Introduction. Other Globes

Past and Peripheral Imaginations of Globalization

Ferdinand, S.; Villaescusa-Illán, I.; Peeren, E.

DOI
10.1007/978-3-030-14980-2_1

Publication date
2019

Document Version
Final published version

Published in
Other Globes

License
Article 25fa Dutch Copyright Act

Simon Ferdinand · Irene Villaescusa-Illán
Esther Peeren
Editors

Other Globes

Past and Peripheral Imaginations
of Globalization

palgrave
macmillan

Contents

CHAPTER 1

Introduction. Other Globes: Past and Peripheral Imaginations of Globalization

Simon Ferdinand, Irene Villaescusa-Illán and Esther Peeren

In the incendiary opening lines of their *Dialectic of Enlightenment*, Max Horkheimer and Theodor W. Adorno observe how although "the Enlightenment has always aimed at liberating men from fear and establishing their sovereignty," "the fully enlightened earth radiates disaster triumphant" (2002 [1944], 3). We begin this Introduction with this stark statement on the outcome of the enlightenment, not because we adhere to Horkheimer and Adorno's gloomy teleologies, which now seem all too transparently overdetermined by the backdrop of exile, genocide, and global war. What interests us, in introducing this volume, is rather how the *Dialectic*'s grand narrative begins with an image of the earth. Through this image, we approach the disasters of "enlightenment," which, for Horkheimer and Adorno, describes not just the eighteenth-century hegemony of positivist experimental science, but a deep history of instrumental rationality, culminating in capitalist regimes

S. Ferdinand (✉) · I. Villaescusa-Illán · E. Peeren
University of Amsterdam, Amsterdam, The Netherlands

S. Ferdinand et al. (eds.), *Other Globes*,
Palgrave Studies in Globalization, Culture and Society,
https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-14980-2_1

of enframing and exploiting people, places, and polities. The "earth" is not a neutral backcloth against which this history plays out. Instead, the "fully enlightened earth" can be construed as the specific conception of Earth *produced by* enlightenment, that is, the "wholly grasped and mathematized" globe (Horkheimer and Adorno 2002, 25, translation modified).[1] Indeed, the mapped modern globe encapsulates the different characteristics that the *Dialectic* imputes to instrumental rationality. It reduces nature to the "mere objectivity" of an inert surface; equalizes qualitative differences by asserting general fungibility and calculability; distances the viewing subject from earthbound objects, establishing its mastery over them; and constructs a framework for total knowledge, which curves back on itself in a global rotundity (Horkheimer and Adorno 2002, 3–42). Admittedly, Horkheimer and Adorno write of the "fully enlightened earth" and the "disenchantment of the world" without explicitly theorizing the spatialities of enlightenment. Extrapolating from their analysis, however, we would suggest that instrumental rationality reduces both *world* and *earth*—the specificity of which we go on to discuss—to the reified framework of a geometrically conceived *globe* (2002, 3).

Today, advertising and media especially are saturated by figures of the global, ranging from photographs of the Earth taken from spacecraft or its moon, through daily references to "globalization" or "global issues" in news broadcasting, to the global logos that brand transnational corporations. As Bronislaw Szerszynski has argued, such unobtrusive forms of global imagining have permeated quotidian culture so thoroughly in recent decades as to "constitute an unremarked, all-pervasive background to people's lives ... with the potential to reshape their sense of belonging" (2005, 166). Szerszynski uses the term "banal globalism" to refer to the commonplace condition in which taken-for-granted imaginations of globalization—whether they relate to finance, environmentalism, news, or tourism—frame identities and experience in inconspicuous ways that escape conscious reflection (Szerszynski 2005, 165–167).[2] It is important to emphasize that Szerszynski does not invoke banality in the evaluative sense of inconsequential or trite. Rather, banality here signals how global images are so pervasive and familiar in contemporary culture as to evade scrutiny. While some banal global images are much more idiosyncratic than their commonplace character might first suggest (Ferdinand 2018b), most reinforce dominant ways of construing globalization and inhabiting the global. In the imagination of globality thus reproduced, the Earth is conceived as a neoliberal globe of frictionless circulation through which flows of commodities, communications, and communities move unimpeded by the constraints of time and geography; and as a calculable geode, available to measurement, management, and manipulation. In a manner consonant with Horkheimer and Adorno's vision of calamitous totality, critical scholarship has tended to emphasize the deleterious effects of this now pervasive imagination of the global. As we go on to demonstrate below, critics have variously argued that dominant global imaginations estrange people from place; reduce the planet's ecological and cultural diversity to an objectified, homogenous system; occasion visions of imperial conquest and mastery; and expedite the exploitation of peoples and environments.

Against this backdrop, *Other Globes* sets out to show how the prevailing vision of the capitalist and calculable globe represents only one among many possible ways in which the global has been—and might be—articulated. Although the volume draws extensively on scholarship critical of dominant global discourses, our intention is less to enlarge this critical mass than to highlight the abundance and variety of alternative imaginations of globalization and the global. Whether before the historical ascendance of the capitalist and calculable globe in the early modern period or at its fringes today, cultural practice brims with different, imaginative ways of narrating and representing the global. In the contemporary context of intensive capitalist globalization, ruthless geopolitics, and unabated environmental exploitation, these various "other globes" offer paths for thinking beyond the globality we have—paradigms for alternative relations among people, polities, and the planet. Accordingly, the chapters in this volume present a collection of case studies of diverse cultural imaginations of the globe, the earth, the world, and the planet in works of art, literature, performance, film, and music, emphasizing how they emerge or can be mobilized as counterpoints to hegemonic representations of globes and globalization. Derived from, among others, the disparate historical and cultural contexts of the Holy Roman Empire (Hess); late Medieval Brabant (Ferdinand); the colonial and postcolonial

Philippines (Flores; Villaescusa-Illán); early twentieth-century Britain (Parsons); contemporary Puerto Rico (Hitchcock); occupied Palestine (Hitchcock); postcolonial South Africa (Ashcroft) and Chile (Radisoglu); and California (Tola), these alternative articulations of the global often contradict one another. Nonetheless, their diversity emphasizes how there is no single, transparent way in which to imagine globalization—no neutral or natural way to inhabit the global. A renewed cognizance of the rich multiplicity of global imaginations underlines the contingency and constructedness of the supposedly fully mapped and spanned modern globe, and interrupts the cultural work of naturalization through which dominant imaginations fade into the taken-for-granted background of everyday life.

The volume collects an archive of qualitatively different ways of conceiving and approaching the global. To avoid establishing new hierarchies among diverse global imaginations, it is largely organized chronologically. Though the counter-imaginations analyzed are specific to each case study and must be grasped on their own terms, overall they tend to emphasize relationality and heterogeneity, while challenging detached, dominative, and homogenizing global representations. Besides showing how they dispel the global's dominant associations with transcendence, objectivity, and mastery, the contributions underline how "other globes" are themselves emplaced and entangled in the power and politics of globalization processes, and participate in shaping them. As a result, there can be no absolute distinction between dominant and alternative global imaginations: hidden complexities may inhabit dominant global imaginations, while alternative global imaginations may exhibit forms of ideological reduction.

The remainder of this Introduction is structured as follows. We begin with a discussion of the divergent meanings of the words "globe," "world," "earth," and "planet," highlighting how each preconditions distinct perceptions of and practices toward what is currently named "the global." Subsequently, we explain how the volume situates global imaginations, describing what we mean by central and peripheral, and elaborating a genealogy of global imaginations focusing on how the opposition between dominant and alternative imaginations emerged in and through modern terrestrial globalism's rise to hegemony. After surveying some major theoretical critiques of dominant global imaginations, and explaining how the volume's contributions relate to them, we close this Introduction with a chapter outline.

Globe, Earth, World, and Planet

In attending to different cultural imaginations of globalization, this volume insists from the outset on the importance of the *globe* embedded in its very name. Although this may seem obvious, the presence of the *globe* in *globalization*—or, alternatively, the *monde* in the French *mondialisation* and Dutch *mondialisering*—is seldom reflected upon explicitly. As W. J. T. Mitchell has written, even when scholars set out to actively scrutinize prevalent understandings of globalization, "the general tendency has been to talk about the global *distribution*" of its various products, flows, risks, and rewards, while allowing globalization as an *idea*—a culturally mediated imagination, grounded in specific "images of the world and the global as such"—to proceed unexamined (2007, 50, emphasis in text). And yet, to speak about globalization, whether extolling its virtues or bemoaning its consequences, entails grasping and inhabiting social reality in and through a specific thought-image that is, ultimately, cartographic and astronomical: the spherical *globe*—whether measured and visually mapped, or photographed from afar against a backdrop of stars and void. If, as Denis Cosgrove has argued, it is from this global figure "that ideas of globalization draw their expressive and political force" (2001, ix), then exploring alternative words for the global might destabilize and reconfigure our ideas of globalization. Accordingly, we will proceed to offer a partial taxonomy of ostensible synonyms for the globe, emphasizing their different histories, cultural associations, and social-political implications. By attending to the notions of *globe*, *earth*, *world*, and *planet*, we mean to unpack some of the alternative conceptual bases through which the case studies in this volume approach globalization processes.

The modern word *globe* denotes "a spherical or rounded body"; "the earth" itself; or "a spherical representation of the earth" (OED). It derives from the classical Latin *globus*, which means the "sphere of a celestial object," but also a "dense mass," such as a "closely packed throng of soldiers" (OED).[3] Since antiquity, the globe has been associated with the arts of geometry and metaphysical reflection (Sloterdijk 2014, 13–43). As the "most geometrically perfect three-dimensional body," it was a key conceptual figure in Neoplatonic thought, for which the globe signified the "incorruptible perfection of mathematical relations and forms" held to lie behind given appearances (Cosgrove 2001, 10). As such, the globe is abstract, detached, and artificial. It emphasizes "volume and surface over material constitution"; is observed from without by a distant calculative gaze; and reduces environmental diversity to geometrical regularity (Cosgrove 2001, 8). The globe has also signified territorial dominion. An especially influential early example is the medieval and early modern iconography of the *globus cruciger*: a globe, often trisected to connote the three continents known to medieval European cultures, to which a Christian cross is affixed (Cosgrove 2001, 10–11; Sloterdijk 2014, 53–57). In its metaphysical mode, then, the globe is associated with an impulse to transcend and rationalize the given world. In its political mode, it signifies unbounded dominion. Together, these connotations indicate a mastering, "implicitly imperial" vision of the globe as a "geometric surface to be explored and mapped, inscribed with content, knowledge, and authority" (Cosgrove 2001, 15–16).

Although often used interchangeably with globe, the term *earth* has a very different cultural significance. Notions of the globe emphasize dimensionality; earth, in contrast, connotes materiality and substantiality. It names both "the planet Earth" (OED) and the "nourishing, fertile and fecund substance … which covers its surface" (Mitchell 2007, 54). Earth denotes the substance common to different terrestrial scales, encompassing both planetary immensity and the ground beneath one's feet. It figures centrally across historical understandings of physics, from the five agents (*wu xing*) of ancient Chinese philosophy to the four elements of Platonic and Aristotelian thought. A feminine noun in Germanic and Latin languages, earth has been personified or referred to as a woman in numerous cultures. As Miriam Tola shows in her contribution to this volume, in patriarchal contexts, such imaginations of earth reduce women's possible social roles to a "natural" realm of earthly fertility, immanence, and reproduction, in contrast to the masculine, historical space of the global. Above all, writes Cosgrove, "Earth is organic" (2001, 7). Whereas the globe is associated with artificiality and geometrical order, earth, as the nourishing soil of agriculture and horticulture, "denotes rootedness, nurture, and dwelling for living things: earth is the ground from which life springs, is lived, and returns at death" (Cosgrove 2001, 7). Through burial practices and cultural modes of being toward buried ancestors, as Robert Pogue Harrison has emphasized, the earth becomes a medium through which cultural legacies are interred and retrieved—or "unearthed" (2003, x–xi). If the globe implies extraterrestrial detachment, for Harrison the earth provides the "humic foundations" in the absence of which notions of "humanity" lose their meaning (2003, x).

Until the eighteenth century, the Latin *mundus* was often used to signify totality: the "agglomeration of all totality of existent things" (Leibniz, qtd. in David 2014, 1220). Since then, however, that meaning has been taken up by *universe*, with *world* dissociated into different meanings. In current usage, world refers to "the earth and everything on it, the globe," but also to a "state or realm of human existence on earth" (OED). As such, it is a distinctly more anthropocentric and conceptual term than earth, which connotes the organic reciprocity of life as such. "Consciousness alone can constitute the world," writes Cosgrove, for whom "world implies cognition and agency" (2001, 7). A world indicates a domain of human activity in its spatial and experiential dimensions. It can form at individual, collective, and universal scales. We speak of someone being in "their own world"; entering the "business world"; or fret that "the whole world knows." A world's geographical dimension does not necessarily coincide with the entire physical earth, but rather indicates the scope of particular cultural domains. In foregrounding the domain of lived experience, *world* has been an important concept in phenomenology and existential philosophy.[4] For Martin Heidegger, world was among the three "fundamental concepts of metaphysics" (1995, title). In his famous analysis of an ancient Greek temple, Heidegger defines world as the "open relational context" of a "historical people" (1992, 167). It is the existential space in which a given culture's understanding of existence unfolds: "a horizon of disclosure" or "horizon of intelligibility" within the bounds of which particular beings take on particular purposes and meanings, and possibilities for relating to them are determined (Young 2001, 23, 104). This Heideggerian concept of *world* stands in stark contrast with *earth*, for a world establishes what the earth is and means, and the possible ways of relating to it, in the first place. As such, this notion of world opens up a wider taxonomy, in that various cultural worlds might each contain further specific ways of naming the global.[5]

Two senses of *worldliness* are also pertinent to this volume. The first has to do with cosmopolitanism. To say that a person is worldly is to suggest that they have experience of, or familiarity with, wide-ranging cultural contexts, and have adopted variously flexible, realistic, or open-minded attitudes as a result. To be worldly in this sense—to "know the world" or the "ways of the world"—may also connote "sexual experience, a certain fleshy materialism" (David 2014, 1221). The second sense relates to Christianity, which, in its several traditions, has opposed a transcendental and eternal heavenly realm to all that is temporal, fallen, appetitive, and profane—in a word, all that is worldly. Here, the worldly "takes on a negative connotation, even one of damnation" (David 2014, 1218). Worldliness in this sense aligns closely with the idea of the mundane; as Mitchell points out, this implies that the French *mondialisation* comes "close to equating globalization with an epidemic of boredom and inanity" (2007, 53).[6]

Set in the context of extraterrestrial space, the world, earth, or globe becomes a *planet*, derived from the ancient Greek word for "wanderer" (OED). A cosmic body among innumerable others in a largely barren and ancient universe, the planet is not constructed, controlled, and contemplated like a globe: it preceded (and will succeed) human life by many billions of years. Unlike a world, the planet exceeds the domain of specifically human experience and meaning. Given the planet's resistance to anthropocentrism and control, concepts of "planetarity" or "the planetary" have been mobilized as conceptual alternatives to globality and the global. Although Amy J. Elias and Christian Moraru, in their survey of the planetary "structure of awareness" in culture and theory, indicate diverse precedents and influences for the contemporary "planetary turn" (2015, xi), work by the literary theorist Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak remains its central point of reference.[7]

Spivak emphasizes how "the 'global' notion allows us to think that we can aim to control globality," while "planetarity … is not susceptible to the subject's grasp" (2014, 1223). Her concept of planetarity remains explorative; the "motif of the planet," as Satoshi Ukai picturesquely puts it, "like a so-called comet … cast a streak of light through [Spivak's] works and then vanished" (2017, 27). Still, Spivak's remarks on planetarity, above all in *Death of a Discipline* (2003), have become touchstones across contemporary reconsiderations of the global:

> I propose the planet to overwrite the globe. Globalization is the imposition of the same system of exchange everywhere. In the grillwork of electronic capital, we achieve that abstract ball covered in latitudes and longitudes, cut by vertical lines, once the equator and the tropics and so on, now drawn by the requirements of Geographical Information Systems. … The globe is on our computers. No one lives there. It allows us to think that we can aim to control it. The planet is in the species of alterity, belonging to another system; and yet we inhabit it, on loan. (2003, 72)

> To be human is to be intended towards the other. We provide for ourselves transcendental figurations of what we think is the origin of this animating gift: mother, nation, god, nature. These are names of alterity, some more radical than others. Planet thought opens up to embrace an inexhaustible taxonomy of such names. (2003, 73)

Several aspects of Spivak's formulation warrant emphasis in introducing this volume.[8] First, she conceives the planetary in opposition to the distance and disengagement imputed to global overviews: even as we are confronted by the planet's alterity, its startling strangeness, humans inhabit and participate in it as "planetary creatures" (Spivak 1999, 46).[9] Against the detached modern globe's attempted severing of all earthly ties, then, planetary thought is distinguished by a heightened consciousness of relationality, a recognition of our thrownness among "inexhaustible" species of planetary difference. It is on the basis of this relationality that Elias and Moraru write that planetarity's "preeminent thrust is ethical" (2015, xii). Second, the planetary indicates an alternative subjective stance toward beings and the world. In a 2006 essay, Spivak conveys humanity's planetary condition by quoting the musician Laurie Anderson, for whom "the scale of space" invites "thinking about human beings and what worms we are" (108). We are, Spivak expands elsewhere, "a glitch/blip on the cycle that pushes up the daisies" (2012, 495). In his analysis of interplanetary travel in H. G. Wells's *First Men in the Moon* in this volume, Cóilín Parsons reflects at length on this "humbling" of humanity before the planetary. In Wells's imagination of space travel, Parsons demonstrates, imperial attitudes of global mastery and Apollonian composure disintegrate before the disorienting, vertiginous spatialities and undifferentiated temporalities of the planetary scale. Third, Spivak suggests that planetarity "is perhaps best imagined from the precapitalist cultures of the planet," yet does not develop the thought (2003, 101). *Other Globes* picks up this orphaned suggestion, which resonates complexly with Peter Hess's discussion of reactions to the onset of capitalist globalization in the sixteenth-century Holy Roman Empire; Simon Ferdinand's analysis of late medieval paintings by Hieronymus Bosch, which depict the created world "from within"; and Patrick Flores's account of Filipino *naturalesa*.

In discriminating different ways of naming the global, this discussion has shown how there is no neutral terminology with which to refer to the object of the narratives and representations explored in this volume.

All of the available terms—globe, earth, world, planet—are laden with specific cultural associations and historical baggage. Thus, although in introducing this volume we refer to "global" imaginations, and to the "earth" as their object, we do so under erasure, acknowledging how these terms are differently constituted, mediated, and contested by the narratives and representations discussed in the contributions.

Situating Global Imaginations

In focusing on past and peripheral global imaginations, the contributions to this volume not only attend to visions *of* the global, but also reflect on how these visions are positioned *within* a global field of shifting political fortunes and cultural hegemonies. This emphasis on the situatedness of global imaginations dispels the aura of transcendence and objectivity that often surrounds global views. Visions and discourses that imagine the whole Earth from an unidentifiable perspective are an extreme example of what Donna Haraway has influentially termed the "God's eye trick" of "seeing everything from nowhere" (1988, 581). Through this rhetorical strategy, masculinist discourses of control claim to rise above the distorting effects of value-laden earthbound vantage points and subject positions, purportedly being able to fully access, grasp, and manipulate situated objects. This same trick is played by global views, which assume the "appearance of worldless neutrality, purged of all residues of situation and subjectivity" (Ferdinand 2019, n.p.). The intellectual historian Lorraine Daston has termed this denial of positionality "aperspectival objectivity," showing how it emerged with the development of an international scientific community in the nineteenth century (1992, 599). Aperspectival objectivity, Daston explains, was constructed around the elimination of contextual influences and personal characteristics from experimental inquiry, such that scientists came to see the knowledge they produced as escaping perspective, context, and embodiment altogether. Although it is now possible to see the whole earth from spacecraft, throughout history, imaginations of the earth seen from an unmarked, seemingly impersonal, and contextless extraterrestrial gaze have been culturally associated with fantasies of a "view from nowhere" (Nagel 1986; see also Bonneuil and Fressoz 2017, 62–63).

Critical feminist standpoint theory has mounted a thoroughgoing critique of the "God's eye trick" or "view from nowhere" evoked by modern representations of the globe. In allowing, as Marianne Janack puts it, "the views of some-people-in-particular" to pass as "the view of no-one-in-particular," the construction of a positionality amounts to a power-laden rhetorical strategy, endowing some knowledge claims with (false) epistemic authority over others (2002, 273). *Other Globes* extends standpoint theory's critique of the rhetorics of objectivity and insistence on the "radical historical contingency of all knowledge claims and knowing subjects" (Haraway 1988, 579) to the study of global imaginations. By emphasizing the situatedness of global discourses, our aim is to dismantle received epistemological hierarchies through which capitalist and colonial, masculinist and measurable articulations of the global have prevailed over other imaginations, historically and today. This focus on grounding ostensibly transcendental global imaginations comes across strongly in Grzegorz Czemiel's contribution to this volume, which explores new "speculative cartographies" as alternatives to detached global visions. Drawing on the work of the ecocritic Timothy Clark, Czemiel emphasizes how extraterrestrial views, even though they look back on the Earth from geostationary orbits or still greater distances, can never truly "server the cords"—material, cultural, political—connecting them to earthbound institutions, concerns, and perspectives. "No matter from how far away or 'high up' it is perceived or imagined," writes Clark, the Earth "is always something we remain 'inside' and cannot genuinely perceive from elsewhere" (2015, 33). In insisting on the dependency of global views on terrestrial institutions and frames of understanding, Czemiel and Clark undercut the basis of their association with a transcendent, unmarked "outside."

Even when people physically escape earth's gravitational pull through spaceflight, they remain caught ineluctability within the intellectual force field of earthbound cultural imaginations. The pathos of this inescapability is explored in this volume in Alexis Radisoglou's analysis of planetary visions in Patricio Guzmán's documentaries, which explore traditions and practices of astronomy in the deserts of northern Chile. As the films trace the astronomers' ostensibly transcendental narrations of star formation and intergalactic distances, Guzman's presentation of planetarity becomes inexorably bound up with Chile's all-too earthly histories of colonialism and dictatorship. Calcium released from exploding stars becomes the bones of "the disappeared;" the crystal-blue ocean water, which, in the image of earth seen from space, we admire as a miraculous and precious force for life, is also the medium that first brought colonizers to Chile and where the Pinochet regime disposed of its victims.

"The planetary," Radisoglou writes, offers "no escape from the exigencies of history" (this volume).

The work of situating global imaginations in sociohistorical contexts has a double significance in this volume. First, it annuls received hierarchies among global imaginations, undercutting the way certain conceptions of the global have been valorized, often on account of their imputed objectivity, and prompting a reappraisal of the myriad narratives and representations disprivileged because of their perceived partiality or parochialism. Second, it emphasizes that, far from being immaterial abstractions, the ways in which the global has been imagined are implicated and entangled in the very globalizing processes they represent or describe. In particular, several contributions to this volume highlight how different ways of perceiving, depicting, and narrating the global are imbricated in histories of capitalism and colonialism, which have also played a crucial role in drawing center–periphery distinctions. Significant here is Bill Ashcroft's contribution, which shows how African literatures have narrated global connections and spaces by describing all-too earthbound processes of diaspora, migration, and enslavement. It is precisely because of its status as the exploited periphery of colonial empires that Africa has played a constitutive role in sustaining the capitalist world system and global modernity.

At this point, it is important to pin down what we mean by "peripherality" in the context of shifting historical imaginations of the global. Numerous critics have problematized this loaded term. Some, like Katherine McKittrick, argue that, in calling on a spatial metaphor "to name difference" in the field of social relations, discourses on peripherality and marginality are often inattentive to "actual geographic displacements"—"material realities of spaces unheard, silenced, and erased" that exist outside a metaphorical register (2006, 57–56). Others suggest that critical references to peripherality might reproduce hierarchical designations of power and cultural value. Denis Cosgrove, for example, writes that "core and periphery ... depended upon an imperial and Eurocentric vision" (2001, 15). Still, while we would agree that it is of paramount importance to contest the dubious justifications adduced by colonial powers to posit and rationalize their centrality, which have included protestations of ethnic superiority and civilizing missions, the language of centrality and peripherality remains indispensable in grasping the power relations that inhere between different global imaginations: "to reject the terminology [of centers and peripheries] as outdated does not diminish the degree to which power relations continue to play out across center-periphery divisions," but "would only make these power relations ... less accessible to analysis and critique" (Peeren et al. 2016, 1). Indeed, Mary Louise Pratt suggests that jettisoning a center-versus-periphery vocabulary in favor of less weighted concepts actually "reauthorizes the center to function unmarked as a center" (qtd. in Peeren et al. 2016, 2). On these grounds, this volume seeks to locate the role of global imaginations in past and present power struggles through which certain polities, classes, and cultures have constituted themselves as centers to subaltern peripheries, which, in turn, have challenged their peripheralization.

Especially pertinent in this context is the way the centered-peripheralized distinction combines ideas of spatial location with assertions of power and politics. As Katherine McKittrick points out in her discussion of the social/spatial marginality of black femininities, notions of the margin or periphery are "not straightforwardly metaphoric," in that they refer to unequal social relations and physical geographies simultaneously (2006, 55). Like the schema of elevated versus earthbound "vantage points" put forward by Jennifer Wenzel in her contribution to this volume, our reference to centrality and peripherality rests on a notion of "power-as-position," in which spatial centrality demarcates "a position of superiority or strategy: advantage," and spatial peripherality signals disprivilege, inferiority, and having to resort to tactics (Wenzel, this volume).[10] Accordingly, in this volume "peripheral" is used in two overlapping senses. First, it describes global imaginations that derive from what have been constructed as the geographical extremities of the modern world. Precolonial worldviews in Asia, Africa, or the Americas, for example, were made spatially peripheral in this way by imperial mapmaking institutions in Western European states. Second, it refers to situations of subalternity in which particular global imaginations are forcibly repressed or censored; cast as fictional, fantastic, or fanciful, and thus debarred from participation in the construction of truth; or otherwise eclipsed and rendered irrelevant by other—more compelling, advantageous, or accepted—conceptions of the world. This second sense of peripherality applies to both current and past representations of the global, for although the latter derive from now-vanished historical contexts, they persist at the margins of contemporary culture and can be mobilized today through critical practice. As Irene Villaescusa-Illán shows in her contribution to this volume, these complex forms of peripherality continually shift and overlap. In exploring imaginations of the global in Hispano-Filipino literature of the early twentieth century, she draws attention to several contradictory processes of peripheralization and centralization. At one level, Spanish-speaking Filipino writers were central in constructing and propagating Filipino nationalism against the new American colonizer; at another, they were peripheral with regard to native Filipino communities. Through their use of Spanish, these writers maintained (nostalgic) connections with an old imperial center; yet they were also peripheral to twentieth-century concentrations of power and culture in Europe, Asia, and the world at large. Politically, culturally, and linguistically, then, Hispano-Filipino literature was constantly reconfiguring its place among various center–periphery dynamics.

We argue that the condition of peripherality, shared by both historically displaced and currently marginalized global imaginations, primarily results from the gradual rise to dominance of what we call "modern globalism." This global imagination grasps the Earth as a measurable, uniformly extended totality that can be calculated, commodified, and controlled. Whether they existed before the mapped modern globe and were displaced by it historically, or whether they emerged under its hegemony, which they challenge from the fringes, the past and peripheral articulations of the global discussed in this volume share a condition of subordination to modern globalism, and thus also the potential to challenge its determination of earthly space. In the following section, we present a brief genealogy of the historical emergence and ascendency of modern globalism.

The Ascent of Modern Globalism

The first key moment in the ascent of modern globalism is the development of modern mapmaking practices in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, corresponding with the formation of modern bureaucratic states and the incipience of West European imperialism in South East Asia and the Americas. At the beginning of this period, world cultures conceived and represented earthly space in a variety of sometimes overlapping, but often incompatible ways. Consider, to choose just three examples of world-imagining from numerous possible traditions, the religious mandalas used throughout Buddhist East Asia, which present the totality of nature as fleeting and insubstantial, in contrast with the transcendental geometries within which

it is framed; the symbolic "T-O" geographies of Medieval Europe, in which schematic divisions between the three known continents recall the Christian cross; and Jain cosmographies, in which *Manuyaloka*—the inhabited human world—presents "a gigantic theater where transmigrations and reincarnations take place" that is variously conceived in the image of a turtle or an egg (Caillat and Kumar 1981, 35). Although worldviews such as these were entangled complexly with social power structures and imperial projects, and were often forcibly instilled or imposed, no one conception came close to monopolizing cultural imaginations of the world's space.

By the end of the seventeenth century, however, this picture of multifarious, relatively autonomous worldviews had been replaced by one of stark asymmetry between a dominant, distinctly modern imagination of the global—modern globalism—and its past and peripheral others. While the Earth's sphericity had long been recognized and geometrically modeled by the intellectual elites of ancient Greek and medieval Muslim cultures, in sixteenth-century Iberia global mapmaking took on a pressing new geopolitical and navigational significance. Disputes between the Portuguese and Castilian empires over the right to colonize the Moluccas or Spice Islands, part of present-day Indonesia, required a newly global imagination of diplomatic space (Brotton 1999, 88–89), while the construction of world maritime markets and establishment of far-flung colonies precipitated a massive reinvigoration of mapmaking practices and their dissemination throughout early modern Europe. Synthesizing the bewildering variety of new geographical observations within the safely measurable and manageable framework of geodetic geometry, cartographic renditions of the Earth became the indispensable tools and potent rhetorical symbols of European imperialism in its Habsburgian, Netherlandish, British, French, German, and Russian forms. The many elements of existing geographical and cosmological imaginations that could not be transcribed into the new techno-ideological framework of these imperial mapping projects were consigned to "cartographic silence," with the effect that North America, for example, was represented as "a free and apparently virgin land" passively awaiting European settlement and exploitation (Harley 2002, 105). From this time on, in colonized societies, modern globalism was instilled through colonial bureaucracies and institutions; in uncolonized or postcolonial non-European societies, it was often adopted as well so as to better participate in interstate competition and trade.[11] Unevenly but relentlessly, the mapped terrestrial globe became the implicit discursive frame within which early modern political affairs and cultural practice were conducted.

Still, if premodern worldviews were displaced from epistemological centrality by the emergence of modern globalism, they did not disappear. One central point of this volume is to underline how fragments of historically suppressed imaginations of the world—such as Hieronymus Bosch's paintings of the Christian creation discussed by Simon Ferdinand; Filipino paintings depicting insurrections against colonial rule theorized through the concept of the art historical by Patrick Flores; or the various expressions of an emerging Filipino worldview in the Hispano-Filipino literature of the early twentieth century analyzed by Irene Villaescusa-Illán—not only persist at the fringes of contemporary culture, but can be activated in the present.

Nonetheless, since the sixteenth century, the mapped and spanned modern globe has increasingly dominated, relegating preexisting or alternative articulations of the world, which had once disclosed the truth of existence in their respective contexts, to the domains of formal experiment, narrative fiction, and personal spirituality. These processes encountered fierce resistance. As Peter Hess shows in his contribution to this volume, the building of new political, commercial and cultural connections among formerly distant regions provoked a will-to-go-back in early modern Europe. Driven by the desire to return to an imagined past of premodern purity and closure, old elites sought to stem the flow of foreign imports, reinforce received theological orthodoxies and castigate external influences.

At the same time, modern globalism is itself not a unitary phenomenon, and has taken on numerous forms and meanings in different contexts since the early modern period. To give an indication of this, we will discuss three distinct permutations of modern globalism, chosen because they resonate closely with the themes of colonialism, extraterrestrial visuality, and global integration that run across this volume.

The first is that achieved by the decolonization movements which, whether through negotiations or liberation struggles, dismantled the European empires built in the initial phase of modern globalism and altered the dispensations of global power. Although, as Jennifer Wenzel has insisted, the early nineteenth-century phase of "primary resistance" to colonialism had already occasioned imaginations of global struggle (2009, 9–11), the decolonization movements that saw the liberation of large parts of Africa and South East Asia in the 1950s and 1960s

gave rise to hopes for a global commonwealth of nations in which power and wealth would be distributed equitably among postcolonial states and their former colonizers. These hopes were formalized at the Bandung Conference of newly independent nations in 1955 and eroded during the ensuing period of financial crisis, conservative retrenchment, three worlds theory, and postcolonial dictatorships (Lazarus 2011, 3–9).

A second key permutation in the genealogy of modern globalism is the emergence of new ways of conceiving global space in the 1960s and 1970s. As Diedrich Diederichsen and Anselm Franke (2013), Fred Turner (2006b), and Adam Curtis (2016) have variously shown, in this period two key discourses came together in US counterculture, establishing patterns of "thinking globally" that have come to predominate in contemporary digital culture: a cybernetic view of the world inherited from the Cold War, in which ecology, institutions, and societies were conceived in terms of self-regulating systems and informational feedback loops (Bonneuil and Fressoz 2017, 58–59; Curtis 2016; Turner 2006b, 108); and horizontal and collective forms of decision-making, exemplified by the "pan-earth ethic of California hippiedom," which opposed top-down command structures (Dorrain 2013, 294; Turner 2006a). As these discourses emerged and intermingled, moreover, the earth was photographed as a whole for the first time as part of the Apollo space missions.[12] Having figured on the cover of the first issue of Stewart Brand's influential 1968 *Whole Earth Catalog* (which Steve Jobs called his "Bible"), the "Blue Marble" photograph became the icon of a new cybernetic and countercultural worldview in which the divisions and hierarchies of the state-based order would be replaced by a global civil society facilitated by cybernetic networks (Curtis 2016). Each node in the global network would be able to dialogue with every other in perpetual, mutually enriching feedback loops without the vertical interposition of political authority. The Blue Marble photograph, which has widely been taken to signify the invisibility of political borders and notions of shared humanity (Cosgrove 1994, 284), dovetails with the ideology of horizontal connectivity that defines digital culture today. This is especially apparent in Google's flagship application, Google Earth, which, as Mark Dorrian has argued, "inherits and deploys … the so-called 'Blue Marble' photograph," appropriating its iconicity and cultural associations with interconnectedness across artificial borders and humanity's common fragility (2013, 297).

Lastly, there is the way in which imaginations of global integration intensified after the Cold War before coming under strain after the 9/11 attacks. Following the collapse of the Soviet Union in 1991, which brought the binary Cold War dispensation to an end, the capitalist world market was seen as incorporating the entire earth under one system for the first time. This wave of globalization, as Julian Stallabrass has emphasized, was accompanied by hopes for a new phase of planetary tolerance and integration, with a "chorus of voices ... praising the demolition of cultural barriers that accompanies the supposed destruction of barriers to trade, and the glorious cultural mixing that results" (2004, 13). It occasioned widespread imaginations of "closure" in both the temporal sense of arriving at a fitting settlement and that of spatial encapsulation or sealing. Temporally, the phase of globalization following the Cold War was widely imagined not only as a historical rupture, but a rupture with history itself. Many intellectuals declared that an uneven and antagonistic modernity, with its narratives of progress, had been superseded by "the global age" (Albrow 1997), with Francis Fukuyama famously declaring that millennial capitalism had ushered in "the end of history" (1992). Spatially, this notion of world-historical closure, as Anselm Franke argues, realized the spatial closure and unity perceived in photographs of the whole Earth, in which "all antagonisms, borders, and conflicts 'down below' fade into the background, and with them history with its contradictions and struggles" (2013, 14). As Christoph Schaub's analysis of Judith Schalansky's *Atlas of Remote Islands* in this volume emphasizes, however, all such images of a complete global space, or total global knowledge, are ultimately partial and illusory. Schaub shows how Schalansky's collection of miniature studies of islands "resists the drive towards a comprehension of the planet in terms of completeness, homogenization, abstraction, and totalization," while also overcoming anthropocentrism by "emphatically represent[ing] the inorganic and organic nature of the planet beyond human beings" (this volume).

Unsurprisingly, post-Cold War fantasies of global integration were soon dashed as the terrorist attacks on the World Trade Center in 2001 and the subsequent US invasions of Afghanistan and Iraq gave rise to divisive rhetorics exemplified (and influenced) by Samuel Huntington's notion of a "clash of civilizations" (1993). The 2008 global financial crisis, moreover, revealed how, if capitalist globalization diminishes the importance of state boundaries, it does so largely to exacerbate global inequalities.

This brief genealogy has emphasized how the hegemony of modern globalism, in its different historical permutations, has marginalized and continues to marginalize other worldviews. The cartographic globe of capitalist modernity, in being imposed upon or accepted by an ever-larger body of people and polities, has attained a position of dominance or hegemony with respect to preexisting or rival articulations of the global, which have been correspondingly cast in a position of pastness conceived as obsoleteness or peripherality. Nonetheless, we want to emphasize, these rival articulations have the potential to disturb modern globalism, which is perennially uneven, incomplete, and unstable. Given our genealogy's reference to histories of capitalism and colonialism, many of the reasons why this volume seeks to disturb the mapped modern globe and entertain alternative imaginations of earthly space may be apparent already. Still, the urgency behind our effort to reevaluate past and peripheral alternatives to modern globalism comes very clearly into focus in the critical literature on globalization and global space. This scholarship is too large and varied to allow for a comprehensive survey in the space of this Introduction, so the following section focuses on outlining some of the most trenchant and incisive critiques of dominant global imaginations from Marxist, feminist, postcolonial, and ecocritical perspectives.

Critiques of Modern Globalism

Imaginations of the globe and globalization have an ambivalent place in Marxist cultural theory. On one level, Marxist critics have consistently drawn attention to the sheer violence of capitalism's socioeconomic dynamics, emphasizing their expansive, roving character, which tends toward a global scale. Most obviously, this violence consists in continuing cycles of primitive accumulation—the forcible seizure of the commons or "accumulation by dispossession" in David Harvey's gloss (2003; see also Amin 1974; Retort Collective 2006, 74–79). But it also takes in the imposition of wage labor and the commodity form on diverse cultures globally, eroding or commodifying their distinctiveness through participation in an ever more compressed and accelerated world market (Harvey 1989, 240–259; Warf 2008, 167–212).

On another level, though, Marxist theory dialectically twists this critique, presenting the violence and proletarianization wrought by capitalist globalization as a precondition of world revolution. Indeed, in transforming globally dispersed handcraft and agricultural populations into an international working class, commonly engaged in an abstractly conceived wage labor and inhabiting an imaginative space constituted by world markets, labor migrations, exploitative imperialisms, and cross-border solidarities, capitalist globalization is thought to incubate revolution on a global scale (Denning 2007, 127–131). Accordingly, global imaginations have played a prominent rhetorical and often propagandistic role in socialist culture and political strategy, and figure prominently in diverse protest movements today. In the early twentieth-century especially, as Nick Baron has written, "the dominant symbol for revolutionary internationalism was the globe, most frequently represented by the abstract graticule, which denoted an open, equal space of possibility rather than closed, differentiated territory" (2013, 4; see also Baron 2015). Unencumbered by topographical detail or local specificities, the geometrical globe projects an abstract universality that eclipses national, cultural, and ultimately also class difference. If capitalist globalization conditions the possibility of such global universality, as Marxist dialectics propose, it can only be realized through the classless, postcolonial, and supranational world promised by global communism.

This dialectical grasp of capitalist globalization has produced a distinct theory of global literary cultures, for which literature is seen as a commodity circulating, through translation, in a world market. Grounded in Goethe's notion of *Weltliteratur* and Marx and Engels's anticipatory account of a literature that would supersede received national borders, this strand of literary theory emphasizes how the expansion of the capitalist world system gives rise to world literature. Through modes of comparative and distant reading, contemporary theories of world literature attend to the mobility of literatures on a global scale (see Damrosch 2003). Franco Moretti presents world literature as "literature of the capitalist world-system" constituting a global system that is "one, yet unequal," characterized by systemic disjunctures between literatures from cores and peripheries (2000, 56). For Moretti, world literary inequality aligns with world wealth inequality. Pascale Casanova, in contrast, posits the "relative autonomy of the literary sphere, with no direct link, no cause-and-effect relation between political-economic strength and literary power or legitimacy at an international level" (2005, 85). Economic capital and literary capital, for Casanova, belong to distinct spheres; in her view, this helps us to understand, for instance, the power wielded in the world republic of letters by Latin American literatures, "despite the political and economic weakness of the countries concerned" (2005, 85). In holding literature apart from economics in this way, Casanova resists the totalizing impulse of theories like Moretti's, which cast literature as just another global commodity circulating in a unified system. As Emily Apter has also argued in *Against World Literature: On the Politics of Untranslatability* (2013), the incommensurability and untranslatability of literary cultures underlines how the capitalist globe is not total and singular, but multiple, uneven, and internally fractured.

A further Marxist engagement with imaginations of the global, which relates closely to our concerns in this volume, emphasizes the ideological function of images of the globe and discourses of globalization in postmodern culture. In a wide-ranging account of what he terms the "millennial dream"—the ideological worldview promulgated in capitalist culture in the decades surrounding the third millennium—Paul Smith (1997) has argued that visions of a fully and flatly globalized world serve to paper over political fault lines among classes and nations, and even obscure the material prerequisites of modern society. The result, on Smith's view, is a hyperbolic, deceptively buoyant vision of the political present, in which consciousness of *capitalism*, and with it exploitative class relations, is diminished by widespread reference to *globalization*, which he sees as an altogether more abstract and politically ambiguous category. Smith focuses on how millennial capitalism constructs "its desired image":

> Magical notions such as that of fully global space replete with an ecstatic buzz of cyber communication, or of an instantaneous mobility of people, goods, and services, or of a global market place hooked up by immaterial money that flashes around the globe many times a minute: these are the kinds of images that are regularly projected in the opening phase of millennial capitalism. Such images … construe a kind of isochronic world wherein the constrictions of time and space have been overcome, where the necessary navigational and communicational means are so fully developed and supremely achieved that they can eclipse even reality itself. (1997, 13; following Lazarus 2011, 111)

More than two decades on, the images adduced here seem rather less "magical" than they might have appeared when Smith's account was published. High-frequency trading, for example, now occurs in nanoseconds (see Meissner 2017, 177–220). Yet Smith is not arguing that these developments are fantastic or unreal, only that they have been enrolled in a fantastic conception of capitalism, the millennial "imaginary of the perfectly global" (1997, 11). This imaginary conjures an impossible vision of a flawlessly even, complete, and enriching globalization, obfuscating the ongoing realities of North/South asymmetry, capitalist exploitation, and basic material need. Against this holistic imagination of globalization achieved, Smith underlines how the dynamics of late capitalism actually "exacerbate material contradictions at the same time as they project a transcendence of those very contradictions" (1997, 14). For this strand of Marxist criticism, then, cultural imaginations of globalization and the global provide an ideological smokescreen of hyperbole and wish fulfillment, behind which uneven capitalist development goes on half-grasped and unabated. Still, Robert T. Tally's contribution to this volume suggests that if ideologically laden global visions are pervasive in contemporary societies, they are far from offering satisfactory cognitive maps of the capitalist world system. Commenting on the prevalence of dystopian and apocalyptic modes in popular cinema, Tally discerns a form wish-fulfillment operative in contemporary culture whereby the frighteningly ungraspable complexity of the capitalist world system is suddenly wiped away, replaced by a situation of simplified center–periphery oppositions, clearly identifiable threats, and definitive endings. Tally argues, these films are existentially comforting, in that they eradicate the capitalist world system, whose daunting chaos and complexity dominant global visions do little to assuage.

Global imaginations have also been extensively theorized and deconstructed in postcolonial criticism. This is not just because world maps and globes have facilitated colonial conquests, world markets, intercontinental resettlements, and the diplomatic apportioning of distant territories. Modern global imaginations have also been taken to encapsulate the epistemology—the informing worldview—of modern imperial projects and cultures. This worldview, critics have emphasized, is premised on visual detachment, objectification, and classification, and constructs correspondingly detached and dominative subject positions, including those productive of Orientalism (Said 1978). Ella Shohat and Robert Stam write that "overarching global points-of-view suture the spectator into the omniscient cosmic perspective of the European master-subject" (1994, 376). This imperialist subjectivity, they go on, projects itself as a "superior and invulnerable observer," whose gaze—produced through visual technologies—"spiraled outward and around the globe … affirming their sense of power while turning the colonies into spectacle for the metropole's voyeuristic gaze" (Shohat and Stam 1994, 369; see also Cosgrove 2001, 248).

In response, much postcolonial theory has been concerned to critically contest the eminently ocular and global imaginations of modern imperialism, including by pointing to "alternative," "multiple" modernities that do not align with Western models (Eisenstadt 2000; Appadurai 1996, 49–50; Gilroy 1993, 1–40). In this volume, Bill Ashcroft shows how African literatures conceptualize an idea of Global Africa, which, while recognizing the diversity of African cultures, draws upon concepts such as pan-Africanism and transnationalism to express relationships among Africans around the globe as future utopias of hope and possibility. Peter Hitchcock, in turn, takes up Said's notion of "libertarian optics," arguing that such optics are "always a register of resistance and possible transformation," but at the same time cannot be assumed to arise automatically from the (post)colonized's dominated position: rather, libertarian optics need to be carefully crafted, in social and literary spaces, as "what form they take requires not just political will and consciousness, organization and collective power, but also cultural coordinates, ways of seeing the world differently" (Hitchcock, this volume).

Both Ashcroft and Hitchcock underline how global imaginations are not inherently imperialist, and that they can serve to express and expedite anti-imperialist struggles too. Consider two more examples. First, the Nonaligned Movement of (largely newly independent) postcolonial nations, which, in 1961, entered into an alliance aimed at challenging the Cold War's nuclear rivalries and proxy conflicts, and at counteracting US cultural imperialism. Akhil Gupta has described this movement as a "groping expression of the idea of Afro-Asian unity," an incipient "transnational imagined community" (1992, 64). Though it was grounded in nationalism and ultimately failed to stabilize a third geopolitical "power bloc," the Nonaligned Movement energetically disseminated an anti-imperialist imagination of the global, often through music and radio.[13] Second, scholars have drawn attention to the diffuse but radical global counter-imaginations that circulated among subaltern subjects imbricated in Atlantic imperialisms. This is the "many-headed hydra" composed of sailors, slaves, pirates, and laborers that, as Peter Linebaugh and Marcus Rediker have argued, formed a "symbol of disorder and resistance, a powerful threat to the building of state, empire, and capitalism" (2000, 2). Once brought together in "productive combination" by imperial capital, as part of "increasing global systems of labor," these globally disparate subaltern subjects "soon developed among themselves new forms of cooperation against those rulers, from mutinies and strikes to riots and insurrections and revolution" (Linebaugh and Rediker 2000, 4–5). They circulated "planetary currents" of antinomian thought that shadowed and challenged imperial globality, but which have subsequently been "denied, ignored, or simply not seen" (Linebaugh and Rediker 2000, 7).

Another strand of postcolonial criticism focuses on ambivalences and countertendencies *within* imperialist articulations of the global. The internal reworking of received dominant global discourses as they are encountered and put to use in peripheralized contexts has been described by Fernando Ortiz (1947) and Mary Louise Pratt (1992) in terms of transculturation. For Pratt, transculturation is a method of cultural reinvention: "While subjugated people cannot readily control what emanates from the dominant culture, they do determine to various extents what they absorb into their own, and what they use it for" (1992, 6). Though there are limits to what marginalized and subjugated groups can do with appropriated or imposed knowledge, the way in which they *use* such knowledge opens up a space of agency and subversion. In the context of colonial Latin America, for example, the colonized "sought to affirm their own identities through discourses against power, created through creolized visions and polyphonic hybridized strategies" (Zavala 1992, 84).

The subversive transculturation of modern globalism is explored at length in the ongoing work of Sumathi Ramaswamy, which offers a nuanced "postcolonial history of the terraqueous globe" (2007, 753). This history emphasizes how imperial global imaginations are diffracted and diffused, reworked and repurposed as they spread through imperial projects and colonial settings (Ramaswamy 2007, 753). As the mapped modern globe "leaves its putative originary home in the metropole and goes elsewhere," Ramaswamy argues, "complicated processes for adopting, accommodating, rejecting, or deflecting Modern Earth [are] unleashed" (2017, 3, 292). Focusing specifically on "the encounter with the globe-form" at different times and places in the history of India, Ramaswamy shows how the "politics of the globe (as concept, apparatus, representation, sign and symbol)" in these contexts is no "mere rehearsal or repetition of the paths taken in the West" (2007, 754). This can be observed in the seventeenth-century introduction of the European terrestrial globe into the court culture of the Mughal Empire, where it was

both eagerly emulated and subverted. For example, whereas in early modern Europe the Earth was increasingly imagined as isolated from the cosmic continuum, "a sovereign sphere unto itself … free of external supports,"[14] the Mughal court painter Abu'l Hasan set it within an Islamic cosmology, whereby it "is made to rest on an ox, which in turn stands on a large fish with scales" (2007, 778–779). In this and other ways, Ramaswamy concludes, "going global in Mughal visual practice did not necessarily mean a capitulation to European worldviews but instead provoked a complex assertion of difference and defiance" (2007, 778).

By foregrounding global imaginations that preceded or remain peripheral to modern globalism, this volume furthers the postcolonial study of global imaginations at each of the levels indicated above. Some—like Bill Ashcroft's analysis of global motifs in South African utopian literature, Patrick Flores's account of postcolonial iterations of the Filipino concept of *naturalesa*, Grzegorz Czemiel's readings of speculative cartographies, or Jennifer Wenzel's examination of subaltern modes of "world-imagining from below" in contemporary theory, literature, and film—describe further possibilities for alternative, non-imperial global imaginations. Others—like Irene Villaescusa-Illán's analysis of disparate imperial influences on the construction of Filipino nationhood, Alexis Radisoglou's discussion of cinematic planetarity in postcolonial and post-dictatorial Chile, and Peter Hitchcock's exploration of the "libertarian optics" at play in the 2017 referendum on state identity in Puerto Rico and novels by Giannina Braschi and Susan Abulhawa—underline how Western imaginations of the global, for all their rhetorics of universality, are altered and reworked as they play out in peripheral settings and postcolonial projects.

Dominant global imaginations have also been critically interrogated from feminist perspectives. Science and technology studies scholar Yakov Garb has elaborated an especially incisive and wide-ranging ecofeminist account of the gender dimensions of global representations. Although it focuses on photographs taken during Apollo missions—conceived as "the *magnum opus* of patriarchal consciousness"—Garb's analysis applies to modern globalism more broadly (1990, 275, emphasis in text; 1985). Anticipating what has since become perhaps the central problematic in critical writing on global imaginations, it focuses on the *distance* instituted by whole Earth representations, which are "obtained from the outside," from afar (Garb 1990, 265). This basic fact, he suggests, amounts to a "tremendous transformation of worldview," whereby "we become disengaged *observers of* rather than *participants in* the reality depicted" (Garb 1990, 266, emphasis in text). Garb shows how this stance of global detachment, which has both spatial and ethical resonances, intersects with—and ultimately reinforces—dominant constructions of gender in terms of perception, ethics, and behavior. In *perception*, for it confirms the "prejudice in favor of the visual" in patriarchal culture, according to which the exclusively visual experience of the distanced whole Earth is culturally valorized over immersive and tactile forms of worldly engagement, discursively constructed as "feminine" (Garb 1990, 268).[15] In *ethics*, because in a culture in which male maturity "is equated with independence and lack of connections to the providing figure" (the mother, society, the environment), the extraterrestrial view fuels masculinist desires to transcend maternal (or earthly) bonds, communal dependence and obligations (Garb 1990, 273). In *behavior*, because the detached whole Earth conditions and instills stereotypically "masculine"—managerial and coercive—forms of practice, even in earthbound subjects (on this internalization process, see Ferdinand 2016, 226).

Ultimately, Garb cautions against attempts "immediately to find an alternative image" to the distanced globe of patriarchal modern culture, which would only reiterate "modernity's obsolete quest for a single privileged viewpoint" (1990, 277–278). Faced with the detached and dominative patriarchal globe, however, many artists, critics, and activists have invoked feminized counterimages of an "all-encompassing, nurturing Earth goddess": Mother Earth (Garb 1990, 277). In her contribution to this volume, Miriam Tola discusses art practices of "sexecology," which, in engaging erotically with environments, reject the simplistic gesture of inverting masculinist globality. Certainly, at one level, sexecological practice counteracts the detached masculine globe, performing tactile and olfactory earthly engagements that, in Tola's words, "move beyond the realms of representation and visibility" (this volume). Yet in enacting these intimate entanglements, Tola argues that sexecology either avoids or reconfigures the implicit assumptions of imaginations of Mother Earth, which often posit the Earth as "a vulnerable gendered subject that demands protection" and participate in a heterosexist "reduction of women to the work of reproduction and care" (this volume). In contrast with both the detached patriarchal globe and passive, feminized Mother Earth, Tola stresses sexecology's evocation of "lover Earth," a queer "polyamorous lover" that demands reciprocity across difference and participates in mutual pleasures. Also countering the distance and externality

established by patriarchal global overviews, Jennifer Wenzel's and Simon Ferdinand's contributions to this volume raise the possibility, in different ways, of what Wenzel calls "world imagining from *within*." This form of global imagination, rather than rejecting global representation outright, acknowledges the subject's emplacement within the world even as that subject strives to grasp the world as a whole.

Lastly, recent critical work in the environmental humanities and ecocriticism has also sought to establish a sense of planetary difference and integration without recourse to reified overviews, developing a conception of planetary politics and history in which the agencies of geology, environments, and nonhuman animals participate.[16] These include Elizabeth DeLoughrey and George B. Handley's remarkable enfolding of postcolonial and ecological approaches, premised on the demand for "an imagination of a totality and an otherness that nevertheless cannot be possessed" (2011, 8); Ursula K. Heise's call for an eco-cosmopolitan "understanding and affective attachment to the global," which "reaches towards … the realm of nonhuman species, but also that of connectedness with both animate and inanimate networks of influence and exchange" (2008, 59, 61); and Timothy Morton's descriptions of the biosphere and global capitalism as "hyperobjects" that are "massively distributed in time and space," and that contain, include, and stick to humans in ways that undercut imaginations of Apollonian transcendence (2013, 1). Together, these theories of immersive relationality and unmasterable totality amount to a new imagination of "geopolitics," no longer conceived as a global chess games played out among imperial powers, but instead grasped in the new sense proposed by Gisli Palsson and Heather Swanson as a relational politics of the planetary environment in its overlapping materialities, species, and scales (2016, 163–167; see also Clark 2014).

* * *

Surveying critical accounts of dominant global imaginations has served to flesh out the sentiment, expressed by Horkheimer and Adorno in our opening, that the "fully enlightened earth radiates disaster triumphant." Global images and discourses have been criticized for projecting an impossible, ideological vision of an evenly achieved capitalism; for transcending moral communities to patriarchally objectify and control the planetary environment; for facilitating colonial conquest and affirming imperialist mindsets; and for reifying the living planet, severing ethical ties with Earth's abundance and alterity. Having been widely denounced and scrutinized in these different ways, negative references to the detached and dominative global view have become somewhat commonplace in critical discourse.

Established critiques of modern globalism, however, are becoming newly relevant in a number of ways. At one level, the heightened anti-globalization "isolationist" rhetoric surrounding both the Trump presidency and Britain's 2016 vote to leave the European Union highlights the need for alternative forms of global thought and practice that cannot be written off as the ideological smokescreen of an elite "globalism." At another, the encompassing context of the Anthropocene—the age of humanity's geological agency, ushered in by industrial capitalist modernity—demands that contemporary societies grasp and represent planetary ecological dynamics in compelling new ways. More specifically, burgeoning policy discourses of "climate engineering" or "geoengineering," which propose to alleviate global warming by taking charge of earth's climate, presuppose and extend the modern global view and its all-too-familiar grasp of the Earth as measurable and malleable totality.[17] Although many climate scientists and legislators endorse it only reluctantly, as a last-ditch response to global warming, others promote geoengineering as a means not just to alleviate existing environmental risk, but to "take control of geological history itself," for instance by setting "an optimal global temperature for the Earth for the next two hundred years" or suppressing future ice ages (Hamilton 2013, 201, 117; see also 191–193).

In expressing a renewed impulse to establish global mastery—indeed to consciously *remake* the planetary environment according to projected blueprints—geoengineering represents the apotheosis of modern globalism. The anthropocentric and patriarchal transcendence and objectification of environments; the dream of a capitalist globality that technically eclipses its material contradictions; the mastering and interventionist global gaze of modern imperialism: all are resurrected and culminate in the imagination of a reflexively human-engineered earth. Against this backdrop of resurgent modern globalism, this volume does not merely reiterate theoretical critiques of the mapped and malleable modern globe, but hopes to push beyond the "negative" moment of critique by fostering a sense of new possibility in cultural approaches to the global. Foregrounding previously lost and currently marginal ways of imagining the globe, inhabiting the global, or relating to globalization underlines the relativity and contingency of dominant global discourses, and conjures a neglected archive of alternative global imaginations, which, in our time of geoengineering and "global capital triumphant," appear as resources through which to challenge and recast our relationship with totality (Spivak 2003, 101).

Chapter Outline

Following this introductory chapter, Chapter 2 revisits accounts of globalization in early modern Europe. In it, Peter Hess shows how German literature resented and rejected proliferating global connections. Old urban elites in particular felt threatened and marginalized by an emergent class of globally networked merchants. Engaging works by Sebastian Brant, Ulrich von Hutten, Martin Luther, and Hieronymus Bock, the chapter shows how a nationalist backlash against globalization constructed false memories of a pure, heroic, and idyllic German past.

In Chapter 3, Simon Ferdinand reaches back to the late medieval vision of the world depicted in Flemish painter Hieronymus Bosch's so-called *Garden of Earthly Delights* (1490). The painting is analyzed in conjunction with Tim Ingold's account of how modern subjects are split between situated experiences of a flat surrounding horizon and prevailing visions of earth as a distanced globe. In combining horizontal and global perspectives, *Garden* ostensibly encapsulates this account. However, whereas Ingold affirms situated existence against estranged global overviews, Bosch's painting blocks recourse to place-based dwelling. In his Christian worldview, all earthly existence—whether lived in place or encompassing the whole globe—is spiritually estranged from God. Thus, *Garden* offers a situated mode of envisioning the global that counteracts contemporary manifestations of the "God's eye trick" without fetishizing placehood.

In Chapter 4, Patrick D. Flores undertakes close visual analyses of colonial and postcolonial art in the Philippines, exploring the multiple significance of nature, or rather *naturalesa*, in its Filipino conception. By discussing two anonymous colonial-era paintings (one depicting a colonial rebellion, another the Christian passion), several contemporary art installations by David Medalla, and cultural projects carried out by Imelda Marcos in the 1970s, Flores unpicks received notions of "art history" and emphasizes moments at which Filipino art has become historical—has acted into history and nature. In this way, the chapter develops this volume's emphasis on cultural practices of world making.

In Chapter 5, Cóilín Parsons takes his cues from Spivak's discussion of planetarity in exploring *The First Men in the Moon*, a 1901 novel by the Irish writer H. G. Wells. In Wells's fictional descriptions of time travel and space exploration at the end of the nineteenth century, Parsons espies a form of planetary consciousness that challenges the triumphant aspirations of imperial globalism. In Wells's prose, he argues, interplanetary travel involves disorienting, fragmented, and uncanny experiences of time and space. Showing how Wells linked astronomical knowledge with critiques of empire and capitalism, Parsons's chapter points to an emergent modernist planetary consciousness on the cusp of the twentieth century.

Like Chapter 4, Chapter 6 focuses on cultural practice in the Philippines. In it, Irene Villaescusa-Illán analyzes two works of Philippine literature written in Spanish in the first part of the twentieth century, focusing on how they invoke global modernity. Paz Mendoza's travelogue *Notas de viaje* (1929) [Travel Notes] and Jesús Balmori's novel *Los pajaros de fuego. Una novela Filipina de la Guerra* (1945) [Birds of Fire. A Filipino Novel About War] offer contrasting visions of the Philippines as an aspiring independent nation. Drawing selectively on countries and cultures from around the globe, Mendoza and Balmori reveal how the Philippines should be conceived not as one homogeneous nation, but as always already an outcome of global transculturation. In this way, Villaescusa-Illán's contribution highlights interactions among central and peripheral cultures in the formation of global modernities.

Questioning the alleged peripherality of Africa in discourses of globalization, in Chapter 7 Bill Ashcroft considers Africa—or rather the idea of Africa—as a significant example of the global circulation of modernity. The global dimension of Africa, he argues, can be seen in African writing. Accordingly, the chapter discusses poems by authors such as Agostino Neto (Angola), Kofi Anyidoho (Ghana), and Tijan Sallah (Gambia), as well as novels by Kojo Laing (Ghana) and three Nigerian-American writers: Ben Okri, Chimamanda Adiche, and Chris Abani. Through close readings of these literary works, the chapter reveals the global scope of a shared "africanness" existing in the imagination of African writers, artists, and creative thinkers. This idea of "global Africa" persists and proliferates, challenging dominant, Eurocentric imaginations of global wholeness.

In Chapter 8, Jennifer Wenzel unpacks the stakes of ongoing debates about power and perspective in relation to the global. In such debates, the totalizing Apollonian view from above is pitted against earthbound imaginations of the world from below. Teasing out the relationships among the *globe* in globalization discourse, *world* in world literature, and *planet/earth* in environmental discourse, Wenzel foregrounds the ethical appeal of a recurrent trope in cultural practice: that of *world-imagining from below*, in which marginalized subjects narrate their own precarious situatedness in a transnational frame. World-imagining from below, Wenzel argues, offers glimpses of a subaltern planetary subjectivity that is grittier and dirtier than the Apollonian view from high above the earth.

In Chapter 9, Peter Hitchcock draws on the Bakhtinian notion of novelization to consider the role of fiction in continuing the work of decolonization. Reexamining Edward Said's critique of orientalism, Hitchcock rethinks the tensions between postcolonialism and globalization as currently construed. Specifically, the chapter analyzes shifting concepts of nation, nationhood, and nationalism as they play out in the 2017 referendum on Puerto Rico's relationship to the United States and in two literary works: Giannina Braschi's *United States of Banana* (2011), set in Puerto Rico, and Susan Abulhawa's *Mornings in Jenin* (2006), set in occupied Palestine. Although the novels do not exemplify a solution to the dilemmas of state that decolonization faces, Hitchcock concludes, they do accentuate the role of imagination in such struggle and the various ways in which it may be inscribed as world making.

In Chapter 10, Alexis Radisoglou focuses on the planetary visions presented in Chilean filmmaker Patricio Guzmán's documentaries *Nostalgia for the Light* (2010) and *The Pearl Button* (2015). Against the homogenizing logic that thinks the globe as a single integrated system, the chapter suggests a model of "ethnoplanetarity" based on overlaps between earthbound and cosmic scales. Indeed, Radisoglou emphasizes how, in Guzmán's films, cosmic spatiotemporalities run together with traumatic national histories of colonial and dictatorial violence in Chile.

In Chapter 11, Grzegorz Czemiel also queries the image of the earth as a complete globe encapsulated in the iconic Earthrise photograph. To establish alternative articulations of the earth, able to face up to the challenges of climate change and globalization, the chapter mobilizes Bruno Latour's geopolitics, Peter Sloterdijk's spherology, and Reza Negarestani's geophilosophical realism to explore "speculative" and "weirder" visions of Earth in literature, music, and art. Specifically, Czemiel looks at how a "weirding" of the earth is operationalized in Jeff Vandermeer's 2014 *Southern Reach* trilogy; the "fourth world music" experiments of Jon Haskell and Brian Eno, and JD Twitch and Fergus Clark; and artworks by Michael Druks, Ruth Watson, and Ingo Günther.

Questioning environmental discourses that present a gendered, and often exploited, Mother Earth, Miriam Tola, in Chapter 12, examines the "sexecology" of Annie Sprinkle and Beth Stephens, an ongoing artistic and activist project that engages the earth as lover, source, and receiver of polymorphous pleasures. By attending closely to Sprinkle and Stephens's writings, performances, and the documentary *Water Makes Us Wet—An Ecosexual Adventure* (2017), Tola shows how they queer the ecological imagination. Besides complicating the gendered trope of Mother Earth, Tola argues, Sprinkle and Stephens's work shows how social ecologies of dirt and sanitation connect with hierarchies of race and sex. Yet, while effectively challenging established environmental discourses, Sprinkle and Stephens continue to rely on an impossible notion of partnership between humans and the planet. As an alternative to this, Tola proposes a different notion of care that takes alterity, rather than reciprocity, as its point of departure.

In Chapter 13, Christoph Schaub attends to Judith Schalansky's *Atlas of Remote Islands* (*Atlas der abgelegenen Inseln*, 2009). This text, he argues, presents an alternative way of grasping the world that is also oriented toward alterity. Resisting the encyclopedic drive toward completeness, Schalansky's *Atlas*, in both its subject matter and form, emphasizes selectiveness, inexhaustibility, and heterogeneity. Schaub contends that the *Atlas*, in offering up the world in discrete fragments, undercuts and satirizes the drive to completeness, abstraction, and homogenization at work in extant narratives of globalization.

In the final chapter, Robert T. Tally Jr. reflects on Fredric Jameson's famous remark that it is easier to imagine the end of the world than to imagine the end of capitalism. Appraising the recently popularity of dystopian narratives with apocalyptic themes in mainstream films in the United States (and then exported worldwide), the chapter argues that these films express an impulse to imagine the world system in its unrepresentable totality. Tally shows how, by setting stark temporal limits, identifying political orders, and simplifying social complexities, dystopian cinema becomes a way of understanding the seemingly chaotic world system itself.

Notes

1. Original German: "der zu Ende gedachten mathematisierten Welt" (Horkheimer and Adorno 2000, 39).
2. For an extended discussion of banal globalism, see Ferdinand (2018b). See also Szerszynski and Toogood (2000) and Szerszynski and Urry (2006).
3. The Latin anticipates contemporary theoretical attempts to establish relationality and multiplicity in place of otherwise totalizing global overviews; *globus*, as Mitchell writes, "condenses the singular and multiple object in the same way that a 'body' can denote an individual or collective" (2007, 51).
4. Pascal David goes so far as to wonder whether there is "a predisposition to phenomenology or even to existentialism in the 'Germanic' concept of the world" (2014, 1217). A closely related term in the phenomenological tradition, especially in Sloterdijk's philosophy (2014) is *sphere*, discussed at length in Ferdinand's contribution to this volume.
5. On the ways in which different conceptions of world are articulated in world literature, see Cheah (2016), Hayot (2012), and Moraru (2015).
6. On the other hand, in Dutch, the gradual replacement, as a result of the global dominance of English, of *mondialisering* (which, with its French root, connotes sophistication and cosmopolitanism) by *globalisering* brings a negative connotation of over-generalization, since *globaal* in Dutch means "roughly" or "broadly."
7. For reviews of Elias and Moraru's book *The Planetary Turn* by contributors to this volume, see Ferdinand (2018a) and Radisoglou (2017).
8. For a searching treatment of the planetarity/globality opposition by a contributor to this volume, see Wenzel (2014), which unpacks the antinomies of Spivak's notoriously recondite reflections on planetarity in detail.
9. For a reflection on planetary alterity by a contributor to this volume, see Tally, who invites readers to "look back on the worldly world from [a] radically otherworldly perspective" (2015, 207).
10. On the spatialization of social power in art and cultural theory, see Ferdinand (2018b, 8–9). On strategy and tactics in relation to spatial position and social power, see de Certeau (1984).
11. On the adaptation of modern globalism in first the Mughal Empire and then the Republic of India state, see Ramaswamy (2007, 2017).
12. For an account of these photographs and their reception, see Poole (2010) and Lazier (2011).
13. Gupta discusses lyrics from the "Song of the Non-Aligned World," which run: "The creators of the Non-Aligned world/Will be hailed forever by the whole world/In the world of justice all men will be free/Everyone will live in peace and harmony" (1992, 64).

14. On the separation of terrestrial and celestial globes in modernity, see Sloterdijk (2014).
15. Experiments in "listening to the planet" in sound art present an interesting counterpoint (Boes 2014, 166–168).
16. Tariq Jazeel offers a searching critical account of how postcolonial conceptions of planetarity cut against contemporary critical mobilizations of cosmopolitanism as a critical concept, which, he argues, remain vitiated by Western—indeed Apollonian—notions of "universal humanity" (2011, 84).
17. Here we are paraphrasing the opening of Clive Hamilton's critical study of geoengineering proposals: "For sheer audacity, no plan by humans exceeds the one now being hatched to take control of the Earth's climate" (2013, ix). For Hamilton's discussion of how geoengineering discourses are preconditioned by imaginations of "Earth-as-object," see 199–200.

Works Cited

Albrow, Martin. 1997. *The Global Age: State and Society Beyond Modernity*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Amin, Samir. 1974. Accumulation and Development: A Theoretical Model. *Review of African Political Economy* 1 (1): 9–26.

Appadurai, Arjun. 1996. *Modernity at Large: Cultural Dimensions of Globalization*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Apter, Emily. 2013. *Against World Literature: On the Politics of Untranslatability*. London: Verso.

Baron, Nick. 2013. Scales of Ambition: The Rise and Fall of Internationalism in Soviet Cartographic Cultural and Practice, from Lenin to Stalin. Unpublished paper presented at the Royal Geographical Society and Institute of British Geographers Annual International Conference, 27–30 August, 1–10, London.

———. 2015. World Revolution and Cartography. In *The History of Cartography, Volume 6: Cartography in the Twentieth Century*, ed. Mark Monmonier, 1766–1770. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Boes, Tobias. 2014. Planetary Mediation and the Anthropocene. *Environmental Humanities* 5 (1): 155–170.

Bonneuil, Christophe, and Jean-Baptise Fressoz. 2017. *The Shock of the Anthropocene*, trans. David Fernbach. London: Verso.

Brotton, Jerry. 1999. Terrestrial Globalism: Mapping the Globe in Early Modern Europe. In *Mappings*, ed. Denis Cosgrove, 71–89. London: Reaktion.

Caillat, Colette, and Ravi Kumar. 1981. *The Jain Cosmology*. New Delhi: Harmony Books.

Casanova, Pascale. 2005. Literature as a World. *New Left Review* 31: 71–90.

Cheah, Pheng. 2016. *What Is a World? On Postcolonial Literature as World Literature*. Durham: Duke University Press.

Clark, Nigel. 2014. Geo-Politics and the Disaster of the Anthropocene. *The Sociological Review* 62 (1): 19–37.

Clark, Timothy. 2015. *Ecocriticism on the Edge: The Anthropocene as a Threshold Concept*. London: Bloomsbury.

Cosgrove, Denis. 1994. Contested Global Visions: One-World, Whole-Earth, and the Apollo Space Photographs. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* 84 (2): 270–294.

———. 2001. *Apollo's Eye: A Cartographic Genealogy of the Earth in the Western Imagination*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Curtis, Adam, dir. 2016. Acid Flashback & A World Without Power. In *Hypernormalisation* (Television documentary). London: BBC.

Damrosch, David. 2003. *What Is World Literature?* Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Daston, Lorraine. 1992. Objectivity and the Escape from Perspective. *Social Studies of Science* 22 (4): 597–618.

David, Pascale. 2014. Welt. In *Dictionary of Untranslatables: A Philosophical Lexicon*, ed. Emily Apter, Jacques Lezra, and Michael Wood, 1217–1224. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

de Certeau, Michel. 1984. *The Practice of Everyday Life*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

DeLoughrey, Elizabeth, and George Handley. 2011. Introduction: Toward an Aesthetics of the Earth. In *Postcolonial Ecologies: Literatures of the Environment*, 3–39 New York: Oxford University Press.

Denning, Michael. 2007. Representing Global Labour. *Social Text* 25 (3): 126–145.

Dorrain, Mark. 2013. On Google Earth. In *Seeing from Above: The Aerial View in Visual Culture*, ed. Mark Dorrian and Frederic Pousin, 290–308. London: I.B. Tauris.

Diederichsen, Diedrich, and Anselm Franke. 2013. The Whole Earth: California and the Disappearance of the Outside. In *The Whole Earth: California and the Disappearance of the Outside*, ed. Diedrich Diederichsen and Anselm Franke, 8–11. Berlin: Sternberg Press.

Eisenstadt, Shmuel N. 2000. Multiple Modernities. *Daedalus* 129 (1): 1–29.

Elias, Amy J., and Christian Moraru. 2015. Introduction: The Planetary Condition. In *The Planetary Turn: Relationality and Geoaesthetics in the Twenty-First Century*, ed. Amy J. Elias and Christian Moraru, xi–xxxvii. Evanston: Northwestern University Press.

Ferdinand, Simon. 2016. The Shock of the Whole: Phenomenologies of Global Mapping in Solomon Nikritin's *the Old and the New*. *GeoHumanities* 2 (1): 220–237.

———. 2018a. Review of The Planetary Turn, edited by Amy J. Elias and Christian Moraru. *Cultural Geographies* 25 (2): 376.

———. 2018b. Seeing the Self in the World: Attending to Banal Globalism in Urban Visual Cultures. *Journal of Urban Cultural Studies* 5 (2): 249–254.

———. 2019. *Mapping Beyond Measure: Art, Cartography, and the Space of Global Modernity*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press. In press.

Franke, Anselm. 2013. Earthrise and the Disappearance of the Outside. In *The Whole Earth: California and the Disappearance of the Outside*, ed. Diedrich Diederichsen and Anselm Franke, 12–19. Berlin: Sternberg Press.

Fukuyama, Francis. 1992. *The End of History and the Last Man*. New York: Free Press.

Garb, Yaakov. 1985. The Uses and Misuses of the Whole Earth Image. *The Whole Earth Review* (March): 18–25.

______. 1990. Perspective or Escape? Ecofeminist Musings on Contemporary Earth Imagery. In *Reweaving the World: The Emergence of Ecofeminism*, ed. Irene Diamond and Gloria F. Orenstein, 264–278. San Francisco: Sierra Club Books.

Gilroy, Paul. 1993. *The Black Atlantic: Modernity and Double Consciousness*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Gupta, Akhil. 1992. The Song of the Nonaligned World: Transnational Identities and the Reinscription of Space of Late Capitalism. *Cultural Anthropology* 7 (1): 63–79.

Hamilton, Clive. 2013. *Earthmasters: The Dawn of the Age of Climate Engineering*. New Haven: Yale University of Press.

Harrison, Robert Pogue. 2003. *The Dominion of the Dead*. Chicago and London: Chicago University Press.

Haraway, Donna. 1988. Situated Knowledges: The Science Question in Feminism and the Privilege of Partial Perspective. *Feminist Studies* 14 (3): 575–599.

Harley, John Brian. 2002. *The New Nature of Maps: Essays in the History of Cartography*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Harvey, David. 1989. *The Condition of Postmodernity: An Enquiry into the Origins of Cultural Change*. Oxford: Blackwell.

———. 2003. *The New Imperialism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Hayot, Eric. 2012. *On Literary Worlds*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Heidegger, Martin. 1992. The Origin of the Work of Art. In *Basic Writings*, ed. David Farrell Krell, 139–212. San Francisco: HarperCollins.

———. 1995. *The Fundamental Concepts of Metaphysics: World, Finitude, Solicitude*, trans. William McNeill and Nicholas Walter. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Heise, Ursula K. 2008. *Sense of Place and Sense of Planet: The Environmental Imagination of the Global*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Horkheimer, Max, and Theodor W. Adorno. 2000. *Dialektik der Aufklärung: Philosophische Fragmente*. Munich: Fischer Verlag.

———. 2002. *Dialectic of Enlightenment*, trans. John Cumming. New York: Continuum.

Huntington, Samuel P. 1993. The Clash of Civilizations? *Foreign Affairs* 72 (3): 22–49.

Janack, Marianne. 2002. Dilemmas of Objectivity. *Social Epistemology* 16 (3): 267–281.

Jazeel, Tariq. 2011. Spatializing Difference Beyond Cosmopolitanism: Rethinking Planetary Futures. *Theory, Culture & Society* 28 (5): 75–97.

Lazarus, Neil. 2011. *The Postcolonial Unconscious*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Lazier, Benjamin. 2011. Earthrise; or, The Globalization of the World Picture. *The American Historical Review* 116 (3): 602–630.

Linebaugh, Peter, and Marcus Redikker. 2000. *The Many-Headed Hydra: Sailors, Slaves, Commoners, and the Hidden History of the Revolutionary Atlantic*. Boston: Beacon Press.

McKittrick, Katherine. 2006. *Demonic Grounds: Black Women and Cartographies of Struggle*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Meissner, Miriam. 2017. *Narrating the Global Financial Crisis: Urban Imaginaries and the Politics of Myth*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Mitchell, W.J.T. 2007. World Pictures: Globalization and Visual Culture. *Neohelicon* 34 (2): 49–59.

Moraru, Christian. 2015. *Reading for the Planet: Towards a Geomethodology*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Moretti, Franco. 2000. Conjectures on World Literature. *New Left Review* 1: 54–68.

Morton, Timothy. 2013. *Hyperobjects: Philosophy and Ecology After the End of the World*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Nagel, Thomas. 1986. *The View from Nowhere*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Ortiz, Fernando, and Harriet De Onís. 1947. *Cuban Counterpoint: Tobacco and Sugar*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.

Palsson, Gisli, and Heather Anne Swanson. 2016. Down to Earth: Geosocialities and Geopolitics. *Environmental Humanities* 8 (2): 149–171.

Peeren, Esther, Hanneke Stuit, and Astrid Van Weyenberg. 2016. Introduction: Peripheral Visions in the Globalizing Present. In *Peripheral Visions in the Globalizing Present: Space, Mobility, Aesthetics*, ed. Esther Peeren, Hanneke Stuit, and Astrid Van Weyenberg, 1–29. Leiden: Brill.

Poole, Robert. 2010. *Earthrise: How Man First Saw the Earth*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Pratt, Mary Louise. 1992. *Imperial Eyes: Travel Writing and Transculturation*. New York: Routledge.

Radisoglou, Alexis. 2017. Review of *the Planetary Turn*, edited by Amy J. Elias and Christian Moraru. *The Germanic Review: Literature, Culture, Theory* 92 (1): 113–116.

Ramaswamy, Sumathi. 2007. Conceit of the Globe in Mughal Visual Practice. *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 49 (4): 751–782.

———. 2017. *Territorial Lessons: The Conquest of the World as a Globe*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Retort Collective. 2006. *Afflicted Powers: Capital and Spectacle in a New Age of War*, Rev. ed. London: Verso.

Said, Edward. 1978. *Orientalism*. New York: Pantheon Books.

Shohat, Ella, and Robert Stam. 1994. The Imperial Imaginary. In *Unthinking Eurocentrism: Multiculturalism and the Media*, ed. Ella Shohat, 100–136. London: Routledge.

Sloterdijk, Peter. 2014. *Globes: Macrospherology*, trans. Wieland Hoban. South Pasadena: Semiotext(e).

Smith, Paul. 1997. *Millennial Dreams: Contemporary Culture and Capital in the North*. London: Verso.

Spivak, Gayatri Chakravorty. 1999. *Imperatives for Re-imagining the Planet—Imperative zur Neuerfindung des Planeten*. Vienna: Passagen.

———. 2003. *Death of a Discipline*. New York: Columbia University Press.

———. 2012. *An Aesthetic Education in the Era of Globalisation*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

———. 2014. Planetarity. In *Dictionary of Untranslatables: A Philosophical Lexicon*, ed. Emily Apter, Jacques Lezra, and Michael Wood, 1223. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Stallabrass, Julian. 2004. *Art Incorporated: The Story of Contemporary Art*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Szerszynski, Bronislaw. 2005. *Nature, Technology and the Sacred*. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.

Szerszynski, Bronislaw, and Mark Toogood. 2000. Global Citizenship, the Environment and the Media. In *Environmental Risks and the Media*, ed. Stuart Allan, Barbara Adam, and Cynthia Carter, 218–228. London: Routledge.

Szerszynski, Bronislaw, and John Urry. 2006. Visuality, Mobility and the Cosmopolitan: Inhabiting the World from Afar. *The British Journal of Sociology* 57 (1): 114–131.

Tally, Robert T. 2015. Beyond the Flaming Walls of the World: Fantasy, Alterity, and the Postnational Constellation. In *The Planetary Turn: Relationality and Geoaesthetics in the Twenty-First Century*, ed. Amy J. Elias and Christian Moraru, 193–210. Evanston: Northwestern University Press.

Turner, Fred. 2006a. How Digital Technology Found Utopian Ideology: Lessons from the First Hackers' Conference. In *Critical Cyberculture Studies: Current Terrain, Future Directions*, ed. David Silver and Adrienne Massanari, 257–269. New York: New York University Press.

———. 2006b. *From Counterculture to Cyberculture: Stewart Brand, the Whole Earth Network, and the Rise of Digital Utopianism*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Ukai, Satoshi. 2017. "Dying Wisdom" and "Living Madness": A Comparative Literature of the Errant Star. In *Planetary Atmospheres and Urban Society After Fukushima*, ed. Christophe Thorny and Mitsuhiro Yoshimoto, 21–28. Basingstoke: Palgrave.

Warf, Barney. 2008. *Time-Space Compression: Historical Geographies*. London: Routledge.

Wenzel, Jennifer. 2009. *Bulletproof: Afterlives of Anticolonial Prophecy in South Africa and Beyond*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

———. 2014. Planet vs. Globe. *English Language Notes* 52 (1): 19–30.

Young, Julian. 2001. *Heidegger's Philosophy of Art*. Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press.

Zavala, Iris M. 1992. *Colonialism and Culture: Hispanic Modernisms and the Social Imaginary*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.