongovernmental organizations, supranational agencies, and community-based institutions. In other words, as states have attempted to respond “to the challenges of transnationality” (Ong 1999: 7), some more successfully than others, the nation-state “continues to define, discipline, control, and regulate all kinds of populations, whether in movement or in residence” (15).

While the privatization drives associated with current processes of globalization have often had debilitating effects on communities at various levels, and while consumerism and individualism have “gone global” with U.S. markets, styles, and tastes saturating aesthetic and political preferences worldwide, it is also true that recent reconfigurations of capitalism have allowed some individuals to enter global circuits in new, and sometimes

lucrative, ways. This is, in part, the point of researchers who have examined emergent transnational forms of family formation, economic advancement, political organization and mobilization, and cultural practice within the rubric of transnational migration.³ Several scholars have also begun to explore the ways contradictions within processes of globalization have, in some cases, given rise to cross-race and cross-national projects, feminist movements, anticolonial and antiglobalization struggles, and other politicized cultural practices.⁴ In these accounts, attention is often directed to the important links that are sometimes forged between such differentiated movements.

Generally, this body of scholarship tends to emphasize the ways individuals and communities negotiate, revise, and sometimes subvert the hegemony of the global political-economic and cultural marketplace, thereby playing an active role in defining global processes for themselves. In doing so, it also demonstrates that just as globalization has not rendered states irrelevant, global processes have not led to a worldwide cultural homogenization. Instead, contemporary capitalism has been shown to operate through difference, negotiating, integrating, and reflecting particularities while “stage-managing” the independence of nations it seeks to incorporate (S. Hall 1997 [1991]: 28). Moreover, while there has been a decline in the hegemony of (Western) modernist narratives that were previously framed as universal, the celebration of a kind of contemporary cosmopolitanism has emerged simultaneous to the intensification of narrowly defined nationalisms, fundamentalisms, racism, and xenophobia (S. Hall 1997 [1991]; J. Friedman 1994, 2003). In other words, as individuals, families, and communities attempt to create new boundaries for their own subjectivities in the contemporary era, older parameters through which difference has been measured have sometimes become reactivated and reenergized, ultimately resulting in a resurgence of racial and ethnic hierarchies. This is because global political, economic, and cultural processes and local experiences have constituted each other within the contexts of particular histories and hierarchies of power and knowledge. These hierarchies change over time but are always influenced by the legacies of earlier periods.

What is clearly critical to a more complete understanding of contemporary global processes is an integrated analysis of the historical precedents of current circulations, of how imperialism and racial ordering have shaped global movements, and of the ways conceptualizations of belonging, membership, and citizenship have been both imagined and institutionalized in racial terms. The relative absence of detailed analyses of the particularities of

contemporary racialized circulations—who travels, what travels, and how transnational alliances are tied to particular knowledge economies—points to the need for historically grounded, multileveled ethnographic and critical research. It also requires the development of an analytic that makes central the relationships between institutional practices and racial ideologies, ideologies that are also simultaneously ethnicized, gendered, and sexualized in particular ways. In other words, blackness does not just index race; it also indexes gender, class, ethnicity, sexuality, religion, labor, nationality, transnationality, and politics. These dynamic relationships create social meanings specific to local, national, and regional contexts.

Recuperating a Racial Analytic for Contemporary Processes

The contributors to this volume explore how global political and economic restructuring over the past two decades has shaped and reshaped the ways that people experience, represent, and mobilize around racial, class, national, generational, and gender identities. Throughout, they insist that contemporary transformations in the production of blackness are as relevant to the globalization of late capitalism as deployments of “race-thinking” (Silverblatt 2004) were to earlier periods of imperialism, state formation, and nationalism. This is because the spheres of power that order micro- and macro-governance continue to be fueled by ideologies which emerged with the development and reformulations of our social worlds. From various perspectives and vantage points, authors explore the articulations between the forces of capital and cultural production known as globalization and the processes of subject articulation known as racialization. They examine how these two processes constitute each other over time, both materially and ideologically, and how they are part of a divergent set of changes that are producing new forms, concepts, practices, and patterns. They also theorize how experiences of racial, sexual, and generational identities that are often labeled “transnational” are still constituted in relation to very specific histories, cultures, and societies. Balancing macrolevel explanations—both material and ideological—for racial inequality and racial ambition with analyses of local responses, translations, and innovations, the authors explore the ways intensified globalization has both reproduced essentialist and racialized structures of citizenship and community and provided new technologies through which these structures are potentially transcended and/or subverted. They also investigate how the geopolitics of blackness are structured through complex relationships of dominance at various levels of interaction.

Their analyses, in turn, help to generate an analytic vocabulary for measuring the interplay between historical categories of racial differentiation and other linked social distinctions (class, gender, sexuality, religion, nationality, ethnicity) and the ways historically embedded patterns of racialization play out in contemporary transformations of daily practice.

The Scope of the Volume

We have identified three areas through which to focus our discussion of the transformations of race and globalization: (1) diasporic movements, missions, and modernities; (2) geographies of racial belonging; and (3) popular blacknesses, “authenticity,” and new measures of legitimacy. Each of these areas captures particular dimensions of the political-economic and socio-cultural shifts we have been parsing. In the first section, contributors explore how notions of community articulate particular understandings of blackness. That is, they examine the ways processes of racialization have been integral to the elaboration of ideas about humanity (or the lack thereof) and community, as well as how these ideas have changed or are being mobilized in alternative ways by different actors. The authors in the second section investigate how deployments of politics have both informed and transformed blackness. In other words, they show how processes of racialization have been imbricated with political mobilization at various levels and how these relationships have changed in the contemporary period. Finally, the essays in the third section consider how practices of consumption have empowered blacknesses, exploring how contemporary racial formations articulate with circulations of popular cultures. Of course, the dynamic dimensions of our subject matter overlap, a fact that has frustrated our attempts to create boundaries between sections. For us, the essays speak critically with one another, engaging similar thematic inquiries within vastly different historical and ethnographic contexts, both within and across sections. By grouping them in this way, we hope to emphasize particular aspects of globalization and racial formation while at the same time recognizing that the boundaries between sections are permeable.

Diasporic Movements, Missions, and Modernities

The contributors in part I of the volume seek to ground contemporary discussions about globalization’s effects in relation to the trajectories of earlier moments. They demonstrate that the ideological fields in which people

of African descent throughout the diaspora currently constitute subjectivities and political identities have not been limited to those generated by the contemporary period of neoliberal, capitalist globalization. Instead, these fields also always recall or revise earlier models of subject formation because current processes of globalization evoke—indeed build upon—those of earlier periods. The essays in this section explore the complexities of popular relationships to modernist projects, seeing modernity, in Donald Donham’s formulation, as “the discursive space in which an argument takes place, one in which certain positions continually get constructed and reconstructed” (2002: 245).⁵

The idea of race and the hierarchical institutionalization of racial difference emerged dialectically in relation to sixteenth-century economic transformations that ultimately created what we now know as “the modern West” (Holt 2000; Silverblatt 2004; Trouillot 1995). While notions of difference operated prior to this period, the expulsion of Muslims from Europe, the initial European voyages of exploration and discovery, and the development of mercantile trade generated a novel situation whereby, for the first time, racialized labor became “crucial to the mobilization of productive forces on a world scale” (Holt 2000: 32). At the same time that the associations between nation building and imperialism and between racial slavery and the development of export-oriented mass agricultural production became more tightly integrated, new ideologies began to circulate in Europe about the nature of mankind. Within religious, philosophical, scientific, and political discourses, hierarchies of human value were mapped onto gendered, racial, and civilizational difference (Trouillot 1995). In this way, early state formation and mercantile capitalism inaugurated material and ideological processes that indelibly linked the “New World” and the “Old” in a common project of defining modern subjectivity in racial terms. In other words, Western modernity’s roots are tangled up with the projects of imperial conquest, plantation slavery, and racial domination (Carnegie 2002; Gilroy 1993; Mintz 1996; Palmié 2002; Trouillot 2002; Winant 2001; Wolf 1982). Here, we use the term modernity not only to refer to the disciplining of a racialized labor force and the innovation of rationalized production and consumption on a mass scale that was made possible by the Atlantic slave trade (Du Bois 1935; Mintz 1977; Trouillot 1992; Carnegie 2002; Palmié 2002). We also mean to invoke what the anthropologist Stephan Palmié has referred to as the “sense of the displacement, rupture, heterogeneity, instability, flux, and incompleteness that characterizes virtually all social projects enacted in the region’s troubled past and

contradiction-ridden postcolonial present” (Palmié 2002: 42; see also Ortiz 1995; Stoler 1995). Because these racialized processes also remade Europe itself (Coronil 1996; Dussel 1998; Mignolo 2000; Mintz 1985; Wolf 1982), this formulation of modernity conceptualizes the Atlantic Ocean as an integrated geohistorical unit, an “area” in social scientific terms, where the structural transformations associated with early European expansion westward created what ultimately became a triangular web of political, economic, and socio-cultural relations joining individuals, communities, and classes on three continents in a single sphere of interaction.

European capitalist expansion via imperialism and slavery was therefore crucial to the establishment of the first truly global markets of exchange (of both bodies and commodities—or more accurately, of the African body as one among several commodities), as well as the infrastructures these markets required (E. Williams 1993 [1944]). The nexus of capitalism, imperialism, state formation, and modernity also generated an approximation of political and economic spheres of interaction within both the Caribbean colonies and their European metropolises, and within the emergent United States. This early moment of globalization engendered a common language not only for an accepted wisdom regarding scales of humanity but also for related notions of personal freedoms and political revolutions (Holt 2000; C. L. R. James 1989 [1963]).

From various vantage points, therefore, the contributors in part I historically and ethnographically introduce themes that will animate the rest of this volume by asking several questions. What does it mean to be “modern”? What is the place of people of African descent in the “modern” world given their cultural heritage (or purported lack thereof)? How have people defined progress and development while simultaneously critiquing the rational logic of universal truths? And how do we, as scholars, locate and interpret these definitions? The authors not only attempt to define the changing relationships between North American, Caribbean, and European blacks and modernity (variously conceived as civilization, freedom, progress, and community building), but in doing so they also reveal the political concerns that have been current during various moments of social reevaluation. In turn, these emphases allow them to raise questions about the assumptions that have shaped the elaboration of political and cultural communities.

This work moves away from earlier formulations of diaspora that tended to rely upon the idea of an initial dispersal or migration from an originary homeland. Instead, the contributors here view diaspora as process, a process

that generates subjects through negotiations arising from particular structural and historical conditions that change over time (Axel 2002; J. Brown 1998; Campt 2004; K. Clarke 2004; B. Edwards 2001). We are interested in “examining how historically-positioned subjects identify both the relevant events in transnational community formation and the geographies implicated in that process” (J. Brown 1998: 293). This is an intervention begun in earnest by Paul Gilroy, who argued that black communities were linked transnationally not through a perceived connection to an actual or mythical “Africa” but by the mutual perception of a shared racial oppression (Gilroy 1987). Borrowing from Robert Farris Thompson’s development of diasporic black unity, Gilroy uses the term “Black Atlantic” (1993) to designate a different kind of community, one that simultaneously defied racial essentialism, nationalist narratives of belonging, and ethnic absolutism, foregrounding instead the ongoing generation of “a relational network” (Gilroy 2000: 123) in ways that would transcend territorial boundaries and epistemological frameworks.

Gilroy’s intervention also redirected a scholarly emphasis on migration and displacement through his demonstration of how black communities worldwide were actively made and remade via the circulation and adaptation of cultural and political resources among them. By highlighting the ways twentieth-century black communities in England appropriated black American “raw materials” in the production of popular meanings of blackness, Gilroy began a focus on understanding how power works through the construction of diasporic belonging. Subsequent studies built on his insights, further unpacking the contextual complexities implicated within these circulations. In her analysis of Gilroy’s work, Jacqueline Nassy Brown has argued that “diaspora may very well constitute an identity of passions, but these passions, and the means of pursuing them, may not be identical within particular communities” (1998: 298). Here, she suggests that we must recognize that the relational networks among different black communities, and between differently gendered or classed people within particular black communities, are also structured by the same dynamics of power and hegemony that constituted the diaspora itself (see also Campt 2004). On one hand, this means that we must pay close attention to the ways the geopolitical dominance of the United States has shaped the relationship of African Americans to people of African descent elsewhere. On the other, it forces us to examine the diasporic “communities” not as unitary but as divided by issues related to class, gender, sexuality, and generation.

We are interested, therefore, in highlighting not only the potential solidarities that might be generated by the invocation of either “diaspora” or “Black Atlantic” but also the misunderstandings, differences, and arguments that arise because these solidarities are always contextualized within power relations that are locationally and temporally specific. Where Gilroy prefers the term “diaspora” as an alternative to the “totalizing immodesty and ambition of the word ‘global,’” (2000: 123), we choose a critical, historical, and place-specific approach to globalization in order to foreground an analysis of the circulations and hierarchies contextualizing black communities at particular times in particular locations and in particular relations of power vis-à-vis one another. We also use globalization rather than Black Atlantic as our analytic rubric here in order to move beyond the spatial and geopolitical dynamics of the Atlantic cartography to consider other circulations as equally critical in the unveiling of counterhistories and the constitution of community.

Lee D. Baker, a historian of anthropology, starts us off by tracing the connections among American Protestant missionaries’ civilizing projects, U.S. imperialism, and the political uses of folklore in order to make two important points. First, he demonstrates that initiatives that perhaps look like diasporic cultural projects with political implications—such as redeeming the cultural value of “Africa” for people of African descent in the “New World”—might instead be socially conservative schemes linked to imperial missions. In the case he examines, members of the folklore society formed by educators at the Hampton Normal and Agricultural Institute used the late nineteenth-century collection of African American folktales as part of their attempt to foster a Christian civilization among its graduates by identifying and then rooting out (rather than celebrating, as would be the case later during the Harlem Renaissance) American cultural patterns thought to be West African in derivation. In doing so, leaders in the industrial education movement emphasized a politics of racial accommodation and cultural assimilation. Second, Baker links this difference in the political purchase of African American cultural forms to more general civilizing missions among America’s newly colonial “natives” during the late nineteenth century throughout the South Pacific, and later among Native American populations. In directing our attention to how religion has been a critical institution that mediates and shapes ideas about Africa and African cultural heritages that circulate within a global public sphere at different times, this essay clarifies how missionaries defined modernity, progress, and ultimately citizenship among communities

of people (African Americans, Pacific Islanders, and Native Americans) who were thought to be related.

While Baker's essay focuses on how religious practice was linked to processes of colonial state formation and cultural reform in the late nineteenth century and the early twentieth, Robert Adams directs our attention to the dynamism of popular religion and its articulation of alternative modernist projects during the same period. His investigation into the conditions surrounding the rise, fall, and legacy of Olivorio (Liborio) Mateo, a messianic leader in the Dominican Republic's San Juan Valley at the beginning of the twentieth century, gives us insight into the ways *campesinos* came to define modernity dialectically in relation to visions of progress elaborated both by elite Dominicans and by U.S. Americans. For Adams, Dominican Vodú is best understood not as a simple African "survival," but as a living and growing practice, one that addresses the changing economic, political, and social realities facing San Juaneros. Again, Adams's essay shows how local expressive cultural practices have emerged from particular relations of power and circulations of labor—in this case, a history of Spanish colonialism and rising American imperialism, Haitian economic and political dominance, economic liberalization, technological innovation, and the move toward establishing a centralized modern Dominican nation-state. Yet here he emphasizes how people mobilized alternative definitions of community (diasporic, intercultural, anti-imperialist) and progress (collective land use, charismatic religious authority). Aligning himself with other recent scholarship on the kinds of religious expressions and spectacles that have accompanied twentieth-century integration into global capitalist markets (Comaroff and Comaroff 1993, 1997, 2001; Piot 1999), Adams argues that scholars need to take seriously these kinds of alternative formulations during earlier periods as well, seeing them as part and parcel of what modernity is—fantastical, fetishized, magic—and understanding them as innovative interventions people make in order to shape modernity for themselves.

Both Baker's and Adams's contributions address the articulations between growing U.S. hegemony throughout the twentieth century and the visions of "Africa" and "African cultural heritages" that were being mobilized toward divergent ends within a global public sphere. The three remaining essays in this section elaborate these themes, concerning themselves not only with the place of "Africa" in diasporic imaginations and political formations but also with the place of "African America" and its relationship to black communities outside the United States at specific historical moments during the long

American century. Jacqueline Nassy Brown investigates the formative influences “black America” has had on racial identity and politics at critical junctures in Liverpool, England. In her essay, she charts the changing connections between black Liverpool and black America in the immediate aftermath of World War II and during the era defined by U.S. civil rights and black power movements. She focuses on the circulations of African, Afro-Caribbean, and native black Liverpoolian men who were employed as seamen by Liverpool’s shipping companies; of black Liverpoolian women who emigrated to “black America,” often as the result of alliances with black American men; and of black American cultural productions that circulated with American GIS. Nassy Brown’s historical and ethnographic exegesis here is designed to ground processes of globalization and racial formation in localities rather than through displacement and in terms of difference rather than similarity in order to challenge notions of the Black Atlantic as a solidary community.

Tina Campt builds on Brown’s arguments to show how lateral connections between communities of black people throughout the world can unravel as quickly as they are forged, even in dialogical encounters between individuals. Like Brown, Campt is interested in thinking through the limits and tensions of diasporic solidarity. To do so she parses when and how moments of connection and disconnection occurred between herself as a researcher and the black German individuals she interviewed as part of her broader project about Afro-German histories of racism, resistance, and struggle; the processes of racialization during the Third Reich; and the politics of race, gender, and sexuality in early-twentieth-century Germany. Campt’s agenda is to clarify what is distinctive about the experiences of Afro-Germans, thereby challenging the tendency to privilege similarity and commonality in discussions of the relations among black communities transnationally. She also questions the centrality of narratives of home, belonging, and community within Black Atlantic populations by demonstrating that black Germans have had to mobilize a vision of diaspora that, because of their specific histories, is not rooted in a memory of an experienced commonality but is conceptualized as a “space in which the relations, definitions, and identifications within and between communities come to materialize and to matter as ‘real’ in ways that are strategically useful” (p. 110).

Naomi Pabst continues this line of inquiry by investigating what is at stake in negotiating the geopolitical axis of black subjectivity. Pabst argues that black Canadians are doubly marginalized. On one hand, they are cast out of

Canadianness through the official discourse of multiculturalism, a discourse that disavows racism by positioning citizens as cultural, rather than racial, others. On the other hand, she maintains that black Canadians are also cast out of hegemonic definitions of blackness. This is because blackness is seen as American, and Canadian nationalist ideology is rooted in “a collective sense of self as *un-American*” (p. 118). This dual displacement persists, Pabst notes, despite the documentation of a black presence in Canada since the early 1600s, despite visions of Canada as a prospective (if often symbolic) homeland for antebellum African Americans following the underground railroad, and despite the fact that Canada hosted the inaugural meeting of W. E. B. Du Bois’s Niagara Movement, the movement which would later become the NAACP. For Pabst, blackness is always already transnational. Throughout her essay, she thinks through the early transnational subjectivities forged across the border between the United States and Canada and the ways they were formed in relation to geopolitical and transhistorical manifestations of global processes. Like Brown and Camp, she argues that “if diaspora gestures to simultaneous difference and sameness among a transnational circuitry of subjects partially descended from Africa, it is also about geopolitical power differentials” (p. 116).

Geographies of Racial Belonging

While the essays in part I provided windows into specific instantiations of the cultural dynamics of globalization, parsing the particular histories of political, economic, and racial circulations that both shaped and were shaped by local experiences, those in part II move us toward an engagement with how these dynamics have been mobilized by scholars, policy-makers, and activists over time. The key issues to clarify in the mapping of diasporic circulations of belonging have to do with the kinds of relations that emerge in various local fields of engagement where race has been fundamental to membership and where the production of knowledge, as it moves in space, has been firmly tied to the production of racial difference.

Imperialism, slavery, and colonial exploitation created enduring global linkages that were sustained through the postemancipation period of the mid-nineteenth century and into the twentieth century. As science eclipsed religion as the dominant discourse of empire, advocates for slavery and colonial expansion helped to institutionalize the new science of anthropology, in part to counter abolitionists’ claims based on morality and biblical

tenets. As the discipline developed during the late nineteenth century, human difference was parsed along a color-coded hierarchy from savage to civilized—from black to white (Baker 1998). The fact that some researchers documented customs and behaviors while others measured brains and bodies did not change this hierarchy because human diversity and cultural differences were blurred and racially mapped in a way that privileged biology as the basis for human difference.

Though in the United States some anthropologists effectively challenged the basis of eugenics research, the institutionalization of anthropological science had the effect of solidifying earlier hierarchical classifications of racial groups. During the early twentieth century, these classifications were further concretized through village studies that conceptualized the distinctiveness of various “peoples” and “cultures” in relation to territorially based conceptualizations of belonging. Yet because racial biology—as the science of empire—was fundamental to the founding of the circumatlantic world, these territorially rooted distinctions continued to be mapped racially. Despite Franz Boas’s early argument for an analytic (and political) distinction between race and culture, traditional debates within the anthropology of the African Diaspora—and among various activist communities—have often employed nineteenth-century biological notions of race as the predominant basis for connection and continuity.

However, other changes were afoot in the early twentieth century as altered relationships between production and consumption also transformed racial meanings, which now circulated with the movement of both laborers and intellectuals between the United States, Europe, and Africa (Gilroy 1993; B. Edwards 2003). The emergence of race-conscious movements such as pan-Africanism, Garveyism, and the Niagara Movement reflected some of these transformations while further reinforcing a cultural politics of racial belonging and membership. While pre-Fordist socioeconomic and political arrangements in the United States required that racialized labor forces remain fixed within the particular (material and ideological) places to which they were transported, by the middle of the twentieth century Fordist models of production and consumption instead relied upon a massive movement of these same labor forces out of their place, “from South to North in the United States, from colony to metropole in the British and French West Indies, from country to city in southern and western Africa” (Holt 2000: 70). This movement, facilitated by the liberalization of U.S. immigration laws in 1965, generated a transnational wave of cultural practices from homelands (in particu-

lar, the Caribbean, Latin America, and Asia) to new lands (the United States, and to a lesser degree, Europe and Canada).

By the mid-twentieth century, these changes spurred the transformation of locally particular notions of difference into discourses of ethnic and national descent and belonging. And as Kamari Clarke's essay will demonstrate, this reordering of human subjectivity increasingly in terms of ethnic heritage—such as African American, black British, black Canadian,⁶ and Indo-Chilean—follows structurally related shifts in the language of contemporary American racial organization particular to the post-1965 period. During this period, the intensification of civil rights discourses against discrimination generated new ideologies about racial belonging and racial difference. These changes, combined with the earlier establishment of African American transnational political and cultural institutions, set the stage for the formation of a post-civil rights heritage movement and the development of closely connected corporate interests willing to exploit lucrative markets (see also Hernandez-Reguant 1999; K. Clarke 2004). The cultural formation of a new *commercial* politics of linkage between people in the Americas and those in related “homelands” set the stage for the establishment of a heritage category through which linkages to origins were used to supplement national identity and citizenship. In the social sphere, this emphasis on diasporic interconnection redefined prevalent notions of biological race to that of cultural race, here shaped by conceptions of ethnicity, or ancestral heritage. Though it manifested in deterritorialized contexts, this notion of heritage was actually deeply territorial but reflected a historical rather than an ontological or biological notion of race.

This is not a trend that has been limited to the United States, but is one that manifests differently within different contexts. Recognizing that diasporic connections are made and remade, undermined and transformed means that we must recognize that they are neither universally constituted nor static. Placing change and innovation at the center of examining the making and circulation of meanings has significant implications for how we approach the category of race in the twenty-first century. It makes it critical to understand the historical and geopolitical processes through which transnational formations are reconceptualized through regional networks and, therefore, the need for studies of racial process to be more attuned to the ways changing relations of power globally have generated innovative alliances.

The essays in this part frame the ways in which racial categories invented

in Europe were imported and developed in the Americas and have set particular standards of racial value by which social hierarchies were established in the building of the West. They ask how the events of slavery and later dispersals, as well as the invocations of spatial geographies, constitute the resultant inequalities being redressed. How do these experiences generate a transnational language through which to interrogate the making, excluding, and legitimization of alliances? And how does attention to the salience of difference and disjuncture undermine this project? The arguments presented underline how critical a recognition of the historical particularities that shape black enslavement and the workings of transnational capital in the production of new capitalist markets are to an understanding of what is new about the workings of claims to racial belonging today. At the same time, the contributors in this section are investigating the conditions of possibility undergirding contemporary racial formations and forms of economic mobilization in which geopolitical approaches to racial difference in the contemporary present are negotiated in complexly historical forms.

Building on conceptions that speak to a postbiological race context in which people are struggling to talk about and live notions of racial difference in a range of ways, Kamari Clarke explores a U.S.-based historical example of the ways that racial categories are being reconfigured institutionally via a broad-based diasporic reformulation of race and citizenship in terms that have more to do with culture and heritage. This reformulation also provided a terrain for the constitution of racial distinctions that would reflect a quest for rights—for protesting for better working and social conditions, access to employment, gender equity, and overall equality for dispossessed people. By demonstrating how the development of particular popular cultural conceptions of black identity enabled African American cultural brokers—such as public intellectuals, religious leaders, cultural workers, and government officials—to create new kinship narratives of the black past, Clarke traces a genealogy of black popular activism over the late nineteenth century through the twentieth in order to track the emergent forms of institutional racial consciousness that took shape in the late twentieth century. However, as she argues, these new conceptions of race based on heritage and a rights-endowed subject have not supplanted biological conceptions. Instead, the politics of rights and the shifts in market technologies worked alongside economic and political institutions to produce a new language for classifying race institutionally. What Clarke is suggesting here is that while the materiality of biological concepts of race, such as phenotype, still operate to

enforce hierarchies of racial aesthetics and value, within the U.S. context of the mid- to late-twentieth-century biological race as a cultural and institutional unit of classification has in some cases been replaced and in many cases supplanted by cultural heritage classifications. The trend toward cultural heritage has also had significant implications for notions of political belonging. Biological race, which, through modern science authorized the terms of U.S. citizenship, has subsumed a redefinition of ancestral heritage that was propelled by the rights movement, transnational migration, and the flexibility of economic markets.

Kesha Fikes continues our exploration of how the geopolitical has generated innovations in identity classification. Her essay is an attempt to examine how the Portuguese colonial state utilized voluntary and forced labor migrations in a fashion that mapped ideals of racial progress and social degeneracy within Cape Verde. By examining the ways that identity patterning can be traced through the histories of migrant plantation laborers and the creation of contemporary forms of globalization (i.e., transnational labor migrations), she documents how people engage the global labor market to transform their political identities via their places of settlement. In the same way that Clarke examines how narratives of slavery and nobility are used by some middle-class black Americans to draw linkages to Africa, Fikes questions how American representations of Cape Verdean raciality—as nonbinary—emerge as resources that 1) confirm U.S. models of racial identification, which are associated with appropriate ideals of racial consciousness and struggle, while 2) eliding the fact that Cape Verdean raciality was a colonial production that serviced Portuguese labor interests across nations and empires. In short, Fikes questions how the collaborative consequences of these two processes service diverse transnational interests; they each position the Cape Verdean subject as a dehistoricized and/or demoralized entity. Her objective, thus, is to consider how Cape Verdeans' use of the Portuguese passport—and thus Portuguese nationality and/or citizenship—became a means of guaranteeing one's participation in labor activities that were voluntary and not regulated by the Portuguese. Fikes observes how such efforts, which necessarily required transformations in one's racial status, are made possible through forms of legal belonging that emerge through transnational movement.

Like Fikes and Clarke, Isar Godreau highlights another social mapping of space—that of the intentional geographical mapping of state-organized neighborhoods. Her essay begins with an exegesis of the discursive terms through which blackness was folklorized and celebrated institutionally as part

of the nation in Puerto Rico. Godreau examines a government-sponsored housing project that was revitalized as a historic black site. In an attempt to document the controversy that emerged from this initiative, she elaborates the government's approach to racial discourses that represent blackness as a vanishing and distant component of Puerto Rico. Arguing that this simultaneous inclusion, celebration, and marginalization complements ideologies of *blanqueamiento* (whitening) and race-mixture that push blackness to the margins of the nation, and that it romanticizes black communities as remnants of a past era, Godreau, like Adams in part I, examines how modernizing state agendas and discourses of authenticity are also used to fuel cultural nationalisms in transnational contexts.

John Jackson's essay is an attempt to rethink globalization, race, and space by considering how Harlem, New York, was differently imagined at the beginning of the twenty-first century. Like the essays before it that map space and race in relation to restructurings of social identities, in this essay Jackson rethinks Lefebvre's distinction between quantitative and qualitative space to consider the various issues related to the gentrification of urban spaces like Harlem. Beginning with an attempt to understand the markings of new racialized spaces through particular forms of numberings, Jackson charts the political and economic changes in the New York metropolis and the ways in which race and space are being differently read in a postmodern temporal and spatial order. He concludes by arguing for a kind of racioscape, one that would span the distance between quantitative and qualitative representations of social life. Racioscapes, he argues, mark the color-culture compressions that bring various diasporic black people into greater and greater everyday contact on the streets of neighborhoods like Harlem, bringing into relief the class and national distinctions that constantly threaten to destabilize notions of racial solidarity and common community. As with the other essays in this section, the geopolitics of space is critical for understanding both the transformations of race and neighborhoods, as well as the impossibility of escaping racial inequality. By calling for a critical geography of globality, Jackson ends by highlighting the ways that articulations of racial subjectivity and spatiality are central to contemporary theorizations of globalization.

Moving away from racial spaces of globality to the economic and political relations of globality, Jayne Ifekwunigwe's essay addresses the dialectics of victimization and empowerment as exercised and experienced by trafficked Nigerian sex workers in Italy. In doing so, she seeks to understand the feminization of globalization and the ways that economic underpinnings of this ra-

cialized process are embodying an economic and political Third World marginality that is circulating globally. Like Jackie Brown, who in the first section calls for a decentering of transatlantic slavery narratives, Ifekwunigwe also argues against the tendency to privilege narratives of transatlantic slavery in theorizing and periodizing the African Diaspora. Further, she displaces the centrality of particular social and historical processes of imperialism and post-colonialism. By focusing on the earlier circuits of trade, processes of settlement, and political economic regimes that created points of reference for African diasporic constituencies, she elaborates new epistemologies of the African Diaspora, which in the twenty-first century are “not predicated on current problematic distinctions between ‘authentic’ diasporas of transatlantic slavery and to a certain extent . . . *faux* diasporas (“economic” migrations)” (p. 206). These “new” African diasporic formations, she demonstrates, allow scholars to reassess understandings of volition, agency, and victimhood. They articulate a language of movement and search for labor from West African urban centers to western and southern European metropolises, themselves undergoing processes of economic and demographic restructuring. In an attempt to locate these movements in relation to globalization and transnationalism, Ifekwunigwe shows that contemporary everyday African diasporic formations are constantly being reinvented by late capitalist geopolitical processes.

To conclude part II, Grant Farred’s essay further reinforces the workings of race and globalization by examining the manifestations of racial logic in the “New South Africa,” exploring how the institutions that are reinforcing the language of universalism and nonracialism reflect paradoxical workings of race that are still present in global reconfigurations. Farred argues that race and racism are fundamentally central to the new universalism. In examining contemporary manifestations of race, he also asks what has race become? In this case, questions about how race continues to function in relation to daily logics are centered around an inquiry into what the struggle for racial equality has become. Into what kind of political tool has it been transformed? By interrogating Paul Gilroy’s suggestion that the body is more than an unreliable marker of racial knowledge, Farred argues that the “crisis of raciology” is located firmly within the (black) body and is a process that destabilizes race as a secure and reliable political category. As such, arguing against Paul Gilroy’s call to move beyond race in particular contexts, Farred calls firmly for an inclusion of the racialized body as the ongoing object of inquiry. He suggests that though some might argue that the black body goes in and out of various subjectivities, it is important to recognize that if “difference cannot

be maintained, what will become of the racialized politics founded upon it, in different forms, for centuries?" (p. 227).

Popular Blacknesses, "Authenticity," and New Measures of Legitimacy

While the circulation of expressive cultural forms has been an area of interest for many contributors to this volume, the authors in part III explicitly address the ways that the mapping of race and space has also influenced, and been influenced by, the production of popular cultural forms, themselves conduits for the conceptualization of blackness globally. The relationships between performance and popular culture on the one hand, and political expression and historical consciousness on the other, have been of particular interest to scholars of the *African Diaspora* because popular culture—and especially music—has been seen as one of very few sites in which Black Atlantic populations have been able to articulate alternative political, economic, and social visions, given their historical marginalization from centers of political, economic, and social power. Fueled by a desire to understand more clearly the processes of cultural accommodation, innovation, amalgamation, and rejection that have occurred throughout the diaspora, research on performance and popular cultures has attempted to illuminate the complex relationships people of African descent have had to the dynamics of nationalism, imperialism, modernity, development, and globalization by reading these relationships through the cultural forms produced by diverse sectors of black populations.

Popular cultures, then, are sites from which we can analyze shifting expressions of subjectivity and the articulation of complementary subjectivities. They are multifaceted and multivalent fields of cultural production that have the potential both to challenge and reproduce aspects of dominant systems and meanings. Moreover, popular cultural forms are created and recreated within the context of changing transnational circuits of ideas, opportunities, and constraints, a point that again returns us to a discussion of the relationships among migration, contemporary processes of globalization, and cultural production.

Global economic restructuring has resulted in the immiseration and displacement of huge numbers of people from Africa and the Caribbean who, in search of some degree of economic stability, have concentrated within the formerly imperial European centers and the currently dominant United

States, especially in urban areas. Many scholars have ethnographically considered the (sometimes unexpected) links between migration, racial formation, processes of ethnic identification, the development of political consciousness, and cultural production. More recent research on migration has also examined the ways changing conceptualizations of the relationships between ethnicity, race, culture, and citizenship in the United States and Europe have been critical in terms of shaping migrants' public presence and political life in the countries to which they migrate. Central to these processes have been the circulation and innovation of popular cultural forms among and within groups.

Migration, however, is not the exclusive institutional domain through which popular cultural forms currently travel. The proliferation of new technologies, as well as greater access to older technologies, has also resulted in an intensified circulation of popular cultural forms worldwide. For many, this has seemed like little more than cultural imperialism, and in particular American cultural imperialism, and has been decried as such. For others, however, the circulation of American popular cultural forms and media technologies has heralded new openings, new kinds of collaborations among marginalized groups (McAlister 2002), and new opportunities for the elaboration of different ideas about the relationships between progress and the development of racial, national, class, gender, and generational identities (D. Thomas 2004; Wilk 2002). The critical question that emerges here has to do, again, with the positioning of African American (and to some degree, Jamaican) popular cultural forms within these circulations, and the implications of this positioning for narratives of black solidarity.

For example, while many activist struggles throughout the *Black Atlantic* have drawn from the language and tactics of the civil rights and black power movements in the United States, and while many black communities worldwide have borrowed from African American musical and fashion tastes, for black people outside the United States, African Americans stand in for both halves of their dual monikers. That is, while they may represent the Africa of political progressivism or the black chic of youth style, they also represent the hegemony of America, and particularly of the American dollar, which are ambivalently admired and only tentatively trusted by those who would draw the boundaries of global black solidarity to exclude those in the "belly of the beast." This was a point made by several contributors in the first part of this volume. In this part, authors also explore the ways the boundaries between black folk are often as blurry as they are policed. While hip-hop could be seen

as the current globally hegemonic black popular cultural form, picked up as the language of protest and expression by communities around the globe as diverse as Japan, Australia, and Mexico just as reggae was during the 1980s, it is worth noting that many of hip-hop's early and contemporary "stars" were the sons and daughters of black West Indian migrants to New York City. There has also been a proliferation of collaborations among African American hip-hop artists and Jamaican reggae and dancehall DJs, with the result being re-remixed musical forms that also constitute revised and revamped racial formations, now broadcast to a transnational listening audience within a global public sphere. The liminal spaces of African American and Afro-Caribbean identity formation, therefore, provide fertile ground for examining emergent tensions in global-local interrelationships.

But it is not just the fact that American blackness holds a place of privilege within the cultural production of race that is notable. What is even more salient about the contemporary post-cold war era is that the process of subject formation more generally is occurring primarily through consumption. Indeed, the contributors to part III demonstrate how racial, gender, sexual, and national identities are not only commodified but are made real—individually and collectively—through consumption. The emergent emphasis on consumption and, alongside it, individualism has destabilized totalizing narratives of revolution and has generated intense debate among sectors of both popular and academic communities. While consumption has become "a privileged site for the fabrication of self and society, of culture and identity" (Comaroff and Comaroff 2001: 9), and as the culture of neoliberalism "re-vision[s] persons not as producers from a particular community, but as consumers in a planetary marketplace" (13), the extent to which different consumers are able to access or influence this market remains clearly uneven. This has led many scholars to approach the tight links between consumerism and identity formation skeptically. Generated by processes of globalization that exacerbate old social polarizations and create new ones, the ideology of consumerism, for these scholars, seems to have eliminated the potential for collectively mobilized, transformative political action (see, for example, Gilroy 2000). However, if we reorient our vision of politics in a way that decenters totalizing revolutionary narratives and pays special attention to very locally grounded negotiations, incorporations, and rejections, we can more clearly see new attempts to confront and revise both structural and ideological systems of power and domination through an engagement with popular culture. In this part of the volume generation becomes a key analytic tool

because it provides a way to mark the significantly changed relationships to political structures and economic mobility that characterize contemporary youth experiences.

Through their analyses, contributors in part III argue against a view of globalized blackness that assumes a homogenization of transnational black (American) identities. Rather, they show that identities remain bounded by local experiences, experiences that are rooted within very particular historical and contemporary political economies. They demonstrate that globalization opens up the possibility for the rearticulation of racial, sexual, and national identities within transnational interpretive communities, but this does not mean that identities are themselves transnational. Instead, participation in transnational networks of popular culture and a referencing of events and images that are situated beyond the immediate territorial surroundings contribute to the reformulation of experience by providing new elements of similarity and contrast. However, despite the heightened circulation of media icons and mass culture across borders, the reconfiguration of state sovereignties, and the increasing interconnections between metropolises, this participation is not equally available to all. As a result, the raced, sexed, and gendered subjectivities fostered by the practices of borrowing and resignification are positional, contingent, and historical.

Ariana Hernandez-Reguant's essay begins part III by examining particular movements of popular meaning. She emphasizes the ways contemporary reformulations of racial, gendered, and sexual identities are tied to material transformations that offer few avenues for socioeconomic survival and mobility for people who are on the margins of global networks of power yet who are integral to their operation. However, in this case the essay involves an examination of how, in the process of challenging the very basis of revolutionary governance and its social hierarchy, the public spectacularization of black masculinity mobilizes the power of an "interpretive community" of audiences, musicians, dancers, media personalities, recording staff, and label executives. The focus is on how, as the revolutionary government was forced to implement capitalist reforms in the 1990s, Cubans began participating in global consumer cultural production in order to confront the crisis caused by the disappearance of socialist trading partners. Thus, Hernandez-Reguant focuses on the political economy of race, sexuality, and nation embodied in the performance, representations, and labor practices of *timba*, a hard-edged form of salsa that came to be known in Cuba simply as "the Cuban music." Here, she highlights how young Afro-Cuban men involved in the populariza-

tion of timba crafted an ethos of black machismo and a narrative of male hypersexuality which paralleled the advent of mass foreign tourism during Cuba's "Special Period." Within this context, she argues that the possession of male sexual prowess became an important key to the empowerment of young Afro-Cuban men whose participation in an underground transnational economy could lead not only to financial gain and upward mobility but also to emigration through marriage. The result? New and old identifications emerged, and race reappeared as both a form of social segmentation and an idiom of positive difference. In this landscape of transnational tourism, Afro-Cubans engaged in new discourses of black pride through popular timba music. As such, timba articulated a counternarrative of race that had the effect of undermining the myth of the *mestizo* and the state rhetoric of color blindness. It emphasized Afro-Cuban heritage through tropes of blackness, difference, and inequality by turning negative stereotypes about black men into positive features.

Oneka LaBennett's essay provides a counterpoint to those scholarly and popular critics who view youth, and particularly black female youth, as lacking the ability to consume critically. LaBennett explores how first- and second-generation West Indian adolescent girls develop racial, ethnic, and gendered subjectivities—in part through their consumption of the protagonist of the American television program *Buffy the Vampire Slayer* (*Buffy*)—that differ significantly from their parents, who migrated from the West Indies. LaBennett demonstrates that while *Buffy* supports the dominant racial ideology by representing blacks as peripheral (and at times primitive), female West Indian adolescent viewers identify with its white protagonist without denying their blackness. She argues that this is the case in part because as consumers of this program, these teenagers came to understand what it means to be black and female in the United States, negotiating their own relationships to both West Indian and American racial formations. For them, she argues, "a primary method of either distancing themselves from, or allying themselves with African Americans was through selective consumption of products coded as white, African American, West Indian, or West Indian *and* African American" (p. 287). These teens identified with *Buffy* precisely because her identity as both a student and a vampire slayer made her just like them, *not* regular teenagers. By clarifying why second-generation West Indian adolescents identified with *Buffy*, LaBennett also positions them as critical spectators with the ability to question those representations that undermined their identities and to extract from popular

culture what they could utilize positively. In this space, *Buffy* becomes simultaneously a source of pleasure and a moral lesson about racial formation in the United States, and the popularity of the show provides insight into the ways first- and second-generation West Indian migrants use cultural products to forge transnational identities.

While LaBennett focuses on the ways African Americans and West Indians in the United States negotiate racially marked popular cultural forms, Raymond Codrington investigates the effects of the circulation of black American popular culture within England. In doing so, he interrogates the currency of “place” and “authenticity” in relation to popular cultural forms and raises questions about what translates when popular cultural forms travel. Codrington is particularly interested in how American rap music, and the wider hip-hop culture in which it is embedded, is incorporated into the cultural production of localities in London. More broadly, his essay considers the ways blacks in London represent themselves through the manipulation of popular diasporic icons. By ethnographically grounding the indigenization of rap music in London, Codrington discusses how the current generation of black Britons negotiates British, West African, West Indian, and African American influences as they strive to represent what is simultaneously black and British. He also examines how, within this multicultural milieu, popular culture can be a space through which people form and practice new identities that can sometimes obscure racial differences among working-class populations. What Codrington demonstrates is that British hip-hop not only provides a way for the contemporary generation of black Britons to publicly critique the inequalities obscured by the discourse of multiculturalism that has emerged as one of the state’s responses to processes of globalization. It also establishes the ongoing ground upon which various actors—working together in sometimes unexpected ways—reformulate blackness in London.

With Lena Sawyer’s essay, we move away from a focus on popular cultural circulations from black America, returning to an analysis of the place of “Africa” within the production and consumption of expressive culture. Here, we are confronted with how Africa is strategically mythologized in Swedish spaces of African dance to meet different needs and to negotiate different power imbalances. For Sawyer, African dance classes provide a window into what she calls the “micropolitics of globalization” (p. 316), sites where both white Swedish women and migrant West African men negotiate conceptualizations of belonging and authenticity that are raced, classed, and gendered. Sawyer mobilizes her ethnographic data to demonstrate how the geograph-

ical space of Africa is used both to reproduce and to challenge embodied notions of power and hierarchy within so-called leisure settings. The essay raises the issue of the “translatability” of Africa in Sweden, and it stands as an example of how older parameters of difference are being reactivated and reenergized in the commodification and consumption of African dance. Ultimately, Sawyer argues that “African dance was not only an economic niche for black African men living in the periphery of the Swedish economy, and a cultural one for stressed out white Swedish women to, through an encounter with an imagined Africa, meet their natural womanly selves. It was also a space where people *performed* ‘Africa’ to debate and negotiate racialized, gendered, and sexualized understandings of belonging and community in Stockholm” (p. 332). With this case study, Sawyer shows us how globalization, while still structured by old colonial racial hierarchies and taxonomies, creates a situation in which mobility, liberation, and consumption embody different meanings, create different limitations for claims to belonging and authenticity, and impose different restrictions for people who occupy distinct conceptual and geographical locations within global hierarchies of power and value.

The final essay in part III brings us back to our earlier concerns with connections and translatability, and with the importance of historicizing assessments of the place of “Africa” and “America” in relation to different moments of globalization. Yet Deborah Thomas’s essay also moves us into the contemporary period, discussing transformations in blackness in relation to the changing relationship between what she calls the “respectable state” and popular culture (p. 353). In doing so, Thomas ultimately challenges the assumption that popular cultural production must necessarily be countercultural to be counterhegemonic resistance. In analyzing the ways progress has been defined by Afro-Jamaicans, and the ways these definitions have changed over time in conjunction with other material and ideological transformations, Thomas examines a shift in the public power of the ideologies, practices, and aesthetics of lower-class black Jamaicans from the end of the nineteenth century to the end of the twentieth. In doing so, she positions Afro-Jamaican popular culture and popular consciousness as complexly derived formulations that defy easy categorization in relation to political struggle. Here, she makes explicit the argument that has been implicit within many contributions to this volume—we must render binary formations such as modernity and tradition, global and local, sacred and secular, state and nation, and hegemony and resistance relationally, that is, as

“mutually constituting conceptual tools rather than oppositional categorizational poles” (p. 350).

Conclusion: New Institutions, New Networks, New Approaches

In order to understand the diverse ways people participate in producing new forms of practice—and thus, new forms of meaning—within the contemporary context of globalization, social theory must render more clearly how culture becomes dislodged from place, even as the ideological politics of state governance continue to reference territorial terrain (regions, villages, nations) as the basis for particular ancestral and, therefore, originary orders. On one hand, as scholars we have asserted that culture is not naturally linked to any given territory. On the other hand, cultural production continues to be inscribed within the particularities of historically contingent zones of exchange, resulting in a complex, yet uneven, reterritorialization. As the essays in this volume have argued, we need to understand not just how these relations and meanings circulate, are transformed, and gain legitimacy, but also how they are deeply embedded in particular historical formations. These are formations, after all, that have shaped the ways people mobilize particular conceptualizations of their regions, ethnic and racial groups, and nations in order to constitute subjectivities in the present, while also moving beyond these conceptualizations.

So, what can the convergence between globalization and race tell us about the decentering of modern biological categories and the emergence of new categories of belonging? About people’s various endeavors to reformulate their relationships to communities, regions, and states? How has the contemporary moment reconfigured notions of racial difference and of belonging to racial communities, communities that are also gendered, classed, and nationalized? The authors here show that in the current period, civil rights discourse is on the wane because states are less powerful in some locations, and in others, less willing in others to hold “equality” as a value. At the same time, the postcolonial context is one in which migration, movement, and media—though unevenly experienced—have created a situation in which “the nation-based dimensions of racial solidarity have atrophied” (Winant 2000: 180). The transformation of global race relations and the entrenchment of American exceptionalism have meant that claims to pan-Africanity have become increasingly fraught with dismissals of racial fraternity and fissured by the distinctions between the West and the rest. Yet, migration and techno-

logical shifts have also meant that notions of blackness and diaspora are more instantaneously debated across space and time, particularly in the realm of popular culture, which is now, to a degree (because of U.S. mass media domination) shared. As a result, a new common language has emerged, and this is a language that is differently political—not the civil and political rights discourses of the mid-twentieth century, but something else that is rooted in changed notions of racial community. Belonging is being recognized as contingent and incomplete, and commonalities are being rethought in relation not only to historical specificities that position black people who are differently national, classed, and sexualized in complex relationships to each other, but also to contemporary processes that seem to solidify particular kinds of hierarchy within diaspora.

Ultimately, as the authors in this volume point out, contemporary transformations command us to think about racial formation as a process—and as a process that articulates with other processes—rather than as a stable (and knowable) category. As these essays indicate, examining locality alongside globality, charting the circulation of concepts and their transformation, and examining the transformation of cultural norms force us to revisit older patterns of social hierarchy. To understand contemporary processes of racial formation, it is critical to clarify the relationships between older imperial relationships and current configurations of power, to identify the ramifications of these two projects' motivations for classifying populations, and to clarify their visions of the future. In other words, context is everything, and historical specificity is crucial. The discussion in which we are engaged is not just about a silence around racial formation in theoretical exegeses of globalization, but is also about the spread of particular Americanized categories of understanding race both outside and in relation to the United States.

We need also to recognize how contemporary processes of globalization and racialization are drawing new and further exasperating preexisting forms of disenfranchisement, thereby generating new forms of dispossession. We are confronting a world in which larger and larger percentages of national populations are illiterate, where the avenues for self-advancement have become increasingly limited, where remittances constitute ever greater percentages of developing countries' GNPs, where sexual tourism and sex trafficking are on the rise, where the availability of critical social services is on the decline, where a commitment to social equality becomes framed as anti-capitalist, and where an assertive call for peace is seen as suspiciously unpatriotic. The shift in the United States from a politics of consensus to one of

coercion on the world stage (Harvey 2003) parallels another shift. While the “color line” was central to struggles throughout the Americas during the twentieth century, it is the poverty line—or, as Manning Marable has put it, the “problem of global apartheid” (Marable 2004)—that will be central in the twenty-first century.

When W. E. B. Du Bois was writing, race was mapped easily in terms of slavery, then still a visceral memory for many African Americans. While various white Americans towed the ontological line about race as scientific truth, various black Americans struggled against this in order to enter the national body politic. Currently, the color line has a different geometry. Class, enfranchisement, and nationality no longer graph so easily onto a black/white axis, and racial power is more difficult to locate but is equally insidious. In the present, with the exception of extremist communities, the public discourse about blackness within the dominant public sphere is nearly nonexistent. Indeed, in the United States today race seems to be invoked most often either ahistorically in relation to debates regarding affirmative action, or apolitically in relation to popular culture. We will soon see whether the horror of Americans and others over the delayed federal response to the 2005 devastation visited upon mainly poor black New Orleanians by hurricane Katrina, and the mainstream media’s indictment of racialized poverty in the United States, can be sustained and translated into real change over the long haul. In the meantime, and despite public erasures of the ways citizenship is still racialized, African Americans and other diasporic blacks are struggling to maintain a sense of racial community and racial political mobilization in the face of persistent prejudice and discrimination. For scholars, this affects how we must think of the political significance of race and racial difference, and it puts us in the complicated position of debunking black racial essentialisms even as we parse how the color line really still does divide. It also requires us to move beyond facile understandings of what constitutes “politics” or “counterculture” to seriously consider how emergent practices might more successfully confront a changed context and to map how these innovative practices continue to be in dialogue with those developed in earlier periods. It is our hope that this volume contributes to this kind of anthropological endeavor.

Notes

1. We thank John L. Jackson Jr. and Ronald Wayne Crooks for helping us to clarify these points.

2. Though many scholars have provided insights into the various transformations in the global political economy since the 1970s, our understanding has been shaped by the following works: Appadurai 1990, 1996; Jean and John Comaroff 2001; J. Friedman 1993, 1994, 2003; Ferguson 1999, 2002; Graeber 2002; Gupta and Ferguson 1992; S. Hall 1997 [1991]; Harvey 1989; Petras 1990; Sassen 1994, 2000b; and Trouillot 2001. Several scholars have also focused explicitly on the ways global processes are gendered in the discourse about globalization (Freeman 2001), in the ways people experience contemporary transformations, and in the ways they mobilize to transform their situations. See, for example, Aymer 1997; Bolles 1983, 1996; Colen 1989; Colen and Sanjek 1990; Deere, Antrobus, and Bolles 1990; Enloe 1990; Fernandez-Kelly 1983; Harrison 1991; Kempadoo 1999; McAfee 1991; Mies 1982, 1986; Mohanty 1997; Nash and Fernandez-Kelly 1983; Ong 1987; Parreñas 2001; Safa 1981, 1995; Sen and Grown 1987; Ward 1990.

3. For examples of some of the path-breaking scholarship on transnational migration, see Basch, Glick Schiller, and Szanton-Blanc 1994; Chamberlain 1997; Glick Schiller, Basch, and Szanton-Blanc 1992; Glick Schiller and Fouron 2001; W. James 1998, James and Harris 1993; Kasinitz 1992; Kearney 1991; Rouse 1995; Smith and Guarnizo 1998; Sutton and Chaney 1987.

4. See, for example, Grewal and Kaplan 1994; Gleeson and Low 2001; Hardt and Negri 2004; Kingsnorth 2003; Lowe and Lloyd 1997; Mohanty 1991; Nielsen 2003; Striffler 2003.

5. Donham's formulation here is part of a growing body of literature that has been concerned to theorize "the modernities that are produced out of the articulations, productions, and struggles between capitalist forces and local communities in different parts of the world" (Ong and Nonini 1997: 15; see also Comaroff and Comaroff 1993, 1997; Donham 1999; Ferguson 1999; Gaonkar 2001; Hanchard 2001; Knauff 2002; Miller 1994; Ong 1999; Piot 1999; Pred and Watts 1993; Robotham 1997; Rofel 1999a; Tsing 1993). The study of alternative, multiple, or critical modernities has been part of a more general attempt among anthropologists to particularize concepts that have been presented as universal, such as democracy (Paley 1999) and development (Ferguson 1990; Escobar 1995; Deere, Antrobus, Bolles 1990).

6. Black British and black Canadian came to be ethnic terms within the context of multiculturalism in the United Kingdom and Canada.