

**Clara Buitrago, Mirko Petersen,  
Paul-Matthias Tyrell, Dorothea Wehrmann** (Bielefeld University)

## **Introduction: (Geo-)Political Imaginaries in the Americas**

### **Abstract**

This article serves as an introduction to the special *fiar*-issue “From Ideas to Concepts: (Geo) Political Imaginaries”. It draws attention to the use of imaginaries in the Americas, explores the ways in which research on imaginaries has evolved and outlines still existing research gaps. By exemplifying the significance of imaginaries in the field of *Geopolitics* this article highlights particularly the potential imaginaries have with regard to the construction of places and spaces.

**Keywords:** imaginaries, Americas, geopolitics

## Nuestro Norte es el Sur – The Americas from Different Perspectives

In the twelfth century, the official geographer of the kingdom of Sicily, al-Idrisi, drew a map of the world, the world that Europe knew about, with south on top and north on the bottom. That was common in mapmaking back then. And that's how the map of South America was drawn eight centuries later, with south on top, by Uruguayan painter Joaquín Torres García. 'Our north is south' [*Nuestro norte es el sur*], he said. 'To go north, our ships go down, not up.'

If the world is upside down the way it is now, wouldn't we have to turn it over again to get it to stand up straight? (Galeano 337)

The author of these lines, the Uruguayan writer Eduardo Galeano, has often been described as the voice of Latin America (e.g. Kassam/Jones 2015; Frieria 2015). In these lines he expresses the struggle of Latin America against being treated like the backyard in the South of the United States and against being the poor neighbor of the place where wealth is concentrated like nowhere else on earth. Galeano challenges us to think differently about a naturalized way of understanding the world: geography, expressed most prominently through cartography. Thereby, Galeano perceives cartographic representation of space as powerful instruments to enforce political and social order. Maps thus shape our perception of the world as they "divide the world up into distinct places and zones" (Dodds 10), which is why the production of maps has also often led to political disputes (e.g. among Chile and Argentina with regard to the Southern Patagonian Ice Field). Thus, maps can be seen as social constructions and are clear expressions of power relations on various scales (e.g., Crampton 2001).

As Galeano's example of Torres García already indicates, geographic assumptions of the Americas are powerful factors in the way we think of this double-continent and of its global position. This dossier emphasizes the need to study geopolitical imaginaries such as the one presented in Galeano's example in order to better understand the dynamics and power relations within the Americas. As will be exemplified by the different contributions in this special issue, we argue that imaginaries constitute lenses which serve to describe and interpret the world.

The authors of the articles in this issue focus particularly on the Americas. Eric Selbin looks at the importance of certain spaces and places for revolutionary imaginaries in Latin America. Joaquín Aldao, Nicolás Damín and Dario Dawyd describe how the focus and attitudes of Argentine syndicalism shifted from Europe to an inter-American dimension and Klaus Weinhauer compares the imaginaries of urban threat in in the USA and Argentina. Within the double-continent, it is possible to observe how imaginaries circulate and expand, how they form part of narratives in different places and spaces and thereby also create entanglements within the American hemisphere, which are often ignored by scholars (Kaltmeier 175). To look at these entanglements means to take the shared and divided

history (Conrad and Randeria 17) of certain places and places into consideration and to focus on their often conflictive histories with each other. By choosing a specific regional focus, the authors included in this dossier, however, do not neglect that imaginaries are also formed through interrelations with other regions. This is shown especially in Angelika Epple's and Kirsten Kramer's article, in which they depict geopolitical imaginaries as spatial configurations that represent not only concrete geographical or topographical places but also systems and relations, which are firmly embedded within global power structures.

With this special issue on (geo-)political imaginaries we aim at

- contributing to the debate on the construction and significance of imaginaries;
- providing examples that illustrate the power of imaginaries in the context of geopolitics and beyond;
- expanding the theoretical and methodological instruments for the analysis of imaginaries in a more profound and systematic manner.

Before introducing the different contributions of which this special issue is composed, we will first briefly relate to the evolvment of the term and the ideas behind *imaginaries*. Secondly, we will outline the significance of imaginaries in the field of geopolitics. We thereby concentrate on the discussions on imaginaries in scholarly works across various disciplines, especially related to the field of critical geopolitics.

## Imaginaries

The term *imaginary*, as we use it here, is influenced by theoretical approaches from different disciplines ranging from History, Literary Science, Philosophy, Political Science, Sociology and Social-Anthropology. However, similar to the Canadian philosopher Charles Taylor (25) we do not believe that we can adequately explain imaginaries in terms of a conclusive theory because of their largely unstructured, unlimited, and indefinite nature. Instead, we propose to analyze them as *lenses* in a double sense; first, as lenses people use unconsciously to look at and interpret certain phenomena and second, as products of a conscious political strategy. Thereby, the perspective that lenses offer can change. For instance they allow one to refocus and defocus on certain phenomena and thus help to understand how imaginaries change over time and through reproduction by others.

The study of imaginaries stems from a French intellectual tradition subsequent to the sociologist Émile Durkheim that investigated the patterns with which society tries to generate meaning as their principal target. The book *The Imaginary Institution of Society* (the French original is from 1975) by the Greek-French Philosopher Cornelius Castoriadis is often

regarded as one of the most important works stemming from this tradition. For Castoriadis, an imaginary is "something 'invented' – whether this refers to a sheer invention ('a story entirely dreamed up'), or a slippage, a shift of meaning in which available symbols are invested with other significations than their 'normal' or canonical significations [...]" (127). Castoriadis' work presents a critical reading of rationalizing assumptions of modernity. For him, although the modern world has presented itself as the product of rationalization, despising the imaginary representations of previous societies, it is precisely this extreme rationalization which makes life in the modern world "just as dependent on the imaginary as any archaic or historical culture" (156). In his argumentation, Castoriadis notes that societies, together with their laws and legalizations, are founded upon a basic conception of the world and the place of the human beings in it. Traditional societies had elaborated imaginaries, expressed through various creation myths, by which they explained how the world came to be and how it is sustained. The same was done in the context of capitalism, appealing to this mythic imaginary of rationalization or pure reason.

The work of Castoriadis is an important foundation to understand the importance of imaginaries in so-called modern societies. A work which relates to the invented character of the most prominent modern organizing principle, the nation, is *Imagined Communities*, a book by the historian Benedict Anderson published in 1983. He points out that nation-states are not a product of the rational principles of a political organization, but the result of subjective processes originated by emergence of the printing press under a capitalist system. For him, the convergence of capitalism and print technology created unified fields of exchange and communication below Latin and above the spoken vernaculars. Thus, speakers of each European vernacular language became capable of comprehending one another via print and paper. In this process, "they gradually became aware of hundreds of thousands of people in their particular language-field" (Anderson 44). Those fellow-readers formed the nationally imagined community or the members of nations, who "will never know most of their fellow members, meet them, or even hear of them," but were able to have in their minds "the image of their communion" (6).

A concept of imaginaries closely connected to Anderson's work is developed by Charles Taylor in his book *Modern Social Imaginaries* (2004). Taylor's focus is on certain social forms which modern Western societies are based on. Those are, in his view, the market economy, the public sphere and the self-governing people—all them related to the constructed nations which Anderson described. These principles constitute Western modernity's *social imaginaries*, that is to say "the ways people imagine their social existence" and their living together with others (Taylor 23).

In contrast to Anderson and Taylor, the philosopher Chiara Bottici draws upon Castoriadis' approach. In her book *Imaginal Politics: Images beyond Imagination and the Imaginary* (2014), she develops a theory of the *imaginal*. According to this theory, she considers images as a starting point for the formation of imaginaries and argues that "without images, there can be neither a world for us nor a subject for the world," and consequently "human beings are not only rational animals but also, and even prior to that, imaginal animals" (6). Thereby, Bottici addresses an important additional dimension in the study of imaginaries and draws attention to the power of images, which she also regards as main drivers of contemporary politics (11).

A work which uses a combination of these approaches is the anthropologist Arjun Appadurai's *Modernity at Large*, first published in 1996. For him, the world we live in today is characterized by a new role for imagination in social life and to grasp this new role, we need to take into account the old idea of images, especially mechanically produced images and the political nature of imagination (according to the Frankfurt School), the idea of imagined communities (Anderson), and the French idea of imaginary (Castoriadis) as a constructed conception or landscape of collective aspirations (31). Further, he argues that there is something critical and new in global cultural processes: The imagination has become an organized field of social practices, a form of work (in the sense of both labor and culturally organized practice), and a form of negotiation between sites of agency (individuals) and globally defined fields of possibility (31). This is a reason to argue that people today do not simply live in imagined communities, but also in "imagined worlds...that is, the multiple worlds that are constituted by the historically situated imaginations of persons and groups spread around the globe [...]" (33).

Appadurai's work and his notion of "imagined worlds" goes beyond what the other aforementioned authors offer us and leads us towards the specific interest of this introduction, which is the explanation of *geopolitical* imaginaries. Nonetheless, some basic ideas for the amplifications of the view on imaginaries are already present in Anderson's and Taylor's work. As Anderson points out, nations define themselves in relation to other nations, and they are imagined as limited because of the existence of these other communities (7). But it is not only the limit itself which has to be considered in the study of imaginaries, but also the relation to what exists beyond the border. This crucial idea is present in Taylor's work, who, in more general terms, indicates that imaginaries hint at a "wider perspective on where we stand in space and time" (27). This means to take into considerations "our relations to other nations and peoples (e.g., to external models of democratic life we are trying to imitate, or of tyranny we are trying to distance ourselves from) and also where we stand in our history [...]" (27).

How such a positioning in space and time can take place is very well described in *Orientalism* (1978) by literary theorist Edward Said. He argues that there is a source of inaccurate cultural representations that are the foundation of Western thought towards the Middle East. His thesis is the existence of a Eurocentric prejudice against Arabo-Islamic peoples and their culture, which has its roots in Western culture's long tradition of (re)producing false and romanticized images of Asia in general and the Middle East in particular. For him, such perceptions, and the consequent cultural representations, have served as implicit justifications for the colonial and imperialist ambitions of the European powers and of the United States. Literary theorist Walter Mignolo adds that there cannot be a construction of “an Orient, as the other, without the Occident as the same” (51). That is to say that at the beginning of the modern world system, there took place what the Iberian colonizers thought of as the extension of Europe to the Americas, the construction of the Occident. This “overarching geopolitical imaginary of the modern/colonial world system,” which Mignolo calls Occidentalism, existed prior to Orientalism and coincides with the shift of power towards Great Britain and France and the conquest of its colonies in Asia and Africa (59).

In our perception, the term imaginaries as coined by Castoriadis and others offers a good starting point to emphasize the importance of the creation of meaning for societies. What one has to add is the role of spaces and places as well as their relation to each other along the lines of what can already be found in some remarks in the works of Anderson and Taylor and is more explicitly present in the works of Said and Mignolo. Imaginaries, especially when referring to its often underestimated geopolitical dimension, have to be embedded into something that we might call worldview, *weltanschauung*, or in Appadurai's wording “imagined world.” This is the basis upon which we will explain the function of geopolitical imaginaries.

### **Geopolitical Imaginaries**

Geopolitics constitutes an excellent example of the modern rationalist thinking to which Castoriadis referred because it aims at a complete categorization and hierarchization of the world according to geographical characteristics of regions, states and other entities, such as, for instance, the city. This is why we consider it an important field to which the analysis of imaginaries can contribute.

The term geopolitics was first used by geographers in Europe in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries (cf. Ó Tuathail, *Critical Geopolitics* 21-55). In this way of thinking, regions, states and other entities are characterized according to their geographical features and

evaluated by their strategic importance. Geopolitics was a considerable part of imperialist thinking and also present in the ideology of Nazi Germany's expansionist foreign policy. After World War II, the term geopolitics was discredited because of its use in the *Third Reich*. This did not mean that its ideas were absent from political actions. In the 1970s, the term was popularized anew, especially by the then U.S. Secretary of State, Henry Kissinger, and was later on adopted by U.S. strategists like Zbigniew Brzezinski ("The Grand Chessboard") and Samuel P. Huntington ("The Clash of Civilizations"). Although the works have been deconstructed academically, they haven't lost influence in contemporary foreign policy making. Especially the post 9/11 cultural clash literature shows how imaginaries are still at work and perpetuated.

The repopularization of the term triggered a new scientific debate, which contested the views of the so-called classical geopolitics. Critical geopolitics as a new school of thought emerged. Taking into account the spatial, linguistic, and postcolonial turn in the humanities, critical geopolitics replace the understanding of geography as naturally given by analyzing it as a social construct (re)produced in discourses, in which a permanent "contest between different ways of envisioning the world" occurs (Ó Tuathail, *Critical Geopolitics* 15). This critical approach no longer treats geopolitics as a neutral description of geography, but instead highlights that the characterization of places and spaces always possesses political and ideological implications. Consequentially, "all international politics is also geopolitics as it necessarily involves geographical and spatial assumptions about people and places" (Dodds, Kuus, and Sharp 6).

One of the main tasks of critical geopolitics is to investigate what Edward Said called "imaginative geography," that is to say the "universal practice of designating in one's mind a familiar space which is 'ours' and an unfamiliar space beyond 'ours' which is 'theirs'" (54). With reference to Said, geographer Simon Dalby calls "[t]he exclusion of the Other and the inclusion, incorporation and administration of the Same [...] the essential geopolitical moment" (418). Every temporal identity construction is based on references to something external and thereby the distinction from others (Laclau 32). Dalby makes an important point here. But one should add that not all geopolitical considerations are about the formation of enemy images, which are based on a geographical distinction between "our land" and an alleged barbarian land as representation for the self and the other as described by Said. Sometimes scholars have to investigate constructions that are shaped by more differentiations in the reference to other spaces and places. Be it in a more or less differentiated or complex form, it is about attaining a better idea of what the German historian Jürgen Osterhammel calls "concepts of world order," which is an expression he uses to refer to "perceptions of relatively stable relations of collectives – nations, states, religious communities, civilizations, etc. – among each other" (410).

Yet geopolitics is not limited to dealing with such large scale entities. It can also be applied to more local phenomena like, for example, urban spaces. In this regard it is also worth investigating in how far the perception and construction of urban spaces works along the same lines as the ones of nations or continents. In research on urban spaces (Huysen 2008; for Latin America: Huffschiemied and Wildner 2013), people's images in particular of the urban space in which they live, work, and play are explored. In this regard, the anthropologist Nestor García Canclini has strongly influenced the usage of the term imaginary in urban research and investigated, for example, how people construct imaginaries while moving through cities and observing different urban districts (García Canclini 109-110).

Apart from this general description of critical geopolitics, it is important to mention two shifts propagated by it. The first shift is the one away from only analyzing state actors in official institutions to a broader view that also takes non-state actors and everyday situations into consideration (Dodds, Kuus, and Sharp 7). Scholarly work in the field of critical geopolitics aims at a comprehension of how particular understandings of place are constructed by political actors (practical geopolitics), strategic institutions (formal geopolitics) and mass media (popular geopolitics) (Ó Tuathail, "Thinking Critically" 8; Dodds 42).

The second shift propagated by critical geopolitics is the de-centering of geopolitical analysis, away from "the Global North as the seemingly natural vantage point" (Dodds, Kuus, and Sharp 8). As geographer John Agnew stresses, "[t]he dominant practices [...] constituting the modern geopolitical imagination have been overwhelmingly those of the political élites of the Great Powers" (9). Without denying the impact of these dominant practices, one should take into consideration that beyond these, there are many interpretations, subversions, and variations of them as well as completely different approaches in the so-called peripheries of the world.

By following some of the important ideas within the field of critical geopolitics (the construction of places and spaces in politics, the broadening of actors analyzed and incorporation of the Global South, here: in Latin America and in the Caribbean) and by combining it with the considerations made about the role of imaginaries in societies (giving people a sense of their existence, their relations to others, and the way this is embedded into a space and time), it is possible to bring the terms geopolitics and imaginaries together.

Against this backdrop, for us, studying geopolitical imaginaries means to analyze the way certain places and spaces are constructed, characterized, and embedded into views of the world. When considering imaginaries as lenses, that pool different images/perceptions of the world, we argue that it is important to understand how different imaginaries intersect and hybridize in order to also comprehend the evolution of imaginaries. These lenses that are always composed of limited, subjective interpretations, even if technical innovations (such as satellites and drone photography) seem to provide more objective images. This means

revealing the underlying political, social, economic, and cultural struggles of seemingly natural geographical assumptions. And perhaps most importantly, it means showing how collectives (or in some cases individuals) understand themselves in relation to others, and how their political decisions are influenced by assumptions about places and spaces.

## Further Research

In the research field on geopolitics and beyond there is much room and indeed need to expand the research both with regard to the definition of imaginaries and also with respect to their construction and application:

First, while a certain lack of clarity of the term “imaginary” derives from the broadness of the term in itself and also from its interdisciplinary evolution, it is also the different contexts in which imaginaries matter that make it necessary not only to understand imaginaries as instruments sharing the function to reduce complexity but also to recognize the different logics behind them. Social imaginaries, for instance, are understood by critical theorists as social constructions of the ‘other’ applied by political communities to distinguish between insiders, who are included, and outsiders, who are excluded, in communities ranging from the level of states, the international community to cultures and thereby manifest systems of exclusion. Historian Olaf Kaltmeier on the other hand points out that geopolitical imaginaries “allow us to understand the articulation of several spatial fragments into a broader concept of space and its representation” (171). Both, the social and geopolitical imaginary thus contribute to identity formations, however, are distinct in their purposes.

Second, although it has been touched upon by Appadurai, especially with regard to concepts like “imagined communities,” “images,” “the imaginal,” and “ideas,” the need to define the distinctions between these terms remains. This is important in order to better understand how, for example, images as visual (re)presentations become mental images, fantasies, and illusions—or, as Taylor points out, become imaginaries that constitute and are constituted by society and thereby create new forms of “imagined communities.” Chiara Bottici argues that in order to define the difference between the imaginal and the imaginary, it is also necessary to consider the increase in images that now mediate politics as well as how “democratization and mediatization brought about a deep revolution in the nature of politics itself” (1). This also leads to the need to better understand the relation of the imaginary with the symbolic and the “real” dimensions: Jacques Lacan, for instance, introduces this psychoanalytical viewpoint and puts emphasis on the organizational function of language, which “is organized in the symbolic order constituting the unconscious (...), by contrast the imaginary order

produces a unified image that is at the same time sustained and sabotaged by language” (Mountain 206).

Third, as some political geographers (Dodds 2014; Reuber et al. 2012) have outlined, geopolitical discourses in general and particularly imaginaries (e.g. about Russia) have increased significantly in political communication, media, and the public. Although the concept of critical geopolitics already provides a methodological approach to trace the interplay between popular, practical, and formal geopolitics in the discursive production and/or circulation of imaginaries, there is still a research gap with regard to the intentional and unintentional production and/or circulation of imaginaries in organizations and institutions and on their significance in local, national, or regional contexts.

Fourth, from a methodological point of view, it must be asked if discourse and frame analyses are sufficient to ascertain how imaginaries are constructed, or if other approaches, e.g. actor-network and agent-structure theories, help to better grasp how imaginaries circulate. While discourse analysis makes it possible to identify hegemonic patterns of interpretation and entangled discourses, frame analysis is often applied to organizational research and contributes to better understanding how issues are imported into organizations or social movements, and how institutional forces shape the framing of, for example, a policy debate (Creed et al. 35). If one follows Erving Goffman, who “presents framing as a day-to-day sense-making technique” on which individuals rely “to make sense of daily interactions, conventional rituals, discourse, advertising, and other elements of social experience” (36), the inclusion of Actor-Network Theory (cf. Michel Callon, John Low, Bruno Latour) and Agent-Structure theories (as developed by Georg Simmel, Norbert Elias, Talcott Parsons, Pierre Bourdieu, Anthony Giddens, and others) further help to shed light on actors coining imaginaries and may help to meet epistemological questions relating to processes and social mechanisms leading to the emergence and power of imaginaries.

In sum, a methodological framework is needed that assists in meeting the two principal challenges:

1. to define how imaginaries explicitly contribute to “othering” processes and
2. to identify the actors actively shaping them.

Finally, awareness must also be raised on the deliberate, functional use of “imaginaries” for example in political communication but also to the momentum they can gain on their own - a problem which was also addressed by Castoriadis which includes its own methodological challenge as it remains speculative whether an actor uses the imaginary on purpose as a steering-instrument or whether an actor is determined by an imaginary her or himself. Although Bottici offers a conceptual tool to overcome this dilemma in her theory of the

*imaginal*, she emphasizes the centrality of images “rather than the faculty or the context that produces them” (5). This third way between theories of imagination and theories of the imaginary again does not provide a possibility to observe and evince the strategic use of imaginaries by human beings.

### **Contributions to the Dossier**

After explaining the main ideas behind geopolitical imaginaries and our suggestions for further research we present, in this last part of the introduction, the four contributions to this dossier. These contributions represent four different ideas of approaching the topic of geopolitical imaginaries.

The dossier starts with an article about revolutionary imaginaries in Latin America by Eric Selbin (Southwestern University), in which he asks a fundamental question for the studies of imaginaries: What do people desire, what do they consider possible, and what impossible? Selbin proposes to understand imaginaries as "socially, collectively constructed through symbols, songs, tales, rituals, dates, places, memory/ies and more, and enforced and circulated through stories, through which [...] we manage the world, our world" (20). Selbin examines how imaginaries circulate and takes us on a journey through twentieth-century Latin America, drawing on examples from Mexico and Cuba to illustrate that places and spaces, like jungles or mountains, were of fundamental importance for the way revolutions and attempts at revolution were imagined. These places and spaces helped to subvert the canonical meaning attached to certain cities, countries, and even the Americas as whole. Selbin further points to the significance of human agency and thereby provides a link between imaginaries and the concept of narratives.

Angelika Epple and Kirsten Kramer (Bielefeld University) also emphasize the importance of space in the understanding of geopolitical imaginaries in their article. They offer an analytical reconceptualization of geopolitical imaginaries using Appadurai’s approach to the term “imagination” and different forms of image production or reception in the current experience of globalization. According to the authors, Appadurai’s understanding of “imagination” results from the intricate interplay of three elements: “images,” “the imagined,” and “the imaginary.” On an analytical level, these three elements point to three dimensions that are pivotal to any consideration about geopolitical imaginaries: the material, the creative, and the social dimensions. In order to develop their argumentations more clearly, they present a brief case study based on the comparison of the different book covers for the two versions of Christopher Bayly’s study on globalization: *The Birth of the Modern World* and *El nacimiento del mundo moderno*, published respectively for an English and a Spanish-speaking audience. Both book covers consist of an *image* that is the mechanical reproduction of a

painting. Each one reflects the historical rise of specific *imagined* spaces closely related to the French Revolution and the emergence of asymmetrical race and gender relations characteristic of the globalized world in Modernity. Finally, the paintings also relate specific *ideoscapes* that epitomize central political ideas associated with the French Nation and the imagination of the modern world as a whole to the aesthetic and visual model of the *imaginary* landscape. Following these argumentations and the examples of the book covers, the authors conclude that geopolitical imaginaries can be an object of investigation and a key analytical tool for cultural and historical studies because they can be understood as culturally and historically situated, socially constructed, and powerful answers to the intertwined globalizing processes of de- and reterritorialization.

Nicolás Damin, Dario Dawyd and Joaquín Aldao (Consejo Nacional de Investigaciones Científicas y Técnicas) also provide a journey through the twentieth century, although with a more distinct focus than Eric Selbin. These authors broach the issue of geopolitical imaginaries of the most important Argentine trade union confederation, the *Confederación General del Trabajo* (CGT), in three different periods: from 1900 until 1945, where different ideological views – socialist reformism, communism, syndicalism – were competing among workers and within the committees; from 1945 until 1955 when Juan Domingo Perón made a huge impact on the country and changed the working world completely; and from 1945 until 1990 when disputes about the attitude of trade unions during the Cold War era took place. This article does not follow the illusionary separation between national and international politics and clearly shows how global geopolitical conflicts were reflected in Argentine trade unionism, and maybe even more importantly, how trade unions were involved in the creation of new geopolitical imaginaries.

Klaus Weinhauer (Bielefeld University) examines a related topic by applying a comparative approach to imaginaries of urban threat as they emerged among elites in both the United States and Argentina during the 1960/70s. By putting these imaginaries in their historical context he argues that in both countries the imaginaries of urban threat shared certain similarities but, in some aspects, also were distinct. In both countries, the elites feared urban crowds, which in the US was strongly influenced by imaginaries from the Vietnam War like the “urban jungle” and the “sniper narrative.” But while the threat was imagined as racial and local in the US, certain Argentinian elites perceived it as a danger for the “divine order” of society as a whole. It was the very broad and blurry imaginary of “subversion,” denounced as a social and cultural thread, against which the Argentinian junta mobilized its murderous oppression.

All four contributions show the enormous importance geopolitical imaginaries can have in very different contexts: revolutions, writing history, trade unionism, and urban conflicts.

These are only four different topics, but there is much more to be explored. By proposing the

use geopolitical imaginaries as a scientific lens we hope to encourage more research which will pick up on the concepts presented in this dossier.

## Works Cited

- Agnew, John A. *Geopolitics. Re-visioning world politics*. London, New York: Routledge, 2003. Print.
- Anderson, Benedict. *Imagined Communities. Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. London: Verso, 2006[1983]. Print.
- Appadurai, Arjun. *Modernity at Large. Cultural Dimensions of Globalization*. Minneapolis: U of MP, 2003 [1996]. Print.
- Bottici, Chiara. *Imaginal Politics. Images Beyond Imagination and the Imaginary*. New York: Colombia UP, 2014. Print.
- Castoriadis, Cornelius. *The Imaginary Institution of Society*. Massachusetts: MIT Press, 1998[1975]. Print.
- Conrad, Sebastian and Shalini Randeria. "Einleitung. Geteilte Geschichten – Europa in einer postkolonialen Welt." Ed. Sebastian Conrad and Shalini Randeria. *Jenseits des Eurozentrismus. Postkoloniale Perspektiven in den Geschichts- und Kulturwissenschaften*. Frankfurt/ New York: Campus, 2002. 9–49. Print.
- Crampton, Jeremy W. "Maps as Social Constructions: Power, Communication and Visualization." *Progress in Human Geography* 25.2 (2001): 235–252. Print.
- Creed, W. E. Douglas, Jeffrey A. Langstraat, and Maureen A. Scully. "A Picture of the Frame: Frame Analysis as Technique and as Politics." *Organizational Research Methods* 5.1 (2002): 34–55. Print.
- Dalby, Simon. "Geopolitical Discourse. The Soviet Union as Other." *Alternatives: Global, Local, Political* 13.4 (1988): 415–442. Print.
- Dodds, Klaus, Merje Kuus, and Joanne Sharp. "Introduction: Critical Geopolitics and its Critics." Ed. Klaus Dodds, Merje Kuus, and Joanne Sharp. *The Ashgate Research Companion to Critical Geopolitics*. Farnham: Ashgate, 2013. 1–14. Print.
- Dodds, Klaus. *Geopolitics: A Very Short Introduction*. Oxford: OUP, 2014. Print.
- Friera, Claudia. "La Pluma y la Voz de América Latina." *Página/12*. N.d. Web. 14 Apr 2015.
- Galeano, Eduardo. *Upside Down. A Primer for the Looking-Glass World*. New York: Picador USA, 2000 [1998], Print.
- García Canclini, Néstor. *Imaginarios urbanos*, Buenos Aires: EUDEBA, 1997. Print.
- Hufschmid, Anne and Kathrin Wildner. "Das Urbane als Forschungsfeld. Öffentlichkeit, Territorien, Imaginarios." Ed. Anne Hufschmid and Kathrin Wildner. *Stadtforschung aus Lateinamerika. Neue urbane Szenarien: Öffentlichkeit – Territorialität – Imaginarios*. Bielefeld: transcript, 2013. 9-28. Print.
- Huysen, Andreas (Ed.). *Other Cities, Other Worlds. Urban Imaginaries in a Globalizing Age*. Durham, London: Duke UP, 2008. Print.

- Kaltmeier, Olaf. "Inter-American Perspectives for the Rethinking of Area Studies." *forum for inter-american research* 7.3 (Dec 2014): 171-182. Web.
- Kassa, Ashifa and Sam Jones. "Eduardo Galeano, Leading Voice of Latin American Left, Dies Aged 74." *The Guardian*. 13 Apr 2015. Web. 19 Apr 2016.
- Laclau, Ernesto. *New Reflections on the Revolution of our Time*. London: Verso, 1990. Print.
- Mignolo, Walter. *Local Histories, Global Designs. Coloniality, Subaltern Knowledges, and Border Thinking*. Princeton: PUP, 2000. Print.
- Mountain, Ilana. "Some Questions around Social Imaginary and Discourse Analysis for Critical Research." *Annual Review of Critical Psychology* 7 (2009): 205 – 222. Print.
- Osterhammel, Jürgen. "Weltordnungskonzepte." *Dimensionen internationaler Geschichte*. Ed. Jost Dülffer. München: Oldenbourg, 2012. 409–427. Print.
- Ó Tuathail, Gearóid. *Critical Geopolitics. The Politics of Writing Global Space*. Minneapolis: U of Minnesota P, 1996. Print.
- . "Thinking Critically about Geopolitics." Ed. Gearóid Ó Tuathail, Simon Dalby, and Paul Routledge. *The Geopolitics Reader*. New York: Routledge, 2006: 1–14. Print.
- Reuber, Paul, Anke Strüver, and Günter Wolkersdorfer. *Politische Geographien Europas – Annäherungen an ein umstrittenes Konzept*. Berlin: Lit Verlag, 2012. Print.
- Said, Edward. *Orientalism*. London: Penguin Books, 2003 [1978]. Print.
- Taylor, Charles. *Modern Social Imaginaries*. Durham: Duke UP, 2004. Print.

**Suggested Citation:**

Buitrago, C., Petersen, M., Tyrell, P.-M., Wehrmann, D. "Introduction: (Geo-) Political Imaginaries in the Americas." *forum for interamerican research* 9.1 (May 2016): 4-18. Available at <[www.interamerica.de](http://www.interamerica.de)>