

UC Santa Barbara

Journal of Transnational American Studies

Title

Archipelagic American Studies and the Caribbean

Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/52f2966r>

Journal

Journal of Transnational American Studies, 5(1)

Authors

Roberts, Brian Russell
Stephens, Michelle

Publication Date

2013

DOI

10.5070/T851019711

Copyright Information

Copyright 2013 by the author(s). All rights reserved unless otherwise indicated. Contact the author(s) for any necessary permissions. Learn more at <https://escholarship.org/terms>

Peer reviewed

SPECIAL FORUM

Archipelagic American Studies and the Caribbean

BRIAN RUSSELL ROBERTS AND MICHELLE STEPHENS

During the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, a white American preacher and an African American scholar arrived at converging prophecies regarding the racialized colonial and postcolonial trends that would characterize planetary relations during the coming decades. In 1885, Josiah Strong (of the Evangelical Alliance for the United States) predicted that “the world [will] enter upon a new stage of its history—the *final competition of races, for which the Anglo-Saxon is being schooled.*” “Strengthened in the United States,” averred Strong, “this powerful race will move down upon Central and South America, out upon the islands of the sea, over upon Africa and beyond.”¹ Less than two decades after Strong advanced this prediction, W. E. B. Du Bois advanced a geographically similar vision of racial conflict in his 1903 *The Souls of Black Folk*. Prefacing a discussion of the US Civil War and Reconstruction, Du Bois famously wrote, “The problem of the twentieth century is the problem of the color-line—the relation of the darker to the lighter races of men in Asia and Africa, in America and the islands of the sea.”² The two men’s visions were clearly antithetical in terms of their racial and imperial politics. Strong focused on the extension of one race’s influence over others, while Du Bois focused on relations between the races, in the context of but also above and beyond mere imperial might. In other writings, Du Bois would suggest that, similar to colonies in relation to the European empires, those territories in which the United States was pursuing colonial expansion could also prove to be intractable shadows, difficult to administer and control.³ Regardless of these differences, Du Bois and Strong converged in their conceptualizations of the twentieth century’s major actors and the planetary geographies upon which these actors would perform. Their visions adumbrated events that would transpire within

several continental regions, but these prophecies also predicted major conflicts within a non-continental and non-regional space, “the islands of the sea,” a transregional archipelago constituted by all the islands splayed across the world’s seas and oceans.

Du Bois and Strong’s prophecies proved generally accurate in predicting that the twentieth century would be characterized by racial and postcolonial conflict. Both were observing the late nineteenth century developments that evolved from what Shu-mei Shih calls the “colonial turn,” or “the globalization of racial thinking and racism” that began “with the dawn of Western colonialism in the late fifteenth century.”⁴ Looking back from the 1970s, Michel Foucault characterized this development in political terms reminiscent of Strong as the onset of “race war.”⁵ And Walter Mignolo describes this racialized geopolitical complex in epistemological terms as generating a “colonial difference” from within modernity, one that produces competing forms of knowledge from the division of the world into spaces, “where [the] coloniality of power is enacted” while “the restitution of subaltern knowledge is taking place.”⁶ Du Bois’s and Strong’s comments draw on—and presage further developments in—the history of colonial modernity in mapping the state of imperialism and the race war at the turn of the century.

The planetary geographies of their commentaries are also prophetic in relation to the contemporary critical move of examining US imperialism that Donald Pease describes as central to a “post-exceptionalist American studies.”⁷ Arising over the course of the past two decades, and functioning to undercut the American exceptionalism of Cold War American Studies, post-exceptionalist American Studies has turned our focus toward “US imperialism and US global interdependencies,” that is, toward the US’s own global aspirations and designs.⁸ Such a focus has given rise to modes of post-exceptionalist American Studies ranging from the transnational to the post-national and from the hemispheric to the planetary.

The new American Studies’ focus on cultures of US imperialism has drawn intense critical attention to a number of islands within the transregional geography that Du Bois and Strong referred to as “the islands of the sea.” Indeed, the US Supreme Court’s Insular Cases, or the post-Spanish-American War cases that framed Puerto Rico as “foreign . . . in a domestic sense,”⁹ in many ways have emerged as paradigmatic of US imperialism, receiving recurrent consideration from scholars including Amy Kaplan, Priscilla Wald, Ramón Soto-Crespo, Nicole Waligora-Davis, and many others.¹⁰ Also foundational to post-exceptionalist American Studies have been scholarly treatments of other island-based US imperial outposts, including Hawai’i, Cuba, the Philippines, and Haiti.¹¹ Yet even as the new American Studies has offered crucial insights regarding the cultural geographies that frequently take island-space as a stage, post-exceptionalist American Studies has been less attentive to the materiality of the island-as-stage, and to the formal topographical assumptions through which islands have been historically and critically engaged.

A view of this inattention to the materialities and formal structures of island-space emerges pronouncedly in a brief survey of post-exceptionalist methodological discussions that rely on the negative valences of the trope of insularity, seen as the defining geoformal feature of the island. When the thawing of the Cold War mitigated the geopolitical utility of American Studies' tradition of exceptionalist scholarship, Giles Gunn, in his *The Culture of Criticism and the Criticism of Culture* (1987), critiqued earlier American Studies scholars by observing that much work in American Studies had been "susceptible . . . to intellectual and international insularity."¹² As post-exceptionalist American Studies then cohered, Amy Kaplan's award-winning 1998 essay "Manifest Domesticity" argued against "the insularity of an American studies that imagines the nation as . . . fixed . . . and self-enclosed."¹³ Two years later, the nine contributors to the influential volume *Post-Nationalist American Studies* amplified post-exceptionalism's anti-insularity with an introduction advocating "internationalist" projects in opposition to an old "American Studies that is . . . insular and parochial."¹⁴ More recently, in the 2008 collection *Hemispheric American Studies*, Anna Brickhouse valorized the construction of a "complex hemispheric history" in opposition to "insular and nationalist" accounts.¹⁵ And in 2011, within a *New Literary History* special issue on "The State of American Studies," Winfried Fluck inadvertently announced the triumph of post-exceptionalist anti-insularity: "The good thing about transnational American studies is that it allows us to look at the United States no longer in an insular way but in terms of international embeddedness."¹⁶

For over two decades, prominent post-exceptionalist scholars have used the notion of insularity as a major marker of American Studies' earlier backwardness. Of course, these scholars, each of whom we admire, have only deployed the term *insular* according to what is a widely accepted usage, namely to describe a state of being "cut off from intercourse with other nations, isolated; self-contained; narrow or prejudiced in feelings, ideas, or manners."¹⁷ But it is important to trace and remark on the entrenched epistemic violence resulting from and perpetuated by a continentally oriented (neo)colonial modernity that has looked toward the island's defining geoformal attribute and ascribed to it this derogatory second meaning, which ineluctably links island-space (and by extension island peoples) to an anti-cosmopolitan mentality.

Through this double meaning, *insularity* becomes the index of a putatively backward geographical and mental space imagined in opposition to broad minds and broad geographies. *Insularity* is evoked as anathema to the continental minds of European philosophers and American Revolutionaries. *Insularity* is evoked as out of step with the planetary cosmopolitanism of those who have traveled broadly and thought through the magnitude of continents. Whereas cosmopolitan subjects "project worldliness, expansiveness, rational decision making, and orderly accumulation," they rarely share the same space as creole subjects, the latter tied indelibly to the insular and representing "a mode of belonging that connects one to a

history of coerced contact.”¹⁸ Hence, even as the new American Studies has turned attention toward islands situated in oceans ranging from the Atlantic to the Pacific and in seas ranging from the Mediterranean to the Caribbean, Americanist cultural-critical analyses remain incomplete to the degree that post-exceptionalist discourse perpetuates a relation to island-space that places a methodological and intellectual premium upon anti-insularity.

How did insularity or islandness emerge as a metaphor for that which is non-cosmopolitan? Françoise Lionnet finds this especially strange given the degree to which the islands of the Indian Ocean and the Caribbean Sea, for example, have been populated by “‘multiethnic, multireligious and multilingual communities’ whose cosmopolitan character was undeniable.”¹⁹ As she goes on to ask, “Whose lives count as cosmopolitan lives?” In a similar vein, and while strongly identifying with the ethics and practices of post-exceptionalist American Studies, we advocate for an undoing of post-exceptionalism’s anti-insularity. We argue instead for an anti-anti-insularity, but, like Paul Gilroy who arrived at anti-anti-essentialism in 1993 as a logical precondition for his critically generative Black Atlantic paradigm,²⁰ we take anti-anti-insularity not as an end in itself but rather as a precondition for what we are terming *archipelagic American Studies*. To see anti-anti-insularity as a precondition of an archipelagic American Studies is to recognize, first, that negative attitudes toward the insular have a history tied to colonialism and imperial nationalism, and second, that historicizing the insular will uncover other meanings and understandings of the shifting human experiences with island spaces.

On the one hand, much of anti-insular sentiment is the effect of a discourse with a fundamentally *continental* logic, pitting a continental and cosmopolitan universalism against more island-bound creole forms, and thereby rationalizing Euro-American domination of island spaces. Yet continental logic’s construction of island-space as quintessentially *bounded* also has evoked the island in terms particularly useful to imperial nationalism and the politics of sovereignty. As land masses whose most salient attribute lies precisely in their boundedness, islands have been key in utopian visions of national sovereignty. Thus, even as the island’s insularity has been enduringly framed in a negative way within traditions dedicated to rationalizing continental superiority and imperial expansion, the insularity of island spaces has nonetheless emerged as persistently useful to the project of imagining the self-enclosed national space. An archipelagic American Studies seeks to understand how the trope of the island functions as the pivot point of these two seemingly contradictory discourses. The island has operated as a metaphor for both the closed and bounded nature of the ideal state, as well as for the power of that state to extend itself across the boundaries of and into other territories.

Undoing the problematic stances toward islands that have been generated by continentally grounded logic and thought, the anti-anti-insularity for which we advocate reveals the ways in which the island itself has functioned as a replacement trope for the more dangerous possibilities inherent in the *relation between islands*

and various other land and sea forms. This is a form of the crucial difference between extension and relation shaping Strong's and Du Bois's varying understandings of the race war extending its color-line across a planetary geography. Tracing the construction of the island as a single unit reveals what is also hidden—that just as “no man is an island,” similarly, no island is simply an isolated island.²¹ Any island may be conceived of archipelagically, as part of a larger island chain or as a fragment broken off from continental landforms, with archipelagic connections traced across the water's surface or across the obscured spaces of underwater terrain. Archipelagic relationality and openness would be the most prominent feature of an island seen from this connected perspective, just as for Du Bois, imperialism and colonialism (and their global designs) provide merely the backdrop or frame for exploring the relations between “the darker [and] lighter races of men” among the continents and “islands of the sea.” The project of assessing archipelagic relationalities between and among islands resonates with what Shu-mei Shih describes as the relational approach in studies of comparative racialization that move globally across various local spaces: “Comparison between the colony and the metropole . . . is about relationality, not relativism. If racialization is inherently comparative, a psychosocial and historical process, then we are working against the meaning of comparison as the arbitrary juxtaposition of two terms in difference and similarity, replacing it with comparison as the recognition and activation of relations that entail two or more terms [bringing] submerged or displaced relationalities into view.”²² This view of comparative racialization is itself undergirded by the topographical structures of the insular and the archipelagic, as relationality here involves the implicit presence of islands—“displaced” from continents and bringing “submerged” terrain into view as spaces of dry land, which in turn activate unanticipated archipelagic relations among themselves.

Even as insular and archipelagic topography has found implicit use in theorizing race and relationality at the beginning of the twenty-first century, islands' inevitably archipelagic relationality has found more intense theorization among thinkers who have brought direct critical attention to island-space. Insular/archipelagic intellectual traditions have emanated from regions including Oceania, the Mediterranean, maritime Southeast Asia, the British Isles, and others, but here, within the “American Studies: Caribbean Edition” Special Forum of the *Journal of Transnational American Studies*, we bring specific focus to the ways in which the Caribbean and the field of Caribbean Studies insists upon a version of American Studies that sheds its post-exceptionalist anti-insularity, and in the process, emerges as transregional and archipelagic.

Meta-Archipelagic Relationality versus Continental Exceptionalism

Contributing to American Studies' role in what Martin W. Lewis and Kären Wigen have described as an interdisciplinary post-Cold War effort toward “the imagining of

new geographies . . . that encourage alternative ways of seeing the world” and its “emergent relationships,”²³ archipelagic American Studies is invested in tracing the interrelations of America (as a hemispheric space constellated by two continents and uncounted islands) and the broader planetary archipelago that Du Bois, Strong, and many others have conceived of as “the islands of the sea.” To a great extent, archipelagic American Studies draws upon the mode of cultural geography that has dominated the transnational turn as scholars have interrogated cultural contact zones, flows, and circuits in devising and contributing to several geocultural heuristics, including the cultures of US imperialism, the circum-Caribbean, the global South, Asia-Pacific, the American Mediterranean, Americanity, the Black Atlantic, the borderland, Empire, the hemisphere, and the planet, among others. Undoubtedly, the planetary archipelago is constituted by island spaces that intersect with—and may be usefully conceived through—all of these geocultural heuristics. And yet, if archipelagic space is ontologically “constituted by a repeating *insular form* whose recursions are discursively ordered in reference to national, racial, imperial, tectonic, or other heuristics,”²⁴ then a truly archipelagic American Studies will complement its debts to cultural geography with corresponding investments in understanding the specialness of islands and island groups as both geo-historical and geo-structural spaces.

In a move similar to the Oceans Connect project at Duke University that Lewis and Wigen describe, focusing in a more material way on the space of the island itself would mean interrogating what world culture has taken as the island’s defining geoformal and ecological feature, the status of being surrounded by water. Relatively recently, maritime-based inquiries have begun using water masses rather than land masses, or often the terraqueous rather than the strictly geo-territorial, as a starting point for interdisciplinary understandings of the regions of the world. In his defining work, *The Repeating Island* (1992, 1996), Antonio Benítez-Rojo hints at such an approach to the Caribbean, reminding us that the black Atlantic (and other Atlantic frameworks that have developed during the past two decades) might be seen as the children of the Caribbean Sea:

Let’s be realistic: the Atlantic is the Atlantic (with all its port cities) because it was once engendered by the copulation of Europe . . . with the Caribbean archipelago; the Atlantic is today the Atlantic . . . because Europe, in its mercantilist laboratory, . . . inseminat[ed] the Caribbean womb with the blood of Africa; the Atlantic is today the Atlantic (NATO, World Bank, New York Stock Exchange, European Economic Community, etc.) because it was the painfully delivered child of the Caribbean, whose vagina was stretched between continental clamps, between the *encomienda* of Indians and the slaveholding plantation,

between the servitude of the coolie and the discrimination toward the *criollo*.²⁵

Benítez-Rojo's graphic list demonstrates precisely the ways in which a body of water and the movements and exchanges it facilitates can generate (even brutally and violently) entire societies, cultures, histories, peoples, and political forms. His provocation leads him to define the Caribbean as a "meta-archipelago," in "having given birth . . . to an ocean of such universal prestige."²⁶ Flowing "outward past the limits of its own sea," Benítez-Rojo's Caribbean is a meta-archipelago not simply because it has given birth to the Atlantic, but because, with "neither boundary nor center," it overflows the Atlantic, with its far-flung islands ranging from the "shores of Gambia" to the "outskirts of Bombay," from "a Cantonese tavern" to "a barrio of Manhattan."²⁷ Apart from admiring his striking conceptualization of a planet-spanning chain of islands washed by the world ocean, we are inspired by Benítez-Rojo's addition of a prefix to the term *archipelago*, a linguistically denaturalizing move which in turn prompts us to recall that the term *archipelago* itself comprises rather surprising component parts and histories.

The English *archipelago* derives from the medieval Italian term *Arcipelago*, with *Arci-* meaning chief or principal and *pélago* signifying sea, pool, or gulf. Indeed, *Arcipelago* was originally the name of the Greek world's principal or chief sea, the island-studded Aegean, before the term emerged as a metaphor for the islands scattered throughout that and any other sea.²⁸ In the context of this layering of meanings, to say that the island is always part of an archipelago is to say, almost tautologically, that an island is always part of, surrounded by, connected to, a larger sea. For us, the term *archipelago* retains reference to this shifting history and concomitantly uncertain ontological status: Is the archipelago the sea, or is it the islands of the sea? This liminal and terraqueous mode of existence is produced by a history of being betwixt and between land and water, at one moment existing as water (studded with islands), and at the next moment existing as islands (surrounded by water). Hence, an archipelagic American Studies would hold in productive tension the insights produced by such nascent and newly emerging fields as island studies and ocean studies.²⁹

An American Studies that is archipelagic in orientation brings this terraqueous perspective to bear on current efforts to rethink area studies according to more cross-cultural and interregional frameworks. Orchestrated after the Second World War to create universities that could enhance the US state's power-knowledge during the Cold War,³⁰ US-based area studies have examined culturally defined territorial designations within which populations share similar traits—e.g., language, religion, custom, or world-view.³¹ Even more significantly, the cultural geography of area studies is organized according to a visible logic of continental thinking—an "underconceptualized mélange of continental and subcontinental divisions" that is itself a legacy of colonial thinking.³² In early modernity, one epistemic global design,

“the threefold global division of the ancient Greek geographers, distinguishing Europe, Asia, and Africa,” became, after the European voyages of discovery, the “seven-continent model” of another type of global design, which remained hegemonic until World War II.³³ It is precisely this division of the world into “large, quasi-continental regions” that ocean studies aims to correct by reframing “area studies around ocean and sea basins” and by using “maritime interactions [to bring] to light a set of historical regions that have largely remained invisible on the conventional map of the world.”³⁴ What amounts, literally, to a new kind of mapping in social scientific terms also points to the need for a new kind of cognitive mapping in more humanistic terms, that is, the interrogation of the continental logic and discourse that generates an anti-insular bias in the first place. Such an interrogation and deconstruction reveals some very particular features of continental, anti-insular discourse vis-à-vis American Studies.

Predating and undergirding the emergence of American Studies, the notion of continental primacy has had a long-running history in American thought. As historian James D. Drake has convincingly illustrated, North American colonists and US citizens of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries developed a sense that their entitlement to national sovereignty was a logical corollary of North America’s continental vastness, which was putatively superior to the insular smallness of England and the islands of the British Caribbean.³⁵ North Americans’ pro-continental and anti-insular stance is well emblemized in Thomas Paine’s famous pamphlet *Common Sense* (1776). Paine implicitly pointed toward England’s island possessions when he conceded that “[s]mall islands not capable of protecting themselves, are the proper objects for kingdoms to take under their care,” but against insular England’s rule of continental America, he argued that “there is something very absurd, in supposing a continent to be perpetually governed by an island.”³⁶ This early mode of continental exceptionalism pre-scripted and made manifest a future in which the United States’ frontier and territory were destined to extend from the Atlantic to the Pacific.³⁷ Subsequent to this expansion across the continent, and in the wake of historian Frederick Jackson Turner’s famous 1893 declaration that the frontier was “gone,”³⁸ a continuing sense of continental exceptionalism certainly underwrote the US’s late nineteenth-century investments in taking under its care what it framed as numerous small islands of the Caribbean and Pacific that were not capable of protecting themselves. In the American context, a long-running formal distinction between small islands and the large continent has framed the continent as the massive and natural source of the US’s drive toward hemispheric and planetary dominance, which in turn has played a role in producing what Lionnet presents as insularity’s persistent cultural yoking with “slavery . . . [and] imposed immobility.”³⁹

In the realm of American Studies, the continent’s geopolitical primacy has functioned as an epistemological primacy that has persisted across (to borrow a term from Gene Wise) several “paradigm dramas” of Americanist scholarship.⁴⁰ The continent’s vastness has offered an epistemological grounding to Americanists

ranging from the early twentieth century to the early twenty-first century. In 1900, Harvard English professor Barrett Wendell published *A Literary History of America*, which looked to the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries and depicted the “insular English race”—whose language, traditions, and character “had been developed” on an “island”—as geographically incongruous in relation to the project of “impos[ing] its image” on either India or North America, “the greatest continents of both hemispheres.”⁴¹ At Harvard, Wendell taught Vernon Louis Parrington,⁴² whose furious composition of *Main Currents in American Thought* (1927) has been seen as an elemental paradigm of American Studies.⁴³ In *Main Currents*, Parrington looks to the colonial era and represents an English “colonial mind,” whose initial years in America were “rude and drab in their insularity.” Yet, according to Parrington, this insularity subsided as “the older English stock” amalgamated with “other races” and developed a “new psychology” created by “virgin wilderness,” “wide spaces,” and “diffused landholding.”⁴⁴ As the early, pre-institutionalized years of American Studies waned and the era of Cold War American Studies came into its own, major Americanist voices found myths and symbols in the putatively virgin wilderness and wide garden spaces offered by a continent that had been imagined specifically in opposition to island-space. Classically, Henry Nash Smith’s 1950 *Virgin Land* and Leo Marx’s 1964 *The Machine in the Garden* centered on the “power of the continent” and America as “the raw continent.”⁴⁵

Over the past two decades, post-exceptionalist Americanists have expressed their dissatisfaction with continentally-oriented scholarship in the vein of Smith and Marx by describing this mode of scholarship as *insular*—as never broad enough, never arriving at geographies of adequate vastness. Yet, the post-exceptionalist reliance on *insularity*’s negative valences may speak to the ways in which the continent (over and against the island) continues as a fetishized geographical object in spite of the field’s transnationalization. Even heuristics looking beyond the hemisphere exhibit a similar continental grounding. Since 2006, Wai Chee Dimock’s illuminating monograph *Through Other Continents* has offered a planetary model for the study of American literature. Notably, Dimock’s title advocates a model routed through the globe’s continental spaces.⁴⁶ Might it be that other continents have emerged as the guiding topographical heuristic because these continents seemingly constitute massive supplements to a North American landmass that once seemed sublime in its magnitude but now (due to new travel and communication technologies) seems too insular, too much like a small island?

One genealogy of post-exceptionalism’s anti-insularity and concomitant drive toward thinking through other continents lies in a historically sedimented sense that England and other island spaces have been narrow and insular while America has been vast and continental. To return to Paine’s words, North Americans (and by extension American Studies scholars from the early twentieth to the early twenty-first centuries) have felt the call to know geographies of a “larger scale”—geographies giving rise to “continental minds”⁴⁷ that will not brook the restraint of

the narrowness produced by “the extent of England”: “the narrow limits of three hundred and sixty miles.”⁴⁸ Even as it has found a prominent place within American Studies, this predisposition extends beyond the Anglophone world to reflect a broader sensibility influenced by coloniality’s global vision and design. As much as one may conceive of the hemispheric frame of the Americas as a “malleable notion” that represents “shifting borders and diverse conceptualizations of region and hemisphere,”⁴⁹ both American Studies and Latin American Studies rely for their sense of the geographic imaginary of “our America” upon continental land spaces, the North, Central, and South Americas of the New World.⁵⁰ The classic example here would be hemispheric American Studies and Latin American Studies’ marked intellectual debts to Du Bois and Strong’s contemporary, José Martí, whose vision of “Our America,” published from Mexico City in 1892, relies on a pronouncedly continental imaginary in framing an explicit counter-vision to Strong’s prophecy of North American imperialism.

Like Strong, but from the perspective of those Central and South American nations at the front line of the United States’ “move down” the continent, Martí used “Our America” to warn Latin America of the “formidable neighbor” to the North who, “out of ignorance . . . may perhaps begin to covet her.”⁵¹ In spite of this danger, North America, the “continent’s light-skinned nation,” was necessary for the “union of the continental soul.”⁵² Martí hoped for a unified continent beyond the color-lines of race: “There is no racial hatred, because there are no races. . . . The universal identity of man leaps forth in victorious love. . . . The soul, equal and eternal, emanates from bodies that are diverse in form and color.”⁵³ And yet, in spite of Martí’s continental rhapsodizing, and in a nod to his own Cuban patriotism, his continental vision of our America retains an insular remainder. Using a phrase congruent with that used by Du Bois and Strong, Martí’s “Our America” concludes with the following vision: “From the Rio bravo to the Straits of Magellan, the Great Cemi, seated on a condor’s back, has scattered the seeds of the new America across the romantic nations of the continent and the suffering islands of the sea!”⁵⁴ Intriguingly, it is the Cemi, a spirit worshipped by the Taino of the Caribbean,⁵⁵ which has sown the seeds of the unified American continent and has, during its flight on the condor’s back, integrated the islands into Martí’s continental vision.

The Island(s) of the Sea and the Insular State

Writing over a century ago, Du Bois, Strong, and Martí clearly felt that the borders of the continental United States were too narrow to contain their respective planetary, imperialist, and hemispheric visions of the coming century. Even as they pointed toward continents, they each in their own way retained a sense of archipelagoes as having world-historical significance not only in the past but also in the future. Of course, when they deployed the phrase “the islands of the sea,” Du Bois, Strong, and Martí were not necessarily offering a dazzling new model for conceiving of all islands

of the global ocean as interlinked and part of the same chain. Rather, they were trading in what bordered on a geographical cliché. Over the course of centuries, the phrase “the islands of the sea” had attained wide circulation and currency, appearing repeatedly for example in several English translations of the Bible, ranging from John Wycliffe’s 1384 translation (“the islis of the se”), to the 1587 Geneva Bible (“the yles of the sea”), to the 1611 King James Bible (“the ylands of the Sea”), to Noah Webster’s 1833 King James Revision (“the isles of the sea”). These English translations framed “the islands of the sea” as a site of Jewish diaspora and consequently, for Christians, a site of potential missionary work.⁵⁶ Within this geographical model, which disseminated itself far beyond the arenas of Jewish diaspora and Christian missionary work, “the islands of the sea” were conceived of as archipelagic, discursively linked by means of a phrase that highlighted their geostructural similarity to—and perhaps interchangeability with—one another.

Nevertheless, in competition and tension with an archipelagic view of insularity, insularity has also found framing in terms of singularity and nationalism. The publication of Thomas More’s *Utopia* (1516) and Francis Bacon’s *New Atlantis* (1624) marked an important tradition in European conceptualizations of island-space. Within this tradition, the island exists not as part of a geographic collectivity but rather as a single unit. As Antoine Hatzenberger describes, within More’s *Utopia* and Bacon’s *New Atlantis* the individual island becomes a metaphor for utopia, and this vision of insular utopia evinces some strikingly state-like and empire-like features. Thought of as an island, “Utopia is an isolated territory defined primarily by its boundaries, and delimited by them.”⁵⁷ More’s *Utopia* was an enclosed space, heavily fortified against intrusion, rejecting “everything that could arrive from outside the frontiers.”⁵⁸ Yet in seeming self-contradiction, More’s *Utopia* also included measures for special types of movement beyond its boundaries, in particular, colonization efforts.⁵⁹ This paradox leads Hatzenberger to conclude: “the relationship of Utopia with its outside is not symmetrical. . . . Although Utopians want their frontiers to be fully hermetic to any foreign influence, they take care to keep them porous to their own power upon the other nations.”⁶⁰ A nation that can extend its own internal frontiers and expand according to a continental logic is like an extended island, and an island that can extend itself beyond its boundaries, an island that “moves down upon” the rest of the world, is like an empire. Existing in tension with the celebration of continental scale, then, is the competing ideal of an insular utopia that, like the British empire or the American empire, could be both bounded and closed to outside influence, but also extendable and able to influence others.

Taking up the issue of how physical geography lends itself to perceptions and conceptualizations of the nation-state, Philip E. Steinberg has also recently discussed the ways in which Renaissance-era cartographic representations of islands—as locales bounded by the putatively natural borders of their shorelines—offered a representational grammar for the emergence of European imaginations of the territorialized nation-state as a “unified, bounded, homogeneous and naturally

occurring entity.”⁶¹ The cartographic genealogy that exists between islands and territorial states—a genealogy in which cartographically represented islands preconditioned a notion of the world that “consisted of unique but equivalent units, with distinct insides and outsides”⁶²—points to the overdetermined quality of post-exceptionalist American Studies’ reliance on the term *insular* to describe Cold War assessments of the United States. Ineluctably, post-exceptionalist scholars’ reliance on insularity’s negative valences draws upon the colonially generated image of the island as a backward, non-sovereign space needing protection (read, domination) by a kingdom or a continent. Yet the post-exceptionalist deployment of the term *insular* also resonates with Steinberg’s genealogy of the island *qua* nation-state—post-exceptionalism’s anti-insularity constitutes a critique of one of the nation-state’s defining features, as a unified, bounded, homogeneous, naturally occurring, and above all sovereign territory, naturalized by homology to the seemingly obvious topographical features of islands.

If the solitary island has been a model for the nation-state, and if conceiving of the nation-state *qua* island has given rise to a theoretical (if seldom practical) view of nations as unique but equivalent units, then the nation-states of the earth might be thought of as hanging together archipelagically, in the image of what Du Bois, Strong, and Martí—together with biblical translators and others—described as “the islands of the sea.” Still, despite his own continental focus, even Martí recognized that the vision of a singular identity for each individual island and nation of the Americas was vulnerable to the power of the northern giant with imperial ambitions. Evoking the idyllic isle of Shakespeare’s *The Tempest*, Martí’s vision of archipelagic relationality focuses instead on unification across boundaries as a political strength, the islands uniting like the trees of a shoreline in the face of tempestuous winds: “We can no longer be a nation of fluttering leaves, spending our lives in the air, our treetop crowned in flowers, humming or creaking, caressed by the caprices of sunlight or trashed and felled by tempests. The trees must form rank to block the seven-league giant!”⁶³ Like Benítez-Rojo’s *meta-archipelago*—ultimately constituted by island spaces ranging from Samoa to the British Isles, from the Malay Archipelago to the Caribbean, and from the Greek archipelago to Hawai‘i⁶⁴—what Martí suggests here is a vision that *contrasts* the archipelago with the island. In other words, the island is not merely part of an archipelago; discursively, the archipelago may be the very antithesis of the island as the figure for the bounded, territorial, insular state.

One version of globalization, then, may signify as merely the culmination of the extension of a national logic of sovereignty, with continental scope, over multiple global territories in both the New and Old Worlds. Lionnet understands creolization not only as a fundamentally archipelagic formation and process, but also as the antithesis of a logic of the “One” operating politically both in the United States and France.⁶⁵ As she explores this discourse of the “One,” Lionnet sees the reappearance once again of a continental logic tied to a certain vision of sovereignty: “the ‘one’ is analogous to a continental landmass with well-defined borders and territorial waters

to keep out undesirables and intruders, a model that is acquiring greater literal meaning in the early twenty-first century with the building of walls in the Middle East or on the United States-Mexico border.”⁶⁶ Lionnet finds the counter-vision for this “continental juridical model of the nation-state” (linked here to the image of insular sovereignty), in a very different relationship to island-space as imagined “by the Philippines and Indonesia, after the African-Asian Bandung Conference of 1955, when they declared themselves archipelagic nations.” Mohamed Munavvar has also described this Bandung vision as “the *philosophical* outlook of archipelagic states” that incorporates, but also goes beyond, juridical discourse and political theory.⁶⁷

The “archipelago principle” appeared simultaneously in the 1950s in the Caribbean, when figures such as C. L. R. James looked toward emerging political and economic alliances among the states that would later constitute the European Union—movements toward “continentalization” as he described it then—and offered a counter-vision of a West Indian Federation for the Anglophone Caribbean.⁶⁸ Referring back to the ancient archipelagic template of the Greek city-states, James saw the islands as exemplifying a very different vision of sovereignty than that imagined in the trope of the insular isle. James now saw the small size of islands as an asset, promoting the free flow of goods, people, and information across territorial shorelines and political boundaries, this ease of movement also facilitating the model of a common people’s democracy.⁶⁹ Benítez-Rojo offers an updated model of James’s vision in coining the term *meta-archipelago* as a specific description for the Caribbean, describing the ways in which the Caribbean’s cultures have integrated and spread throughout the planet’s myriad cultural traditions, evoking a relationality, openness and multi-directionality that the Martinican writer Édouard Glissant compares to Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari’s rhizome.⁷⁰ Drawing and expanding upon Benítez-Rojo’s attentiveness to the ways in which archipelagic space may be configured and radically reconfigured according to human perceptions, we want to frame the wider planetary archipelago (that is, the world’s islands of the sea) in a truly decentered and unbounded, meta-archipelagic vision that contrasts with both the continent and the insular state. Closer to home, this model conceives of the American hemisphere itself as, paradoxically, an island-system as much as a continental system of states.

Landmasses traditionally conceived of as continents may be reframed as islands that are constituent parts, rather than continental administrators, of the global meta-archipelago. During the 1990s, Glissant asserted that “the whole world is becoming archipelagized and creolized.”⁷¹ In making this assertion regarding late twentieth-century trends in globalization, Glissant offered a Caribbean geographical imagination consistent with that of Barbadian intellectual George Lamming. In 1960, Lamming observed US involvements in the Caribbean and remarked, “America is very much with us now; from Puerto Rico right down to Trinidad. But America is one island only; and we are used to living with many islands.” Lamming explained, “[f]rom the very beginning we were part of the island of China, and the island of

Africa and the island of India.”⁷² Here, Lamming and Glissant undercut the difference between island and continent and thereby undercut continentally exceptionalist assumptions about insularity. They also ask us to think about continents as islands, or as parts of island systems. This is what is striking about the circum-Caribbean focus of such works as Matthew Guterl’s *American Mediterranean*, Christopher Iannini’s *Fatal Revolutions*, and Sean X. Goudie’s *Creole America*.⁷³ By taking the Caribbean basin as their starting point, turning Martí’s and Lamming’s North American neighbor into a unit not simply in a world-system but in an island-system of power relations and commercial exchanges that Goudie calls a “creole complex,”⁷⁴ the Caribbean basin offers a geoformal starting point for organizing the relations between different American and Caribbean territorial entities as they have negotiated each other’s presence and influence across hemispheric space.

In the 1950s, C. L. R. James used the model of “continentalization,” or the geopolitical linking of different nations within a continent, to describe intra-continental alliances as contingent cultural processes rather than self-evident and natural political arrangements, and to suggest that the Caribbean islands could formalize their own archipelagic, geographic form into a political federation. As his vision made clear, reverting back to those archaic city-states and islands of the Aegean Sea, James was thinking littorally, of the forms of connectivity between islands and crossing shorelines that, in his Caribbean vision, were inherently a part—and perhaps constitutive—of the insular. The archipelago, in opposition to anti-insular thought, offers a vision of bridged spaces rather than closed territorial boundaries. In the work of all three Caribbeanists—Lamming, Glissant, and James—insularity emerges not as parochial, fixed, self-enclosed, disembedded, or inferior but as a crucial component of a terraqueous planet whose land- and water-spaces may only be connected by way of a fundamentally archipelagic logic, a logic within which intermittent locales assume spatial forms that may be ordered in reference to racial, imperial, tectonic, or other cultural heuristics. Within the economy of this Caribbean spatial imaginary, the interlinking of island- and continent-spaces into a common planetary meta-archipelago asserts the parity of land-spaces regardless of magnitude. This view involves, to return to Glissant, “insularity as [not] a mode of isolation” or “spatial neurosis” but as constitutive of a world in which “each island is an opening. . . . The Antillean imaginary frees us from suffocation.”⁷⁵ Within a planetary meta-archipelago imagined along these lines, St. Lucia may be an opening to China, while China may be an opening to Easter Island, while Easter Island may be an opening to continental Europe, which may in turn be an opening to Hispaniola, which may then be an opening to North and South America. Of course, insular openings may exist between and among all nodes within the global archipelago. The island becomes a rim opening onto the ocean, in a rhythm and tension between movement and settlement, plantation colony and ship, land and sea.

Making recourse to this Caribbean imaginary becomes especially crucial because even among scholars dedicated to the study of island-space, one finds a

need (and call) for an “archipelagic turn” to compensate for trends that leave “island-to-island relations . . . under-theorized.”⁷⁶ Understanding the island as an archipelagic space (a space of cultural, epistemological, and political relationality) requires, in the context of Caribbean Studies, a de-valuing of the premium on individual sovereignty that has been in place in the Caribbean since the independence era. The alternative is a recovery of and a return to more latent discourses organized according to the logic of an “archipelago principle,” such as the vision of West Indian Federation in the Anglophone Caribbean during the 1950s, or in maritime Southeast Asia, the site of the largest archipelagic state, Indonesia. In the contemporary Caribbean, geoformal concerns with how varying cultures have interacted with the structural materialities of islands also lead to new geopolitical formations, new, non-sovereign imaginaries and discourses in archipelagic territorial units such as the islands of Martinique and Guadeloupe that remain departments of France, or of St. Thomas, St. Croix, and St. John that make up the US Virgin Islands.⁷⁷ The idea of a non-sovereign Caribbean, and the use of such a frame as a category of historical and geo-political analysis, suggests precisely the kind of contemporary turn an archipelagic studies also represents—a turn away from the trajectories of postcolonial studies as offering the only language for understanding present and contemporary political formations not culminating in the expected narrative of national sovereignty, as merely holding onto the relations of dependency that characterized the colonial past. And from the Antillean perspective, where the island becomes the space for the breaking of the naturalized connection between insularity and sovereignty, new definitions of a non-sovereign subject can also emerge that offer literary and cultural opportunities for the further unfolding of a re-imagined, transnational American Studies.

Notes

¹ Josiah Strong, *Our Country*, ed. Jurgen Herbst (1885; reprint, Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard Univ. Press, 1963), 175.

² W. E. B. Du Bois, *The Souls of Black Folk*, ed. Brent Hayes Edwards (1903; reprint, New York: Oxford Univ. Press, 2009), 15.

³ W. E. B. Du Bois, “Worlds of Color: The Negro Mind Reaches Out,” in *The New Negro*, ed. Alain Locke (1925; reprint, New York: Atheneum, 1992), 386.

⁴ Shu-mei Shih, “Comparative Racialization: An Introduction,” *PMLA* 123 (October 2008), 1349.

⁵ Michel Foucault, “*Society Must Be Defended*”: *Lectures at the College de France, 1975–1976*, trans. David Macey (New York: Picador, 2003), 65.

⁶ Walter D. Mignolo, *Local Histories/Global Designs: Coloniality, Subaltern Knowledges and Border Thinking* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton Univ. Press, 2000), ix.

⁷ Donald Pease, "Re-thinking 'American Studies after US Exceptionalism,'" *American Literary History* 21 (spring 2009), 19.

⁸ *Ibid.*, 20.

⁹ Quoted in Christina Duffy Burnett and Burke Marshall, "Between the Foreign and the Domestic: The Doctrine of Territorial Incorporation, Invented and Reinvented," in *Foreign in a Domestic Sense: Puerto Rico, American Expansion, and the Constitution*, eds. Christina Duffy Burnett and Burke Marshall (Durham: Duke Univ. Press, 2001), 1.

¹⁰ Amy Kaplan, *The Anarchy of Empire in the Making of U.S. Culture* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard Univ. Press, 2002), 2–4; Priscilla Wald, *Constituting Americans: Cultural Anxiety and Narrative Form* (Durham: Duke Univ. Press, 1995), 224; Ramón Soto-Crespo, *Mainland Passages: The Cultural Anomaly of Puerto Rico* (Minneapolis: Univ. of Minnesota Press, 2009), 59–60 and 101–02; Nicole Waligora-Davis, *Sanctuary: African Americans and Empire* (New York: Oxford Univ. Press, 2011), xiv, 94–104.

¹¹ See Rob Wilson, *Reimagining the American Pacific: From South Pacific to Bamboo Ridge and Beyond* (Durham: Duke Univ. Press, 2000); Allan Punzalan Isaac, *American Tropics: Articulating Filipino America* (Minneapolis: Univ. of Minnesota Press, 2006); Mary A. Renda, *Taking Haiti: Military Occupation and the Culture of U.S. Imperialism, 1915–1940* (Chapel Hill: Univ. of North Carolina Press, 2001); and Matthew Pratt Guterl, *American Mediterranean: Southern Slaveholders in the Age of Emancipation* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard Univ. Press, 2008).

¹² Giles Gunn, *The Culture of Criticism and the Criticism of Culture* (New York: Oxford Univ. Press, 1987), 151.

¹³ Amy Kaplan, "Manifest Domesticity," *American Literature* 70 (September 1998), 583.

¹⁴ John Carlos Rowe et al, introduction to *Post-Nationalist American Studies*, ed. John Carlos Rowe (Berkeley: Univ. of California Press, 2000), 2.

¹⁵ Anna Brickhouse, "Hemispheric Jamestown," in *Hemispheric American Studies*, eds. Caroline F. Levander and Robert S. Levine (New Brunswick: Rutgers Univ. Press, 2008), 21.

¹⁶ Winfried Fluck, "A New Beginning? Transnationalisms," *New Literary History* 42 (summer 2011), 381.

¹⁷ "Insular," def. 4. a., *Oxford English Dictionary*, 2nd ed. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1989).

¹⁸ Françoise Lionnet, "Cosmopolitan or Creole Lives? Globalized Oceans and Insular Identities," *Profession* (2011), 27–28.

¹⁹ Ibid., 26.

²⁰ Paul Gilroy, *The Black Atlantic: Modernity and Double Consciousness* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard Univ. Press, 1993), 1–40, 99–103.

²¹ The phrase “no man is an island” is a famous line from *Meditation XVII* (1624) by the English poet John Donne.

²² Shih, “Comparative Racialization,” 1350.

²³ Martin W. Lewis and Kären Wigen, “A Maritime Response to the Crisis in Area Studies,” *Geographical Review* 89 (April 1999), 162. Also see their foundational work, *The Myth of Continents: A Critique of Metageography* (Berkeley: Univ. of California Press, 1997). For a discussion of American Studies’ investments in imagining new geographies, see Wai Chee Dimock, “Planet and America, Set and Subset,” in *Shades of the Planet: American Literature as World Literature*, eds. Wai Chee Dimock and Lawrence Buell (Princeton: Princeton Univ. Press, 2007), 3.

²⁴ Brian Russell Roberts, “Archipelagic Diaspora, Geographical Form, and Hurston’s *Their Eyes Were Watching God*,” *American Literature* 85 (March 2013), 122. Emphasis added.

²⁵ Antonio Benítez-Rojo, *The Repeating Island: The Caribbean and the Postmodern Perspective*, 2nd ed., trans. James E. Maraniss (Durham: Duke Univ. Press, 1996), 5.

²⁶ Ibid.

²⁷ Ibid., 4.

²⁸ “Archipelago,” *Oxford English Dictionary*.

²⁹ The field of island studies has two English-language journals, founded in 2006 and 2007 in Canada and Australia, respectively—*Island Studies Journal* at the University of Prince Edward Island and *Shima*, supported by Macquarie University and Southern Cross University. For discussions of ocean studies see the *Geographical Review* 89 (April 1999) and the May 2010 issue of *PMLA*.

³⁰ Lewis and Wigen, “A Maritime Response,” 163. On American Studies and area studies, see John Carlos Rowe, “Areas of Concern: Area Studies and the New American Studies,” *Alif: Journal of Comparative Poetics* 31 (2011): 11–34.

³¹ Lewis and Wigen, “A Maritime Response,” 165.

³² Ibid., 163.

³³ Ibid., 162.

³⁴ Ibid., 161.

- ³⁵ James D. Drake, *The Nation's Nature: How Continental Presumptions Gave Rise to the United States of America* (Charlottesville: Univ. of Virginia Press, 2011), 128–32, 186–88.
- ³⁶ Thomas Paine, *Common Sense and Related Writings*, ed. Thomas P. Slaughter (Boston, Mass.: Bedford, 2001), 93.
- ³⁷ Drake, *The Nation's Nature*, 287–88.
- ³⁸ Frederick Jackson Turner, *The Frontier in American History* (New York: Holt, 1921), 38.
- ³⁹ Lionnet, “Cosmopolitan or Creole Lives?,” 27.
- ⁴⁰ Gene Wise, “‘Paradigm Dramas’ in American Studies: A Cultural and Institutional History of the Movement,” *American Quarterly* 31 (fall 1979): 293–337.
- ⁴¹ Barrett Wendell, *A Literary History of America* (1900; reprint, New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1931), 62.
- ⁴² H. Lark Hall, *V. L. Parrington: Through the Avenue of Art* (Kent, Ohio: Kent State Univ. Press, 1994), 37–41.
- ⁴³ Wise, “‘Paradigm Dramas,’” 300.
- ⁴⁴ Vernon Louis Parrington, *Main Currents in American Thought: Vol. 1 The Colonial Mind, 1620-1800* (New York: Harcourt, 1927), 131.
- ⁴⁵ Henry Nash Smith, *Virgin Land: The American West as Symbol and Myth* (1950; reprint, Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard Univ. Press, 1970), 161; Leo Marx, *The Machine in the Garden: Technology and the Pastoral Ideal in America* (1964; reprint, New York: Oxford Univ. Press, 1967), 42.
- ⁴⁶ Wai Chee Dimock, *Through Other Continents: American Literature Across Deep Time* (Princeton: Princeton Univ. Press, 2006).
- ⁴⁷ Paine, *Common Sense*, 89.
- ⁴⁸ *Ibid.*, 88.
- ⁴⁹ Quotes taken from the description of the theme of the 2007 meeting of the American Studies Association, “América Aquí: Transhemispheric Visions and Community Connections.”
- ⁵⁰ We thank Yolanda Martínez San Miguel for this insight regarding the inevitable focus on continental space in Latin American Studies, given the prioritizing of nation building projects and imaginaries that exclude the Caribbean and the Phillipines (in “Archipiélagos de ultramar: Studying Spanish Colonialism in the Philippines and the Caribbean,” paper presented at the Caribbean Philosophical Association conference, Rutgers University, New Brunswick, 2011).

⁵¹ José Martí, “Our America,” in *Selected Writings*, trans. Esther Allen (New York: Penguin, 2002), 295. The phrasing of America’s “move down” the continent is taken from Strong’s statements in our essay’s opening paragraph.

⁵² Martí, “Our America,” 296.

⁵³ *Ibid.*, 295–96.

⁵⁴ *Ibid.*, 296.

⁵⁵ Claudio Iván Remeseira, *Hispanic New York: A Sourcebook* (New York: Columbia Univ. Press, 2010), 70.

⁵⁶ As rendered in Noah Webster’s revision, the Israelite prophet Isaiah predicted that “the dispersed of Judah” would be gathered “from Assyria, and from Egypt, and from Pathros, . . . and from the isles of the sea” (Isaiah 11: 11–12). (Biblical quotations are drawn from *The Bible in English [1990–1970]*, ProQuest). Though the Hebrew word corresponding to the biblical *islands* or *isles* referred simply to “lands across the sea” or “sea-coasts” (“Island,” def. 1. b., *Oxford English Dictionary*), many Christian missionaries (intent upon gathering lost portions of the Jewish diaspora) looked toward small landmasses surrounded by water for the scattered remnants of Israel (K. R. Howe, *The Quest for Origins: Who First Discovered and Settled the Pacific Islands?* [Honolulu: Univ. of Hawai‘i Press, 2003], 36–41; Hokulani K. Aikau, *A Chosen People, A Promised Land: Mormonism and Race in Hawai‘i* [Minneapolis: Univ. of Minnesota Press, 2012], 31–53). More generally, the phrase “the islands of the sea” came to refer to a transregional and planetary stage for the activity of missionary work (see “Protestant Missions in the Pacific Islands,” *Baptist Missionary Magazine*, October 1897, 1; and Alfred Williams Anthony, “The Whole Mission Field,” *Homiletic Review*, September 1919, 188).

⁵⁷ Antoine Hatzenberger, “Islands and Empires: Beyond the Shores of Utopia,” *Angelika: Journal of the Theoretical Humanities* 8 (April 2003), 119.

⁵⁸ *Ibid.*, 120.

⁵⁹ *Ibid.*, 121.

⁶⁰ *Ibid.*, 121.

⁶¹ Philip E. Steinberg, “Insularity, Sovereignty and Statehood: The Representation of Islands on Portolan Charts and the Construction of the Territorial State,” *Geografiska Annaler: Series B, Human Geography* 87 (December 2005), 253.

⁶² *Ibid.*, 263.

⁶³ Martí, “Our America,” 288–89.

⁶⁴ For an expansive view of the world archipelago, see Edward Walter Dawson, *The Isles of the Sea* (Hartford, Conn.: Betts, 1886).

⁶⁵ Françoise Lionnet, “Continents and Archipelagoes: From *E Pluribus Unum* to Creolized Solidarities,” *PMLA* 123 (April 2008). She states: “*E pluribus unum*, the original motto of the United States adopted by an act of Congress in 1782, has echoes in the French constitution of 1793, which states that “[t]he Republic is one and indivisible”” (1504).

⁶⁶ *Ibid.*, 1508.

⁶⁷ *Ibid.* For more on the archipelagic principle and Bandung, Lionnet cites Mohamed Munavvar’s *Ocean States: Archipelagic Regimes in the Law of the Sea* (Dordrecht: Nijhoff, 1995).

⁶⁸ C. L. R. James, *Modern Politics* (Detroit, MI: Bewick/Ed., 1973), 84.

⁶⁹ *Ibid.*, 70.

⁷⁰ Édouard Glissant, *Poetics of Relation*, trans. Betsy Wing (Detroit, MI: Univ. of Michigan Press, 1997), 11.

⁷¹ Quoted in Celia M. Britton, *Edouard Glissant and Postcolonial Theory: Strategies of Language and Resistance* (Charlottesville: Univ. of Virginia Press, 1999), 179.

⁷² George Lamming, *The Pleasures of Exile* (1960; reprint, New York: Alison and Busby, 1984), 154.

⁷³ Guterl, *American Mediterranean*, *ibid.*; Christopher Iannini, *Fatal Revolutions: Natural History, West Indian Slavery, and the Routes of American Literature* (Chapel Hill: Univ. of North Carolina Press, 2012); Sean X. Goudie, *Creole America: The West Indies and the Formation of Literature and Culture in the New Republic* (Philadelphia: Univ. of Pennsylvania Press, 2006).

⁷⁴ Goudie, *Creole America*, 13–16.

⁷⁵ Quoted in Kaiama L. Glover, *Haiti Unbound: A Spiralist Challenge to the Postcolonial Canon* (Liverpool, Eng.: Liverpool Univ. Press, 2010), 1.

⁷⁶ Elaine Stratford et al., “Envisioning the Archipelago,” *Island Studies Journal* 6 (November 2011), 123, 115. Also see Michelle Stephens, “What Is an Island? Caribbean Studies and the Contemporary Visual Artist,” *Small Axe* 41 (July 2013): 8–26.

⁷⁷ For more on “non-sovereignty,” see Godfrey Baldacchino and David Milne, eds., *The Case for Non-Sovereignty: Lessons from Sub-National Island Jurisdictions* (New York: Routledge, 2008), and anthropologist Yarimar Bonilla’s work on the non-sovereign Caribbean, as described in “Non-Sovereign Futures? Caribbean Politics in the Wake of Disenchantment,” a paper presented at the Carter G. Woodson 30th Anniversary Symposium, “African American & African Studies at Work in the World,” held at the University of Virginia in April 2011.