

and of language. Echoing Toni Morrison, Wang closes with highlighting “poems themselves” as sources of theoretical deliberations (230). Particularly this last point poignantly concludes the volume with an assertion of the cultural and sociopolitical relevance of poetry.

The Cambridge Companion to Twenty-First-Century American Poetry comes like a breath of fresh air in the world of such series by academic publishers. While several contributions do not convince this reviewer, the collection certainly offers ample food for thought, as do the “Chronology” (xi–xix; compiled by Timothy Yu and Jacquelyn Teoh) that precedes the introductory essay and the (rather brief, but still helpful) “Further Reading” section (234–37; compiled by Timothy Yu and Caroline Hensley). This volume links up quite well with the equally welcome innovative impetus of the extensive and variegated *Cambridge History of American Poetry* (ed. Alfred Bendixen and Stephen Burt, 2014),³ which also follows a highly insightful revisionist trajectory. For scholars interested in contemporary poetry in the United States and for instructors who want their students to strive toward developing innovative research projects, *The Cambridge Companion to Twenty-First-Century American Poetry* is definitely an asset.

Notes

- 1 See, for instance, Timothy Yu, *Race and the Avant-Garde: Experimental and Asian American Poetry Since 1965* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2009); Timothy Yu, “Asian American Poetry in the First Decade of the 2000s,” *Contemporary Literature* 52, no. 4 (2011): 818–51, DOI: [10.1353/cli.2011.0040](https://doi.org/10.1353/cli.2011.0040).
- 2 See, for instance, Timothy Yu, *100 Chinese Silences* (Los Angeles: Les Figues Press, 2016).
- 3 Alfred Bendixen and Stephen Burt, ed., *The Cambridge History of American Poetry* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014).

***How to Hide an Empire: A History of the Greater United States.* By Daniel Immerwahr (New York: Picador, 2020), 516pp.**

Martin Gabriel, University of Klagenfurt

DOI: [10.47060/jaaas.v3i1.137](https://doi.org/10.47060/jaaas.v3i1.137)

Daniel Immerwahr’s *How to Hide an Empire: A History of the Greater United States* features an introductory chapter that centers on the Japanese attacks in the Pacific in December 1941. While few strategists would have doubted the strategic value of outlying U.S. possessions such as Guam, Howland, and Wake Island (and even less the Philippines), official discourses marginalized these areas and focused on the attacks on Hawai’i instead. “Pearl Harbor” became synonymous with Japanese aggression, a site that represented an assault on (white) America. In 1940, more than one in every

eight Americans (“subjects” and citizens alike) lived outside the continental United States. “If you lived in the United States on the eve of World War II[,] . . . you were more likely to be colonized than black, by odds of three to two” (11). The author is correct in stating that “race” as a formative factor in U.S. history went far beyond relations between Euro-Americans and African Americans. Immerwahr’s considerations regarding the cartographical construction of a non-imperial nation—one that omits “colonial” areas—could tempt the reader to see this as an exceptionalist U.S. project designed to “deny empire”; we should keep in mind, however, that map-making is never neutral, but rather a “part of a range of spatial strategies.”²

Immerwahr traces the beginnings of U.S. expansionism to the eighteenth century, when settlement of the areas west of the Appalachians turned into a mass movement, much to the chagrin of social elites. A new category of “territories” was established and administered in a quasi-colonial manner. On a continent “substantially cleared of its indigenous population by disease” (33), immigrant communities grew quickly and while earlier settlers had been marginalized as “banditti,” politicians began to promote the positively connoted term “pioneer.” Existing Native American nations were subsequently displaced from their homelands and, after plans for an “Indian Country” in the western half of the continent had failed to materialize, resettled in modern-day Oklahoma: “It was as if someone had depopulated most of Europe and shunted remnants from each country to an allotment in Romania” (42).

Another chapter of the book is dedicated to the little-known story of the “guano islands,” where the world’s most important agricultural fertilizer was found in abundance. While guano was mostly found on barren islands, it played a crucial role in late nineteenth-century U.S. expansion. At one point, U.S. activities almost led to war with Peru. Immerwahr’s descriptions of such topics are vivid, concise, and promote a highly critical picture of national, imperial, and global history. The same can be said about his comments on the “War of 1898” (and the occupation of former Spanish possessions). U.S. *realpolitik*, racial conceptions, and economic interests quickly became obvious in dealings with independence movements in the Philippines and the Caribbean, respectively. “Filipinos who had besieged Manila . . . at the cost of thousands of lives, thus watched in astonishment as their allies entered the city unopposed, locked Filipino soldiers out, and fraternized with the enemy” (72). On the *mainland*, native populations were excluded from the census until 1890—a highly symbolic gesture based on the myth of a virgin land. “Imperialists” and “anti-imperialists” debated the inclusion of additional “people of color”; in these discussions, racism was omnipresent on both sides, but supported different arguments. Ambivalence was also a personal trait of leading U.S. politicians: “For the inhabitants of the world’s colonies, there were two [Woodrow] Wilsons: Wilson the liberator, Wilson the racist” (117). In the Philippines, for example, he supported increased self-administration against many officials who saw

“natives” as unfit for this kind of responsibility. In Puerto Rico, however, hopes for an independent future faded quickly; in 1937, tensions finally culminated in the “Ponce Massacre,” the bloodiest shooting by U.S. police in history.

World War II also features quite prominently in Immerwahr’s book: the famous Asian American 442nd Infantry Regiment, General MacArthur, Bataan, the fighting for Manila’s *Intramuros* district in 1945 are all covered, albeit at different levels of detail. After Japan’s surrender, the country “wasn’t a U.S. territory like the Philippines. But MacArthur nevertheless ran it as if it were” (225). At the end of 1945, more people were living in US colonies or occupation zones than in “mainland USA.” Politicians considered incorporating parts of Japan or even Iceland. Instead, “the United States . . . won a war and gave up territory” (229). Immerwahr mentions the widespread—but now little-known—mass protests of GIs against their government and their own presence overseas. He also covers the issue of Hawaiian statehood that came in 1959, after heated controversies regarding race issues.

A lengthy chapter details the bloody history of Puerto Rico between the late 1930s and the 1950s, including a number of nationalist uprisings and a botched assassination attempt on Harry Truman. The following chapter focuses on the replacement of natural by synthetic rubber and its implications for global power. Immerwahr also deals with the Panama Canal, malaria, and DDT; while all of these processes and phenomena deserve attention, sometimes it seems unclear why they were selected and included at particular points. The author then turns to the importance of language. An intriguing chapter summarizes American approaches to language in both national and global contexts. Not only does Immerwahr shed light on the multilingualism of presidents like Mandarin-speaking Herbert Hoover, but he also takes a look at tendencies toward unilingualism, a phenomenon “being increasingly given emblematic status . . . by at least some political forces.”³

Immerwahr covers the topic of U.S. military bases in Asia and Europe and the civilian settlements surrounding them, spaces that became “bustling borderlands where people from the United States came into frequent contact with foreigners” (356). Whether it was British bands playing for U.S. servicemen during the 1960s, or Japanese protesting against the “Yankee” presence in 1995, military bases turned into focal points of global cultural contact. The U.S. garrison at Dhahran (Saudi Arabia) was of special significance with respect to Muslim sensibilities; in this chapter, a man named Osama bin Laden makes his appearance. But Immerwahr also deals with the question of U.S. bases on Okinawa that resulted in the resignation of Japanese prime minister Hatoyama in 2009, as well as Guam, another crucial point for twenty-first-century U.S. military strategy in the Indo-Pacific area of operations.

The monograph concludes with a discussion of the “citizenship” problem. Instead

of choosing a well-known topic such as Latin American immigration, Immerwahr presents the case of Senator John McCain's and Governor Sarah Palin's 2008 presidential bid. McCain "was born in the Panama Canal Zone, a Guantánamo-like space under exclusive U.S. jurisdiction" (395), while Palin had ties to the Alaskan Independence Party, a movement questioning the legality of Alaska's statehood. The author also states that Donald Trump already laid the base for his presidential campaign in 2011—by publicly doubting the legitimacy of Barack Obama's U.S. citizenship.

To Immerwahr, the United States ("America") is a bona fide empire, even though most of its critics focus on some kind of informal imperialism rather than overseas possessions. By contrast, the author argues that "if there is one thing the history of the Greater United States tells us, it's that such territory *matters*" (400). Immerwahr's book addresses a number of controversial and relevant topics of U.S. history. Beyond glorifying national myths, he deals with diverse forms of imperial policies and politics, focusing specifically on the issue of territoriality. At some points, the reader might get the impression that Immerwahr simply wanted to integrate ever more details or storylines into his monograph, resulting in a loss of coherence. Nonetheless, *How to Hide an Empire* is undeniably a well-founded yet easily comprehensible book. Even if one does not agree with all of the author's hypotheses or conclusions, this monograph offers important suggestions for additional critical discussions regarding a national and global history of the (Greater) United States.

Notes

- 1 Niall Ferguson, "Empire in Denial: The Limits of US Imperialism," *Harvard International Review* 25, no. 3 (2003): 64–69.
- 2 Alexander Hidalgo and John F. López, "Introduction: Imperial Geographies and Spatial Memories in Spanish America," *Journal of Latin American Geography*, 11, Special (2012): 3, DOI: [10.1353/lag.2012.0030](https://doi.org/10.1353/lag.2012.0030).
- 3 Michael Silverstein, "Encountering Language and Languages of Encounter in North American Ethnohistory," *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology* 6, no. 2 (1996): 138, DOI: [10.1525/jlin.1996.6.2.126](https://doi.org/10.1525/jlin.1996.6.2.126).

Literary Afrofuturism in the Twenty-First Century. Edited by Isiah Lavender III and Lisa Yaszek (Columbus: The Ohio State University Press, 2020), 248pp.

Marijana Mikić, University of Klagenfurt

DOI: [10.47060/jaaas.v3i1.135](https://doi.org/10.47060/jaaas.v3i1.135)

Isiah Lavender III and Lisa Yaszek's collection introduces a variety of critical perspectives to the study of Black speculative fiction. The editors observe that Afrofuturism has grown well beyond Mark Dery's 1993 "conception of this aesthetic movement