



Empire's Geographies

James D. Sidaway¹

Department of Geography, Loughborough University, Leicestershire LT11 3TU, UK

E-mail: J.D.Sidaway@lboro.ac.uk

Abstract

In tandem with their critical interests in the historical complicities of western geography and empire and in the contemporary geographies of imperialism and its legacies, geographers have engaged with the widely read book *Empire*, authored by Michael Hardt and Antonio Negri and published by *Harvard University Press* in 2000. This paper uses a geographical critique of *Empire* as an entrée to thinking about contemporary spatialities of 'technical'-economic, political and social power.

* * * * *

“People are now coming out of the closet on the word ‘empire’...The fact is no country has been as dominant culturally, economically, technologically and militarily in the history of the world since the Roman Empire.” (Charles Krauthammer, cited in Cody, 2003, xiv)

¹ © James D. Sidaway, 2005

“Empire is materializing before our very eyes. Over the past several decades, as colonial regimes were overthrown and then precipitously after the Soviet barriers to the capitalist world market finally collapsed, we have witnessed an irresistible and irreversible globalization of economic and cultural exchanges.” (Hardt and Negri, 2000, xi)

Introduction

Geography has come out of the closet too; if not quite in the terms that the *Washington Post*'s correspondent Charles Krauthammer (who is cited above) has in mind. Thus, over the last couple of decades, just as formal empire retreated a little further (in Brunei, Hong Kong, Macau and Micronesia for example), so have imperial *geographies* been cast into sharper relief. Hence recent decades have seen a plethora of critical works on histories of geography and their complex relations with imperial projects (Smith, 2003; Blunt and McEwan, 2002; Barnett, 1998; McEwan, 1998; Godlewska and Smith, 1994). Studies of the visualisation of empire as places and landscapes (within and beyond the discipline of geography) have also traced the multiplicity and complexity of these relations (Ryan, 1998). All this work has been invigorated by readings of *Orientalism* (Said, 1978) and Said's (1993) subsequent work; but it now goes far beyond the analysis of past geography as a colonial discourse towards the (often contradictory) projects of decolonising contemporary geographies or moves to produce avowedly postcolonial geographies (Cook and Harrison, 2003; Robinson, 2003; Clayton, 2000; Sidaway, 2000; Crush, 1994).

More widely, the geopolitical and geo-economic jolts and transformations of recent decades (apparently accelerated since '9/11') mean that other new imperial geographies are very much in evidence and a subject of discussion. For example, David Harvey (2003) is in good (and some pretty bad) company in talking about '*The New Imperialism*' and American Empire. Bookstores, newspapers and magazines are full of material discussing the merits, dangers, extent and limits of America's empire. The London-based *Financial Times* notes that:

We now see descriptions of the American empire from both right and left... On the left, the depictions are still meant to alarm and rally; but so too on the right. And, more tellingly, there is a large neo-conservative group that makes these charges not to distress, but to inspire. (Bobbitt, 2004, 18)

The *Boston Review* sets out the parameters of what it terms as a 'semantic shift' in more detail:

Not too long ago, it was difficult to find mention of empire in American intellectual circles, save in discussions of bygone eras or, more commonly, of the Soviet Union's relation to its satellites. The steady stream of U.S. interventions in countries around the globe could not, of course, be denied; but they were commonly explained as defensive response to Soviet or Chinese imperialism.... But America itself could not be cast as an imperial power. Times have changed. America and empire are joined at the hip in political discourse, not just on the Left but also in visible organs on the Right.... This semantic shift was not instantaneous. In the immediate aftermath of the Eastern Bloc's demise, the terms most typically used to describe American supremacy were more benign — sole superpower, new hegemon, and so on. The real change came with the George W. Bush presidency, and especially in the aftermath of 9/11. Commentators and ideologues no longer shy away from the E word and, indeed, openly embrace it — as well as the phenomenon it describes. (Chibber, 2005, 30)

No one doubts that the geography of American military deployment registers important shifts, even if these are not all so radically new. Barkawi and Laffey (2002, 124) note that:

[a]s we write, the US is establishing an arc of military bases across Central Asia and developing patron-client relations with the authorities there. Such strategies of intervention and imperial control point to continuities not only with past US engagements in the Third World but also with older histories of imperialism.

In common with many others tracing some sinews of contemporary geopolitics and imperialism, Barkawi and Laffey critically and carefully engage with the long (504-page) book that bears the short, striking and blunt title of *Empire* which they term: "one of the most widely read accounts of international politics in recent years." Subsequent responses to and elaborations of Barkawi and Laffey's critique by Callinicos (2002), Shaw (2002) and Walker (2002) represent just one stream of what has become a multidisciplinary debate and set of intellectual and political statements and claims about the themes that *Empire* raises. Epitomising these, a lengthy edited collection on *Reading Hardt and Negri* (Passavant and Dean, 2003) appeared just three years after the book itself. Many critical commentators largely dismiss *Empire*. Arrighi (2005, 203) for example claims that:

Hardt and Negri's work simply repackaged and gave a radical twist to the central tenets of globalization-speak, including the proposition that under present conditions of global economic and informational integration, no nation-state, not even the US, can form the centre of an imperialist project.

Others have sought to contextualise Hardt and Negri's designations of Empire amidst a long history of publications and debates about American and world (geopolitical) power (J. Kelly, 2003; Cox and Schechter, 2002) and to locate the economic, social and political mutations they describe within what Steinmetz (2003) terms "an Authoritarian Post-Fordism," or feel the need to register "the deepest reservations about this book" in a critique of the (neo)colonial present (Gregory, 2004, 348). Gregory's reservations are no doubt important and heartfelt ones, for he objects to *Empire's* abstraction and refusal to grapple with concrete sites and domains of contemporary imperialism. Yet exploring the links between such sites (which are powerfully and passionately mapped in Gregory's *The Colonial Present*) with Hardt and Negri's arguments about the transformations of sovereignty also seems to offer critical opportunity and promise.

Coming at the end of the 1990s and not long before '9/11', the key arguments of Hardt and Negri's book refer to the associated political, social and economic phenomena accompanying 'globalisation', regarding them as constitutive of a new form of 'Empire'. For Hardt and Negri however, this Empire is not reducible to or centred on a particular state or group of states, region or place (such as the United States or the West), but rests upon a universal and expansive logic of networks:

The passage to Empire emerges from the twilight of modern sovereignty. In contrast to [classical] 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. Empire manages hybrid identities, flexible hierarchies, and plural exchanges through modulating networks of command. The distinct national colors of the imperialist map of the world have merged and blended in the imperial global rainbow. (Hardt and Negri, 2000, xii-xiii)

Moreover, some of *Empire's* other passages have prophetic tone. The appeal and impact of the text have probably been bolstered by its (admittedly rather oblique) references to 'radical contingency and precariousness' of Empire and to resistances characterised by:

the unforeseeability of *sequences of events* — sequences that are always more brief or more compact temporally and thus ever less controllable ...[and]...sudden accelerations [in resistance struggles], often cumulative, that become virtually simultaneous, explosions that reveal a properly ontological power and unforeseeable attack on the most central equilibria of Empire. (Hardt and Negri, 2000, 60-61; italics in the original)

For some readers, Hardt and Negri's other arguments about deterritorialisation may, as Moore (2003) has argued in this journal, sit uncomfortably with aspects of the aftermath of 9/11. However, these arguments are not so much about degrees of sovereignty as changes to the dominant logics of territorial sovereignty (Elden, 2005). Moreover *Empire* has captured something of the *zeitgeist*. And it is precisely that sense of a changed world order, of global interconnectedness through terror and war, and context of geopolitical revanchism that have created much of the mood for the book's reception and impact. Tens of thousands of copies of *Empire* have been sold and, as of October 2004, the *social science citation index* (<http://isiknowledge.com>) specified 219 articles in which *Empire* had been cited. The sequel, *Multitude* (Hardt and Negri, 2004), continues the drama of *Empire*, opening with details of contemporary 'network power' in the context of 'perpetual war'. Re-invigorated by *Multitude*, debates about the arguments in *Empire* seem set to continue and are working their way into many disciplines, finding echoes in an array of political debates.

Picturing *Empire*?

In other words, *Empire* has been something of a phenomenon, and not only amongst the intellectual Left. This dense book by a young American literary theorist and a longer-established Italian academic became, as *Newsweek* termed it "an unlikely best seller."

For Martin Shaw (2002, 327-328), therefore;

[t]he book's success is indeed a minor cultural phenomenon, very much in keeping with earlier successes of the more opaque offshoots of Continental philosophy, especially Marxism, in the English-speaking world — the main difference being that this text is written directly in reasonable English.

In turn, as Kirsch (2003a, 222) points out, translations have been published in more than 20 other languages; this dissemination means that "the text stretches into its own network of multi-national production and consumption."

It is these networks that form a point of departure here. *Amazon.com*, for whom *Empire* was amongst their top ten bestsellers for months after publication, also claims that:

Empire is a sweeping book with a big-picture vision. Michael Hardt and Antonio Negri argue that while classical imperialism has largely disappeared, a new empire is emerging in a diffuse blend of technology, economics, and globalization. The book brings together

unlikely bedfellows: Hardt, associate professor in Duke University's literature program, and Negri, among other things a writer and inmate at Rebibbia Prison in Rome. *Empire* aspires to the same scale of grand political philosophy as Locke or Marx or Fukuyama, It has been widely reviewed and debated.

(http://www.amazon.com/exec/obidos/tg/detail/-/0674006712/qid=1127592146/sr=2-1/ref=pd_bbs_b_2_1/103-4995163-5100607?v=glance&s=books)

These debates and reviews are already more extensive than can be neatly summarised here.² But it is clear that there is much with which economic, political and cultural geographers can engage — a process that is underway (see for example Kirsch, 2003b; Sparke, 2003) and was epitomised by a review symposium in *Antipode* (Chari, 2003; Corbridge 2003; Merrifield, 2003; Raman, 2003; Welker, 2003) and a critical forum in *ACME* (Kirsch, 2003a; Minca, 2003; Painter, 2003; Ramírez, 2003). These scholars have already pointed to some of the ways that reading *Empire* throws up intriguing possibilities and problematics deserving further reflection from the vantage points of a critical geography. For example, *Empire's* reflections on the geography of sovereignty and geopolitics of world order (subsequently clarified in Hardt and Negri's interview by Brown and Szeman, 2002) are especially suggestive. Empire is therefore conceived as a name for a tendency for sovereignty to be transformed by, through and into a variety of forms of political agency (corporations, multilateral agencies and NGOs for example). In turn, this new 'biopolitical order' (and here the debts to Foucault as well as Marx are clear) is understood as something produced out of (geo)political resistance to prior imperialisms:

If 'resistance' precedes power [something that Marx's *Capital* sometimes concerns itself with and which is so central to Foucault's histories], the well-known relentless dynamism of capitalism does not then reside in capital, but in living labour, that at every step forced capital to reorganize. On this model, the current reorganization of capital called globalization is an essentially reactive regrouping after the disintegration of classical imperialism at the hands of the anti-colonial movements." (Hardt and Negri interviewed by Brown and Szeman, 2002, 179)

The geopolitics of the Cold War and postcolonialism, and much in the political, economic and social-cultural geographies of the twentieth century are thereby seen (amongst many other things) as moments in this wider manoeuvre

² However a useful summary of *Empire's* political arguments may be found in Hardt and Negri (2002).

within the capital/labour relation. For Hardt and Negri, this has been brought to life in the anti-colonial and revolutionary struggles of the twentieth century and the birth of new sovereignties associated with them (the post-colonial states), but which in turn are *now* being incorporated into what they call Empire.

Such (richly geographical) arguments merit our critical scrutiny. For Hardt and Negri leave their observations mostly at an abstract level. Stuart Corbridge (2003, 186) accurately notes that “*Empire* is resolutely anti-empirical.” And Claudio Minca (2003, 231) surely has a point when he notes that Hardt and Negri: “could have greatly benefited from dialogue with recent geographical literature in order to develop in much more nuanced fashion its reading of the geopolitics and constitution of Empire.”

Here however, I want to consider another geography that visibly and prominently binds *Empire*. For perhaps one of the most striking and unmistakably *geographical* features of *Empire* is on its cover. ‘Never judge a book by its cover’ they say, but as geographers how can we not notice the tropical storm, photographed from space that is printed on the cover?³ This is a striking image, but one that otherwise escapes comment in *Empire*’s long text (and most of the extensive commentary about the book), notwithstanding those references by booksellers to *Empire*’s ‘big picture vision’. Of course, *storms* are often used as metaphors for economic and political turmoil and transformations. A classic of early Soviet cinema, depicting revolution and struggle in Central Asia was entitled *Storm over Asia* (directed by V.I. Pudovkin, 1928). Such metaphorical storms never quite go away. Fifty-something years later, in the midst of a landmark history of Indonesia, Theodore Friend (2003, 221) notes how:

[i]n the outside world, Suharto’s evils went largely unnoticed, while his achievements were rewarded with accelerating foreign investment. But nothing is forever. That larger world, from which Suharto believed he was safe, was already being transformed by financial transactions moving at a speed across spans previously unknown. Politico-economic weather systems could hit whole regions or travel inter-regionally.

It has been argued that the rhetoric of financial typhoons, storms earthquakes and similar ‘acts of God’ are integral to the ways that economic events

³ The image of the tropical storm on the front-cover of *Empire* cannot be reproduced here for copyright reasons (for as the paper details, the image is owned by Corbis), however it may be readily viewed through searching for Hardt and Negri’s *Empire* at Amazon.com:

http://www.amazon.com/gp/reader/0674006712/ref=sib_dp_pt/103-4995163-5100607#reader-link

are represented and hence their politics. Considering such political representations of economic space in the Asian financial crisis of 1997, Philip Kelly (2001, 738) thus notes how, in Singapore:

[b]y presenting the crisis as resulting from ‘natural’ causes, the possibility that either the global financial system as a socially constructed framework, or the development strategies of the Singaporean state, might be responsible are precluded. Moreover, these [storm/typhoon/earthquake] metaphors enable a policy response that deepens Singapore’s enmeshment in the global economy and justifies the continued existence of a strong unchallenged leadership.

But what turns out to be most interesting (and I will argue, most revealing) about the storm image (and whatever metaphorical baggage it may bear) on the cover of *Empire* is where it comes from. Other geographers have noticed this. Merrifield (2003, 197) thus describes the book as:

an impressive and bizarre tome of a text. Impressive, because of the scope of its vision, the breadth of its scholarship, and the optimism of its will; bizarre, because of its bloated voice, the narrowness of its radicalism and the remoteness of its politics. (The cover photo — earth from outer space — fittingly sets the tone of what’s to come inside.)

Likewise, in a critical engagement with Hardt and Negri and other prophets of a decentred globalisation, Sparke (2003, 375) notes how the tropical storm image that now appears on *Empire*’s front cover;

...was taken from the American space shuttle *Challenger* as it crossed the Pacific, and it was accessed by the cover designer at Harvard University Press from Corbis, an online commercial purveyor of images based in Seattle.... the point of the book cover has nothing whatsoever to do with the tropics or the Pacific *per se*... the cover image was instead imagined by its designer simply as an “obvious image-of-the-world rather than a single ‘empire’” (email communication [with the designer]...).

There is another twist here, for *Corbis* is owned by the world’s richest man. And, even more than others associated with Mr Bill Gates Jr., it has become a controversial company. Since Gates purchased it, *Corbis* has both bought up all the rights to a series of images in publicly-owned galleries (notably the National Gallery in London and the Hermitage in St Petersburg) and the *Sygma* photo agency. Moreover, it has sought to claim that digitising photographs and artworks transfers the customary ‘author’s rights’ to the entity that owns the now digitised

image. As the UK *National Union of Journalists* has pointed out: “Some see this as an attempt to engineer an end-run around author’s rights laws” (Holderness, 2000). Whilst a full account of copyright laws and their relationships to regulation, capital and creativity are beyond the scope of this paper,⁴ it is clear that the moves which *Corbis* are making reflect the balances of power between corporations, states and public culture. Such issues are germane to *Empire’s* interest in biopolitics and representations, yet the striking cover passes unremarked — even while the contents of the text might inform our understanding of the conditions for its (re)production.

In other words, inscribed on the very frame of *Empire* is a view from somewhere (which itself was traded and purchased after its original picturing from an American spacecraft). The authors did not select the image, for as Michael Hardt (2003) notes; “...this is something the Press did. I only gave them negative instructions, such as no images of the Roman coliseum or such empires of the past.” Following such an instruction, the publishers have simply resorted to an ‘obvious image-of-the-world’. However, this ‘obvious image’ (like so many others) turns out to be a commodity owned by a corporation, the lion’s share of which is property of the wealthiest entrepreneur-capitalist of our times. Moreover, that corporation has acquired the image from the aeronautical and space agency of the world’s most significant capitalist state apparatus. It is precisely the nature of the obviousness that has (‘accidentally’) selected this image that I find so interesting. Somehow, by default, so to speak, this image comes to signify Empire. Yet this image of the world, like other ‘Apollo’s eye’ views (Cosgrove, 2001), itself embodies a very particular geography.

The space shuttle and *Corbis* are both expressions of American corporate and state power. In turn, their preconditions include the Cold War, the ideology and idolatry of technoscience and American renditions of masculinity (Carter, 1988). This might lead us to reflect more systematically on the continuities that *Empire* downplays or elides. For Sparke (2003), moreover, it is confirmation that *Empire* understates the role of American military and corporate power. Elsewhere, Sparke (2005) interprets the taken-for-grantedness of the situated geography on *Empire’s* cover as analogous to the ways that US domain names (and email addresses) carry no country code. They are naturalised defaults — built into the very architecture of the World Wide Web and the codes that comprise its operating systems. Certainly the stark facts of the origins of the image that is used to invoke Empire and invite readers to the book are something which the thousands of words of political science, philosophy and international relations on *Empire* have not (for all their other insights) usually foregrounded. Indeed, critical comment on the conditions of possibility for the picture on/of *Empire’s* cover and what this might

⁴ See *Creative Commons* (<http://creativecommons.org/>) for some alternatives.

tell us about the very subject of the book is conspicuously absent. *Empire's* geographies might perhaps be about more than first meets the eye.

Conclusions: The Geographies of *Empire*

“Once a figure of the Earth is ubiquitous, it becomes invisible.” (Cloud 2000, 402)

“One has to be a geographer today to map the topography of exploitation.” (Hardt and Negri 2004, 164)

The relative absence of comment on the cover image of *Empire* amidst dozens of reviews is symptomatic of opportunities for critical geography. For it demands scrutiny of how imperialism, both past and present, is not only always based somewhere (in geographical language, it has cores and peripheries), but that it is pictured, framed, envisioned (it is represented in manifold popular and corporate geographies) and tied up with enormous flows of resources and with what might be termed ‘geo-political-ecologies’ of extraction, production and consumption. In simple terms and with regard again to the image on the front cover of *Empire*: who owns that space shuttle, what fuels it and where do the resources with which it is manufactured come from? What social relations of production and exchange are embodied within these (and the corporations and agencies involved)? Finally, how does the image of the tropical storm from space embody western scientific, technical and commercial relations and vantage point? And how did it come into the possession of a firm owned by the world’s richest man? How does the creative vitality of capitalism appropriate such symbols and meanings, and rework them into a ‘smooth’ order? All these are the preconditions for its ‘accidental’ selection by Harvard University Press to illustrate *Empire*.

So what? Well, such questions point to the necessity for a critical geography attendant to intertwined and reworked imperial, resource and media flows. Consider, for example, the case of Western relationships with the Middle East during the twentieth century and especially since 1945, (where these geographies are also clearly caught up in imperial discourses and practices about ‘race’ and ‘culture’). The formation and trajectory of states and societies in the region and their economic, social, cultural and political geographies are arguably — to a very considerable extent at least — products of the layered and intertwined geographies of imperialism and resources. Moreover, according to Robert Vitalis (2002, 186-187):

[m]uch about oil politics and emerging markets today is echoed in the history of state and market formation on the eastern shores of the Saudi kingdom. The pipeline battles in the Caspian Sea are eerily familiar scenes from World War II in the Gulf. Accounts of Baku as

a boomtown resemble those that were once written about Dhahran and dozens of other places. Even the muckraking attacks on Chevron in the Niger River Delta, where the firm admits to transporting Nigerian troops to put down the rebellions in the oil camps, echo the past...[and] practices which were themselves legacies of earlier mining booms and market formation in the American West and Southwest.

Attention to these reworked imperial geographies (and the ways that they are represented in popular, media and political cultures) demands a sharpened focus on the grounded constructions and circulations of capital, commodities and *resources*. In particular, it demands critical scrutiny of the latter's geo-political-ecologies (Bryant, 1992), economic (Hayter et al., 2003) and political geographies (Sidaway, 2003; Le Billon, 2001) and in the contemporary intersections of primitive accumulation and informational capitalism (Harvey, 2003).

Part of this is about what might be termed modes of enclosure, from the 'primitive accumulation' of the beginnings of capitalism to contemporary globalisation, in so far as these all rest on an intensely geographical project of appropriating, portioning and commodifying resource spaces (Harvey, 2003). Here, the insights of many years of geographical scholarship on the inherently spatial and uneven nature of capitalism (Smith, 1984; Harvey, 1982) take on a new relevance and 'purchase'. But this is about much more than the urban spaces and their attendant regimes of accumulation that Harvey and Smith focused on in the 1980s and 1990s. The contemporary scramble for geo-resources such as oil, minerals and precious stones and bio-resources (from timber to 'exotic' genes) are both legacies of past imperialisms and intimate accomplices of new ones. All manner of geo- and bio-resources need to enter this picture. Moreover, the most vital bio-resource on which Empire depends and which it must continually re-appropriate is human life and labour. This is where agency resides for any future transformation from Empire and this is probably where Hardt and Negri are at their most suggestive in reworking Foucault through Marx in their ideas about biopolitical production. We ought to be attentive therefore to these (also highly territorial but fluid) modes of enclosure and incarceration as well. Moreover, it is precisely about the fine-grained contexts to all of these – the connections between the views from underneath and above that storm – which might set the scene for engagements with new imperial geographies. After all, if Empire really is materialising before our very eyes, we better be attendant to its *ordinary* and extraordinary geographies.

Acknowledgements

I am grateful to Prem Kumar Rajaram, James Ryan and Henry Wai-chung Yeung for comments on an earlier draft; to Matt Sparke for making available a draft of part of his forthcoming *In the Space of Theory: Postfoundational Geographies of the Nation-State* and Stuart Elden for his forthcoming paper on "The State of Territory Under Globalization: *Empire* and the Politics of Reterritorialization." In addition, Lawrence Berg and three referees (Scott Kirsch, Claudio Minca and David Moore) made many useful suggestions and critiques, which have been included in revised paper. The usual disclaimers apply. The paper was drafted when I was based at the National University of Singapore and finalised whilst I was visiting fellow at the National Centre for Research on Europe, University of Canterbury, Christchurch (Aotearoa, New Zealand), whose hospitality is gratefully acknowledged.

References

- Arrighi, Giovanni. 2005. Hegemony unraveling I. *New Left Review* 32, 23-80.
- Barkawi, Tarak and Mark Laffey. 2002. Retrieving the Imperial: Empire and international relations. *Millennium* 31, 109-127.
- Barnett, Clive. 1998. Impure and worldly geography: The Africanist discourse of the Royal Geographical Society, 1831-1873. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers* 23, 239-251.
- Bobbitt, Philip, 2004. Better than empire. *Financial Times Magazine* 46 (13 March) 16-24
- Blunt, Alison and Cheryl McEwan (eds.). 2002. *Postcolonial Geographies*. New York and London: Continuum.
- Bryant, Raymond. 1992. Political ecology: An emerging research agenda in Third-World studies. *Political Geography* 11, 12-36.
- Callinicos, Alex. 2002. The actuality of imperialism. *Millennium* 31, 319-326.
- Carter, Dale. 1988. *The Final Frontier: The Rise and Fall of the American Rocket State*. London: Verso.
- Chari, Sharad. 2003. The vicissitudes of Marxism in 'Postmodern' times. *Antipode* 35, 178-183.

- Chibber, Vivek. 2005. The good empire?. *Boston Review: A Political and Literary Forum* February/March, 30-34.
- Clayton, Daniel. 2000. *Islands of truth: The Imperial Fashioning of Vancouver Island*. Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press.
- Cloud, John. 2000. Crossing the Olenangy river: The figure of the earth and the military-industrial-academic complex 1947-1972. *Studies in History and Philosophy of Science Part B* 31, 371-404.
- Cody, John. 2003. *Exporting American architecture, 1870-2000*. London: Spon Press.
- Cook, Ian and Michelle Harrison. 2003. Cross over food: Re-materializing postcolonial geographies. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers* 28, 296-317.
- Corbridge, Stuart. 2003. Countering Empire. *Antipode* 35, 184-190.
- Cosgrove, Denis. 2001. *Apollo's Eye: A Cartographic Genealogy of the Earth in the Western Imagination*. Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press.
- Cox, Robert and Michael Schechter. 2002. *Political Economy of a Plural World: Critical Reflections on Power, Morals and Civilizations*. London: Routledge.
- Crush, Jonathan. 1994. Post-colonialism, de-colonization and geography. In, Anne Godlewska and Neil Smith (eds.), *Geography and Empire*. Oxford: Blackwell, pp. 333-350.
- Elden, Stuart. 2005. The state of territory under globalization: Empire and the politics of reterritorialization. In, Maria Margaroni and Effie Yiannopoulou (eds.), *Born(e) Across: Metaphoricity and Postmodern Politics*. Amsterdam: Rodopi (forthcoming).
- Friend, Theodore. 2003. *Indonesian Destinies*. Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press.
- Gregory, Derek. 2004. *The Colonial Present*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Godlewska, Anne and Neil Smith (eds.). 1994. *Geography and Empire* Oxford: Blackwell.
- Hardt, Michael. 2003. Re: Empire's front cover. Email correspondence with the author, 25 September 2003.

- Hardt, Michael and Antonio Negri. 2004. *Multitude: War and Democracy in the Age of Empire*. New York: Penguin Putman.
- Hardt, Michael and Antonio Negri. 2002. Globalization and democracy. In, Stanley Aronowitz and Heather Gautney (eds.), *Implicating Empire: Globalization and Resistance in the 21st Century*. New York: Basic Books, pp. 109-122.
- Hardt, Michael and Antonio Negri interviewed by Nicholas Brown and Imre Szeman. 2002. The global coliseum: On *Empire*. *Cultural Studies* 16, 177-192.
- Hardt, Michael and Antonio Negri. 2000. *Empire*. Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press.
- Harvey, David. 2003. *The New Imperialism*. New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Harvey, David. 1982. *The Limits to Capital*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Hayter, Roger, Trevor Barnes and Michael Bradshaw. 2003. Relocating resource peripheries to the core of economic geography's theorizing: Rationale and agenda. *Area* 35, 15-23.
- Holderness, Mike. 2000. Bill's basket case. *Freelance* October. Available at: http://media.gn.apc.org/fl/0010corb.html?i=clist&d=2000_10 (accessed on 2 October 2003).
- Kelly, John. 2003. US power, after 9/11 and before it: If not an Empire, then what?. *Public Culture* 15, 347-369.
- Kelly, Philip. 2001. Metaphors of meltdown: Political representation of economic space in the Asian financial crisis. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 19, 719-742.
- Kirsch, Scott. 2003a. Introduction: Critical forum on Empire. *ACME*, 2, 221-226.
- Kirsch, Scott. 2003b. Guest editorial: Empire and the Bush doctrine. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 21, 1-6.
- Le Billon, Philippe. 2001. The political ecology of war: Natural resources and armed conflicts. *Political Geography* 20, 561-584.
- McEwan, Cheryl. 1998. Cutting power lines within the palace? Countering paternity and eurocentrism in the 'geographical tradition'. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers* 23, 371-384.

- Merrifield, Andy. 2003. Death on credit. *Antipode* 35, 197-200.
- Minca, Claudio. 2003. Empire goes to war, or the ontological shift in the transatlantic relationship. *ACME* 2, 227-235.
- Moore, David. 2003. Hardt and Negi's *Empire* and real Empire. *ACME* 2, 112-131,
- Passavant, Paul and Jodi Dean. 2003. *Empire's New Clothes: Reading Hardt and Negri* London and New York: Routledge.
- Painter, Joe. 2003. Empire and citizenship. *ACME* 2, 248-253.
- Raman, Bhavani. 2003. De-centering Empire. *Antipode* 35, 194-196.
- Ramírez, Blanca. 2003. Globalización o Imperio: ¿Nuevas tendencias del capitalismo contemporáneo?. *ACME* 2, 236-241.
- Robinson, Jenny. 2003. Postcolonising geography: Tactics and pitfalls. *Singapore Journal of Tropical Geography* 23, 273-289.
- Ryan, James. 1998 *Picturing Empire: Photography and the Visualization of the British Empire*. Chicago: Chicago University Press.
- Said, Edward. 1993. *Culture and Imperialism*. New York: Alfred Knopf.
- Said, Edward. 1978. *Orientalism*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Shaw, Martin. 2002. Post-imperial and quasi-imperial: State and empire in the global era. *Millennium* 31, 327-336.
- Sidaway, James. 2003. Sovereign excesses? Portraying postcolonial sovereigntyscapes. *Political Geography* 22, 157-178.
- Sidaway, James. 2000. Postcolonial geographies: An exploratory essay. *Progress in Human Geography* 24, 591-612.
- Smith, Neil. 2003. *American Empire: Roosevelt's Geographer and the Prelude to Globalization*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Smith, Neil. 1984. *Uneven Development: Nature, Capital, and the Production of Space*. New York: Blackwell.
- Sparke, Matthew. 2005. *In the Space of Theory: Postfoundational Geographies of the Nation-State*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Sparke, Matthew. 2003. American empire and globalization: Postcolonial speculations on neocolonial enframing. *Singapore Journal of Tropical Geography* 23, 373-389.

Steinmetz, George. 2003. The state of emergency and the revival of American imperialism: Toward an authoritarian post-fordism. *Public Culture* 15, 323-345.

Vitalis, Robert. 2002. Black gold, white crude: An essay on American exceptionalism, hierarchy, and hegemony in the Gulf. *Diplomatic History* 26, 185-213.

Walker, Rob. 2002. On the immanence/imminence of Empire. *Millennium* 31, 337-349.

Welker, Marina. 2003. A global superorganic. *Antipode* 35, 191-193.