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For Americanist cultural critics, the continent has been king among geographical forms and the continental model central to a general practice of Americanist transnational analysis. Yet recent work in US American and hemispheric American contexts has showcased the continental narrative’s erosion when faced with the materiality of oceanic and archipelagic spaces. This special forum explores new understandings of transnational relations scholars produce as we invert traditional geographic paradigms and consider the globe not as a collection of continents surrounded by water, but as oceanic space comprising and bordering landmasses. In other terms, we ask what if oceans and the islands they contain were perceived not as negative space around continents but as the positive space that defines postcontinental geography and throws transnational relationships into relief? As a means of both illustrating and pursuing this possibility, this forum features essays and works of art curated by Christopher Lynn and Fidalis Buehler that engage and adapt postexceptional American studies and postcontinental frameworks. Together, this assemblage of visual art and written scholarship presents a view of America as closely affiliated with islands, archipelagoes, and oceans—and, to an even greater degree, as unexpectedly constituted by archipelagic and oceanic spaces.

This special forum grows out of larger academic currents: an arena of ocean studies that takes the archipelagic Americas into account, an arena of archipelagic studies that at times grapples with territorialized American oceans, and a field of American studies that is increasingly indebted to oceanic and archipelagic thinking. All of the scholars and artists involved in the forum in some way find themselves in these archipelagoes/oceans/Americas currents. Edward Kamau Brathwaite in his classic book
Contradictory Omens spoke of the Caribbean as a place of “interlapping,” or mutual palimpsest, where various items reciprocally inscribe themselves on each other. At the site of this interlapping, he said, “[t]he idea is to try to see the fragments/whole,” using a slash. We wish to frame the slashes in this forum’s title as signifying an interlapping relationality among the three components and a charge to see—both conceptually and visually—the interlapping fragments-slash-whole among archipelagoes/oceans/Americas.

In many ways, the term archipelago is a figure of interlapping—of islands overlapping with ocean and ocean reciprocally lapping up onto the islands’ shores (see Figure 1). Archipelago means chief sea, referring to the Aegean, so it was originally a reference to ocean space, accruing a connotation and eventually denotation of islands because the Aegean is studded with islands. And yet, even as its current usage has islands superimposed upon the original oceanic space, the oceanic space returns, as the UN Convention on the Law of the Sea or UNCLOS authorizes nation-states to lay claim to an Exclusive Economic Zone extending two hundred nautical miles out from their shorelines, so islands function to territorialize vast swaths of ocean space. This is particularly the case for the United States of America, whose island territorial claims
authorize concomitant claims to more ocean territory than nearly any other nation-state.

Against the gravity of the continent as US American space’s foundational geographical form, the field of American studies has been increasingly attentive to these ocean and island—these archipelagic—interlappings. In fact, the American Quarterly’s 2015 move to the University of Hawai‘i may be taken as an initial crystallization of a postcontinental structure of feeling that has arrived at a point of supersaturation within Americanist waters. The structure of feeling and sense of supersaturation become clear when we consider, visually and quantitatively, the place of the term archipelago within the American Quarterly from its founding in 1949 through the end of the year during which the Hawai‘i-based editorial team began producing issues of the American Studies Association’s official journal.

Those familiar with the field’s trajectory over the past quarter century will readily see (in the chart’s demonstration of a jump from two occurrences of archipelago in the 1990s to twelve occurrences in the 2000s; see Figure 2) a reflection of a new emphasis on cultures of US imperialism, which of course directed many Americanists’ gazes toward those archipelagic US territories that have largely remained outside a more general national self-perception among US Americans. This tack toward studying US imperialism within dispersed island territories was in some ways already a move toward decentering US continentalism. But during the mid-2010s, commentary within American Quarterly (AQ) became self-consciously archipelagic.

Figure 2. Graph tracking an increase in references to archipelago in the journal American Quarterly.
This new attention to the archipelago as an island–ocean framework appears prominently in the AQ’s special issues of 2014 and 2015, which were pivot points, respectively the final special issue produced at the University of Southern California and the first special issue produced at the University of Hawai‘i. Introducing the 2014 special issue, the editors explain that the issue’s final section, titled “Archipelagic Thought,” contains four essays that refuse to permit “islands [to] do the work of clarifying inter-American relationships” while still remaining “occluded from knowledge production in the Americas.” In assuming this stance, one of the essays frames itself as contributing to work “in the surround of Archipelagic American studies” which Michelle Ann Stephens and Brian Russell Roberts have described as an Americanist approach “invested in tracing the interrelations of America (as a hemispheric space constellated by two continents and uncounted islands) and the broader planetary archipelago that [W. E. B.] Du Bois ... and many others have conceived of as ‘the islands of the sea.’” A year later, in the 2015 special issue, Craig Santos Perez pointed toward the ocean–island frame and suggested that “this archipelagic turn offers a promising analytic to navigate the transnational, transatlantic, transpacific, transindigenous, and transhemispheric turns in the now discontinuous archipelago of American studies.” As does Perez, the issue editors Paul Lyons and Ty P. Kāwika Tengan gesture toward the island–ocean form of the archipelago as a model for investigating “undercurrents that extend to the conceptual,” and they conclude by asking about potentially intersecting undercurrents of relationality among islands: “How will Islanders and Islands—inclusive of Turtle Island (North America) and its peoples—move at the points of their convergence?” One of the answers to this question must involve, as conveyed in the title of an essay in the same special issue, the “Oceanizing [of] American Studies,” and more broadly, as Hester Blum has written in PMLA, a recognition that “the sea is geographically central to the hemispheric or transnational turn in American studies and to Atlantic and Pacific studies.”

Blum’s nod to the Pacific and the Atlantic is an acknowledgment that in taking an oceanic and archipelagic tack, scholars of US and broader American cultures are joining and contributing to long-running critical discussions. In fact, though oceanic and archipelagic approaches may feel emergent, to engage in this type of thought is to engage with intellectual traditions that have long been unfolding and that span the planet and academy. Oceanic theorizations, furthermore, are also in conversation with the environmental humanities: Archipelagic perspectival shifts have a special urgency in our planetary moment of anthropogenic climate change. The consequences of warming on human and nonhuman life are unevenly distributed among global populations, and islands are under special stress and threat. As the accelerating diminishment of polar ice caps continues to elevate sea levels, the contours of the land that interrupts the aqueous globe are themselves transformed. We see these effects not just in the Pacific, Indian, or Caribbean archipelagoes, but in the Arctic archipelago as well. Oceans and archipelagoes have been shaped by and respond to human actions, ones whose effects (like archipelagoes themselves) are both visible to human
perception and subaqueous, and both exigent in the present and tuned to deeper timescales. What the islands of the sea and our sea of islands remind us is to imagine forms of relationality that reject the rigidity of the lines of demarcation stipulated by continental or terrestrial spaces. Such modes of analysis understand the planet as contingent and kinetic, and thus archipelagic and oceanic orientations may have special explanatory power in an age of ecological crisis.

Here, we wish to offer one possible map of these traditions, not modeled on a flat piece of paper with crosshatched lines of latitude and longitude but modeled on a navigational map of the sky that takes constellations of stars as modes of orientation, a map that can orient in spite of the fact—or even because of the fact—that it shifts in the sky over the course of hours and minutes. For us, the components of these constellations are often questions.

**Constellation 1: Basic Definitions.** What does the *Oxford English Dictionary* tell us about the words *ocean, insular, oceanic, or archipelago*? How did *insular*, the adjectival form of the word *island*, become an English synonym for benighted? How did *archipelago*, a specifically Greek Mediterranean word, become a naturalized term for island groupings across the planet? The etymologies and usages are intriguing, even as the gaps and ethnocentricities point toward the urgency that ocean–island studies not be confined to the English language—pointing toward the need to incorporate non-English and especially non-European and Indigenous languages and epistemologies.

**Constellation 2: From Precontinental to Continental to Postcontinental Thinking.** Before continents came into their own as the planet’s seemingly fundamental geographical building blocks, what were precontinental modes of human’s phenomenological relation to the natural environment? And how did what Martin W. Lewis and Kären E. Wigen call *The Myth of Continents* come to saturate thought from grade school all the way to contemporary transnationalist scholarship that might ask us to view the planet through other continents?8 Nelson Maldonado-Torres has written of a *postcontinental philosophy* that emerges from ocean and island thinkers.9 How does postcontinental philosophy and thought differ from continental philosophy and thought? Additionally, we need always to remember that there have been modes of thought that are not postcontinental because they have never been continental.

**Constellation 3: Fundamental Thinkers on Oceans and Islands.** When island-based or island-oriented thinkers such as Jamaica Kincaid have critiqued the supposed smallness of island cultures, in what ways has continental thought structured the critique? When Pacific and Caribbean writers such as Derek Walcott, Albert Wendt, and Epeli Hau’ofa have pointed to sublime oceanic spaces or infinite grains of sand, what has been the place of the island in those formulations?10 How does the work of fractal mathematician Benoit Mandelbrot, particularly with his questions about coastline lengths, help resolve issues of comparative magnitude?11 Are we still grappling with questions of comparative magnitude when we approach Martinican thinker Édouard Glissant, Cook Island novelist Florence (Johnny) Frisbie, and Cuban writer Antonio Benítez-Rojo on questions of discontinuity, interconnection, and difference within the
Raymond’s SaVAge K’lub literally set the stage for a number of performances, presentations and activations by Pacific artists and local communities. The “VA” in SaVAge references the Samoan “vā” that denotes the space and relationships between people or cultures.
geographical form of the archipelago? Consider the archipelago’s elasticity, as it does simultaneous work for Sylvia Wynter (with her postslave archipelago) and Craig Santos Perez with his notion of poetic words sitting on the page like a sea of islands.

**Constellation 4: Human Culture, Human Law, and the Terraqueous Environment.** How has the archipelagic doctrine within the UN Convention on the Law of the Sea (UNCLOS) given international legal standing to non-Western oceanic and archipelagic epistemologies? UNCLOS imagines continental borders that have become permeable and liquid. Even as it does so in the service of national sovereignty claims, UNCLOS allows for new archipelagic theorizations. We see such epistemologies showcased in the Indonesian notion of *tanah-air*—conventionally translated as *homeland* but literally meaning *land–water*. And how has UNCLOS’s territorialization of the sea resulted in legal rationales for militarization? Or for environmental protection? On the topic of environmental protection and the human classification of geological ages, Elizabeth DeLoughrey has remarked on a rising ocean as the “determinative but largely unnoticed aspect of the Anthropocene.” Island, oceanic, and archipelagic human cultures are profoundly influenced by legal, political, and environmental pressures, often as they subvert or resist these forces. As two vivid visual examples, Rosanna Raymond’s *SaVAge K’lub* (2010–ongoing) and Dan Taulapapa McMullin’s *Aue Away* (2016/2017) invoke histories of cultural stereotypes and appropriation even as they portray the power of Pacific artists and communities to reclaim and recreate sites and images of exclusion. *SaVAge K’lub* (see Figure 3) is an installation space in New Zealand, named for a nineteenth-century gentlemen’s club in London, which is now activated by participants, who, in Raymond’s words, “put the vā into the sa va ge.” Vā refers to the Samoan concept of open, nonlinear space, which Raymond interpolates into an artifact of colonial history in order to mark a site of Indigenous cultural reclamation. And in *Aue Away* (see detail in Figure 4), a hybrid of video, installation, and sculpture, McMullin clashes images of war, fantasy, and colonial conquest against images of and objects connoting Pacific waters, shorelines, and islands, establishing these environments as central rather than peripheral to recent and ongoing developments in transnational law, geopolitics, climate, and culture.

![Figure 4. Dan Taulapapa McMullin Soa (detail), 2016](image)
Constellation 5: Cultural Studies of the Ocean. In tandem with and as complement of fields like marine biology and oceanography, there has emerged a scholarly stream invested in the cultural study of the ocean. Usually different from a Paul Gilroy model that takes the ocean as spatial backdrop, this stream has been intent on thinking metageographically about oceans and seas, and also intent on parsing the interlappings of oceanic metaphoricity and materiality. This mode of scholarship has watershed moments in the journal Geographical Review’s “Oceans Connect” special issue of 1999 and PMLA’s “Oceanic Studies” cluster in 2010. What are the ramifications of a
name—is it the Arctic Ocean or the Inuit Sea? On the horizon: How might Karin Amimoto Ingersoll’s work on Indigenous Hawaiian seascape epistemology come to bear on Elspeth Probyn’s new work on the cultural politics of industrial fishing?

**Constellation 6: The Development of Island Studies.** The field of island studies boasts two journals: *Island Studies Journal*, founded in 2006 in Canada, and *Shima*, founded in 2007 in Japan. In many ways the field has been invested in what Grant McCall in 1994 called “nissology,” or “the study of islands on their own terms,” and even island studies luminary Godfrey Baldacchino has wondered if islands have their own terms. Meanwhile, Elaine Stratford has also critiqued island studies from the inside, calling for an “archipelagic turn” in the field, a study of island-interconnectedness that avoids reinscribing island-isolation as the fundamental attribute of the island. One wonders about the potential for—or desirability of—further integrating Euro–American oriented island studies such as those done by Marc Shell and John Gillis with Global South island thought—for example, that published in a special issue of the *Journal of Okinawan Studies* by figures including Arif Dirlik, Gary Y. Okihiro, Vijay Prashad, and Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak.

**Constellation 7: Archipelagic Transregionalisms.** Island studies did not invent the so-called archipelagic turn. Rather, building on fundamental island and ocean thinkers as well as traditional and Indigenous epistemologies, scholars have been discussing archipelagic regions and transregions for a few decades. In the 1970s, J. G. A. Pocock devised what he called a new “British history” by changing “the British Isles” into “the Atlantic Archipelago.” In 1998, legal scholar Jay L. Batongbacal spearheaded the University of the Philippines’s volume titled *Archipelagic Studies*, which was published as the university’s archipelagic studies program came into existence. Vicente M. Diaz and others have been writing about Indigenous Pacific navigational practices in archipelagic terms. Scholars of the Greek Mediterranean have discussed islands hanging together in dancing networks.

The map we offer here is modeled on a sky whose constellations shift and disappear over the course of weeks and months—and even hours and minutes. Even as we have collaborated on the production of this forum, some of these constellations have disappeared and reappeared in changed form, with new constellations constantly appearing on the horizon and other constellations emerging as newly recognizable patterns among groups of stars we have been looking at all along.

This forum grows out of an interinstitutional collaboration between the Rutgers Center for Cultural Analysis’s Archipelagoes Seminar and the Archipelagoes/Oceans/Americas Humanities Center research group at Brigham Young University. Along with regular workshops, these groups sponsored two large events, an art exhibition in 2015 in New Jersey and a symposium in 2016 in Utah. The art exhibition, titled *From Island to Ocean: Caribbean and Pacific Dialogues*, featured visual art by Juana Valdes and Fidalis Buehler. During panels associated with the event, we discussed Valdes’s cyanotype image of ceramics floating in blue space as if we were viewing, with the eyes of a fish, the underside of floating and moveable islands (see Figure 5). And we discussed Buehler’s work, in which sets of trajectories represented by arced lines disrupt clichéd images of Bali Hai from Rodgers and Hammerstein’s *South Pacific* (see Figure 6). At the 2016 symposium at BYU,
Figure 6. Fidalis Buehler, White Cloud Caution Flasher, oil painting on panel, 18 × 20 in. Courtesy of the artist.
we furthered this disruption in a series of presentations, readings, and an exhibit that staked out new perspectives from which to view and interrogate the relationships among geologic forms and their contingent cultures and histories. These events brought together some of the authors and artists whose work appears in this forum, as well as other scholars, artists, activists, writers, and teachers. The participants inspired illuminating discussions about the relationships among geologic and epistemic formations, from landmasses and waterways to disciplines and fields. The essays and art contained in this forum elaborate on or complement those discussions, suggesting additional ways scholars and artists can reframe these formations in ways that bring obscured relationships into sharper focus.

In “‘Our ice-islands’: Images of Alaska in the Reconstruction Era,” **Ryan Charlton** reframes nineteenth-century accounts of the Alaska Purchase from an archipelagic perspective, one that is responsive to the Reconstruction-era moment of the acquisition. In this account Alaska is envisioned as a constellation of ice islands, one whose permeability stands in for the indeterminacy of postbellum reunification narratives in the continental US. Charlton’s illuminating reading of the Arctic episode in Constance Fenimore Woolson’s 1880 story of Reconstruction Florida, “The South Devil,” demonstrates how an archipelagic imaginary brings a fresh perspective to historical moments traditionally read as continental in their effects. In “Cartographic Sea-Changes in Herman Melville’s *Moby-Dick*: Ahab, Charles Wilkes, and the US Exploring Expedition,” **L. Katherine Smith** explores the way Herman Melville, one of the nineteenth century’s most prolific chroniclers of terraqueous experience, also unsettles the relationship between sea and land by making the sea central, rather than peripheral. In *Moby-Dick*, in particular, Melville shows the inadequacies of conventional cartographic processes when brought to bear on the Earth’s fluid and mobile forms (including pods of whales). Melville further suggests the radical potential of applying oceanic and archipelagic logic to the representation of familiar continental forms. Doing so, Smith argues, allows him to traverse expanses of space as well as time. In transposing earth and sea, Melville challenges longstanding and even enduring “assumptions of geological permanence.”

In another consideration of temporality and decontinental forms, **Emalani Case**’s essay “Caught (and Brought) in the Currents: Narratives of Convergence, Destruction, and Creation at Kamilo Beach” focuses on a beach located on the shore of the southernmost district of Hawai‘i Island, the Hawaiian archipelago’s largest island. The Hawaiian-language term *milo*, from which the beach’s name is derived, references the twisting and whirling oceanic currents that extend back into deep time but have now, during the Anthropocene, covered the sand with plastic objects, shards, and confetti. In contributing to this special forum’s thematic on visuality and the archipelagic, Case reflects on the comparative visibilities and invisibilities of this “plastic beach,” as viewed via US continental media, cultures of the Big Island, and ecological education in Hawai‘i.
The essays in this forum attend with particular care to the possibilities and paradoxes of visual representation. Cherene Sherrard-Johnson’s essay “‘Perfection with a hole in the middle’: Archipelagic Assemblage in Tiphanie Yanique’s Land of Love and Drowning” reads the US Virgin Islands writer Tiphanie Yanique’s 2014 debut novel in dialogue with the work of visual artists Wangechi Mutu and La Vaughn Belle. In engaging Yanique via these artists of the Caribbean and Black Atlantic world, Sherrard-Johnson grapples with what she terms “archipelagic assemblage” as a model for countering the invisible and otherwise caricatured existences of islands within US cultures and self-perceptions. In so doing, she traces ways in which Mutu’s and Belle’s examinations of splintered identities amplify Yanique’s myth-building thematics regarding the USVI and archipelagic spaces more generally. And using the trope of an inverted telescope, taken from Benedict Anderson, Kathleen DeGuzman’s essay “Telescopic Relationality: Visualizing the Archipelagic Americas in Burn!” argues for the “telescopic relationality” in Burn! (1969), a film directed by Gillo Pontecorvo and starring Marlon Brando, who plays the role of a British agent charged to capture a revolutionary dissident on a fictional island in the Caribbean. Through a close reading of the filmic diegesis, DeGuzman delineates the conflict between the colonial regime and the postcolonial insurgency on the island. Placing the Caribbean island in the context of George Lamming’s “archipelagic Americas,” she asserts the “alternative American connectivities” that relate the uprising onscreen with those offscreen, demonstrating the conceptual possibilities of the “postemancipation archipelagic Americas.” Zachary Tavlin and Matthew Hitchman use both J. M. W. Turner’s 1840 painting Slavers Throwing Overboard the Dead and Dying and Charles Chesnutt’s 1901 novel The Marrow of Tradition to argue that the ocean provided a crucial site of transnational and extranational negotiation of racial identity, especially as the traditional conceptions of the American nation and national identity shifted or gave way during the Reconstruction period. In their essay, “Feeling Oceanic: Racial Identity and Postbellum Drift,” the authors take seriously the choice of both Turner and Chesnutt to leave their subjects out at sea, either literally or figuratively, and survey episodes of racial violence from an oceanic rather than national perspective. The ocean thus emerges as a canvas upon which identities are mapped and revised beyond or in defiance of the constraints and contests embedded in continental thinking.

Christopher Lynn and Fidalis Buehler selected the visual works featured in this forum in order to foreground other canvases that present a related range of geographic and paradigmatic reframings of oceanic, islandic, and archipelagic American space. In Lynn’s words: “The selected artists’ deft and clever navigation of complex histories and overlapping cultures is evident in the varied chosen works. These images gesture toward intersectional archipelagic customs, geographic and environmental concerns, politics, contempo–rary living, historical contexts, and colonialism, among other subjects. The works, although independent and singular, sit in close proximity to one another like clustered islands with shared interests.”
We invited scholars to comment on these visual pieces in short essays that trace and engage with the works’ orientation toward or within America as it is constituted across archipelagos and oceans. These responses, by Tashima Thomas, Tiara R. Na’puti, Ipings Liang, Steve Mentz, Hi’ilei Hobart, Caroline Sinavaiana Gabbard, Brandy Nālani McDougall, and Michelle Ann Stephens, consider a single work or a combination of works from distinct perspectives, discovering points of relationality between artists’ projects or, as in the case of Yuki Kihara’s Siva in Motion and Kalisolaite ‘Uhila’s Ongo Mei Moana, approaching the same works from different vantage points and thus revealing unexpected elements and meanings. If these essays, art, and responses illustrate a world in flux, they also illuminate networks of dynamic relationships that structure and adapt continuously to new permutations of archipelagic and oceanic American experience.
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