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Who but a horizon so keenly feels how we are kept at each other’s distance?
Because much more than wind carries so many of us away from our islands. Because we are made to consider our oceans as walls.
...
The salt in our blood carries droplets of the ocean. No matter where we are, inside us is a liquid web connecting our beating hearts.
I am quiet so I can perceive your tugs, the delicate density of your tangles.

—— Lehua M. Taitano,
“A Love Letter to the Chamoru People in the Twenty-first Century”

These excerpts from queer Chamoru poet and artist, Lehua M. Taitano mark horizon, distance, islands, oceans, and connections—they weave complexity of belonging to self, place/space, and people. ¹ Felt experience conveys movement under constraint (“away from our islands,” “kept at each other’s distance”) and barriers (“oceans as
walls”); while oceanic bodies (“salt in our blood,” “inside us is a liquid web”) comprise our relations (“no matter where we are,” “connecting our beating hearts”) that freely traverse a close space (“your tugs,” “your tangles”). This poem resonates with me as I consider Robert Smithson’s *Floating Island* visual art project in relation to archipelagic and oceanic thinking (see Figure 1), specifically as I apply theories of etak (*moving islands*), the triangulation developed by traditional Carolinian seafarers, to examine Smithson’s work. I also hold these poetic and visual artifacts together to reflect on how they rhetorically engage connection and motion and to map some relationalities between Manna-hata (the Lenape word for “island of many hills”) and Oceania.

I began writing this reflection after traveling to the United Nations Headquarters in Manna-hata for meetings of the UN Special Political and Decolonization Committee, in October 2018. As a petitioner speaking for decolonization of Guåhan/Guam, I was struck by how these places and peoples (the Chamoru and Lenape) are profoundly connected through colonial experiences and mistranslations, through ocean, and as islands comprising archipelagos. These connections, relations, and waterways matter.

**Archipelagic Thinking: Moving Islands**

Filipino and Pohnpeian scholar Vicente M. Diaz argues for a “critical rethinking of islands” from Indigenous cartographies, explaining traditional voyaging in the Pacific provides an “archipelagic way of apprehending self and space” that inform “practices of mobility and movement.” Other Indigenous scholarship also argues land and ocean are creatively articulated—understood as archipelagic, fluid, moving, relational, and storied. Drawing from voyaging and seafaring traditions helps to rethink land archipelagically, to examine archipelagic relationalities. These ideas invite connections with voyaging and seafaring traditions of Oceania to rethink land and consider archipelagic relationalities.

The theorization of moving islands disrupts conceptions of land as fixed and stable; for example, it “posits the canoe as stationary, and the islands move on the sea around it.” These approaches index the ocean as a *pathway* (or, as Taitano puts it, “a liquid web”) connecting islands, rather than a barrier between islands (“because we are made to consider our oceans as walls”). Significantly, *Floating Island* centers processes of movement to deepen relationships among islands.

**Floating Island**

In 1970, Smithson developed the project concept, intended as an “homage to Central Park” that “offers a displacement of the park—itself a man-made creation from its natural habitat.” Displacement expresses movement of something from its original position/place (the park) and also articulates how objects float (the barge). The former meaning of the park’s “displacement” reverberates with Taitano’s reality of distance for Pacific Islanders “because much more than wind carries so many of us away from
our islands.” As the Lenape territory of New York City faces a rapidly growing Pacific Islander and Native Hawaiian population (a figure that more than doubled in 2018), it reflects Oceania’s legacies and continued practices of movement across land/water. 

Smithson’s Floating Island invites us to rethink land archipelagically and read it rhetorically through the theory of etak (moving islands). The barge at once represents an island that traverses a watery “field” or “terrain” of the Hudson/East River. It also signals and challenges understanding of lands, such as Manna-hatta, as fixed. The juxtaposition between the barge and the adjacent landscape reveals a parallelism where one seems to be a larger replica of the other—both are landscapes filled with rocks, native trees, and shrubs. Both “islands are moving, tectonically and culturally” (emphasis in original). The barge island physically moves by the power of the tugboat guiding its travels across the water. From the perspective of etak, we might imagine the tugboat as a canoe—remaining stationary while the islands (Manna-hata and the Floating Island barge) move around it. We could imagine the tugboat ropes as forming the lines for a sail on a traditional canoe. The tugboat (or canoe) is navigating and triangulating its position in relation to the Floating Island.

Manna-hata also moves as it supplies material for other spaces—for instance, providing the “trees common to the New York Region” that were lifted and transported (displaced) onto the barge. The image’s industrial elements (i.e., the tugboat, the barge, the docked vessel) sharply contrast the foliage covering the “fabricated island” barge and the vibrant trees and plants on Manna-hata. This example suggests mastery or control over the environment as the tugboat pulls the island, with hard lines between water and land. Yet another interpretation is that it signals navigation and relationality.

Following theories of etak/moving islands and the interconnectedness of ocean, land, and sky offers a compelling reading of Smithson’s project. Reflecting on legacies of mobility, relationality, and traversal demonstrates how land itself is not fixed, but rather dynamic and moving—for both Manna-hata and Floating Island. Archipelagic thinking opens up ways of processing movements and our commitments to place and people. It offers an homage to our relationalities, consideration of movement/displacement, and a challenge to colonial continental logics. These reflections and flows continue—as the closing of Taitano’s poem reminds us—“[u]ntil we can gaze together upon a horizon full of sails.”
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