CARIBBEAN INSULAR MOBILITIES

• CARLO A. CUBERO •

ABSTRACT

....

The article examines the role that processes suggestive of 'mobility' and 'insularity' have played in research that has concerned itself with the constitution of Caribbean island identities. Historically, the relationship between these two concepts has suggested a contradiction or a paradox to unravel. Here, the author reviews core concepts in Caribbeanist research and places 'mobility' and 'insularity' in conversation with each other, arguing that, rather than posing a puzzle to unravel, they operate simultaneously in the process of constituting Caribbean island social identities. Engaging with the simultaneity of stasis and movement can be a powerful tool for researchers seeking to understand the complexities of Caribbean social life.

....

Keywords: Caribbean island identity, mobility, insularity, creolisation, plantation societies, transnationalism, islands

Introduction

This article will evaluate a series of contradictions that have characterised discursive representations of islands, specifically Caribbean islands, and argue that these apparent contradictions represent a creative paradox that characterises the reproduction of island social identities. The central paradoxes that I will consider in this article relate to interplays between what I call mobilities and insularities. This article will consider a strand of Caribbeanist scholarship that addresses island social life using categories suggestive of insularity, which I link to marginality, peripherality, provincialism, isolation, the pristine and the conservative. I will then address another set of representations that stress the West Indies' mobile quality, which I connect to cosmopolitanism, creolisations, transnationalisms, the post-modern and the improvisational. It will be argued that these approaches do not represent competing discourses but are indicative of the paradoxical values that characterise island life. It is further suggested that understanding the paradoxes generated by mobility and insularity as constitutive of island life allows for a more consistent representation of other seemingly contradictory valuations of the West Indies, that is, as a landscape that is simultaneously attractive and repulsive (see Lowenthal 2007 and Sheller 2003).

The mobilities that I will be referring to are networks of people, ideas and goods that traverse a variety of national, regional and global spaces and which inform the contours of island identities. Some of these movements go against the grain of historical, political and academic understandings of the spaces that make up a Caribbean island because they operate outside academic and politically prescribed notions of colonial history, language, ethnicity and landed narratives. These movements have the capacity to deconstruct the

Suomen Antropologi: Journal of the Finnish Anthropological Society
36(1) Spring 2011
PO Box 59, 00014 University of Helsinki, Finland

5

notion of an 'island' as an insular or isolated space because the island place is opened beyond its physical and discursive confines, thereby functioning more as a connector than an isolator of social experiences.

However, these movements ultimately serve to inform a sense of unique island identity. Discourses that produce and reproduce national and island identities are inescapable in the construction of Caribbean identities. Colonial legacies, such as language, ethnicity and landed narratives, are proven to be important building blocks in the imaginings of Caribbean islanders' sense of self and are platforms for political action in their post-colonial context. The island-nation-state nexus continues to be an important resource for a Caribbean islander's sense of self and a tool for political action in the contemporary Caribbean regardless of initiatives to achieve a sense of Caribbean common community (Payne 1978; Price and Price 1997).

A significant way in which movement is restrained in the construction of Caribbean island experience is through academic and political representations of the Caribbean that cluster islands according to their colonial histories and conflate these histories with cultural identities. Caribbeanist research and discourse tends to unproblematically fragment the archipelago into linguistic regions, which corresponds to their colonial past, that is, Spanish, English, French, Danish, and Dutch. These regionalisations classify Caribbean islands according to their linguistic practices and construct a history and an ethnographic present which does not attend to the relationships that occur between island groups that do not share linguistic affinities. In this way, Caribbean islands are constructed as disconnected from each other, developing a discourse of island identity independent of other islands while maintaining connections to its colonial metropolis (Puri 2003).

These approaches to the Caribbean reproduce discourses of empire by constructing islands as operating exclusively within their linguistic and former colonial space. While the regionalisation of the Caribbean corresponds to its colonial past, the insularisation of the islands was reproduced and reified in the nation building processes that ensued throughout the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, giving rise, for instance, to the notion of a national subject presupposed to have provenance from a specific island and identified with a specific island-ethnic discourse, such as Jamaican, Martinican, Puerto Rican or Haitian. Meanwhile, the wealth of research dedicated to Caribbean migration out of the region and its global role has not been matched by research projects that look into the inter-regional migrations or other movements that do not correspond to the centre-periphery or empire-colony binary of movement, regardless of data which demonstrate regional migrations as prevalent (see Puri 2003: 2). 'Movement'—global as well as intra-regional—has been constitutive of West Indian social life. However, mobility accounts for only half the story of Caribbean islandness. Narratives of Caribbean cultural identity create insular spaces and cluster the islands into colonial histories at the same time as constructing the region as a global example for creolisation, diversity and transculturalism. Concomitantly, the notion of a Creole society, born out of a process of global movements and travel, is empirically capable of reproducing discourses of island uniqueness.

This paradox is by no means limited to the Caribbean or to island discourse. It is indicative of the mobile character of the contemporary global condition. For example, James Clifford's *Routes: Travel and Translation in the late Twentieth Century* (1997) offers a collection of writings and reflections that highlight practices of travel and displacement

as constitutive of cultural meanings. His book presents a view of 'human location as constituted by displacement as much as by stasis' (Clifford 1997: 2). More connected to islands, David Lowenthal argues that the Western imaginary of islands can be characterised as alternating between a series of irreconcilable binaries that suggest, amongst other characterisations, seclusion-connection, empty-overpopulated, pristine-plundered, modern-traditional, imprisoning-liberating, paradise-hell, etc. (Lowenthal 2007).

While I draw inspiration from Clifford, Lowenthal and other writers who acknowledge the complexities of places constituted in movement, my approach to the issue of located identities varies slightly from Clifford and Lowenthal's. For Clifford, discourses and practices of insularity work in opposition to histories of movement (Clifford 1997: 7). For Lowenthal, representations of islands are alternatively static or mobile. In this article, I will put forward the notion that discourses and metaphors of mobility and insularity are necessarily constitutive of the social processes of Caribbean islands. I begin by focusing on the different ways in which mobility and insularity are present in the literature that addresses grand narratives of Caribbean identity. By and large, Caribbeanist research takes colonial partitions as a matter of fact, which results in generating insular spaces that conflate linguistic categorisations with ethnic and island identities. And yet, the same body of work represents Caribbean islanders as travellers and engaging in meaningful relationships with different islands and locations. However, markers for movements have a tendency to be written as separate from insular discourses and practices. In doing so, Caribbeanist research can reproduce an inconsistency that threatens the categories that sustain its discourse.

The subsequent sections will look at this discrepancy in three specific historical concepts that have been consistently deployed to address the historical and sociological development of Caribbean society—'plantation', 'creolisation' and 'transnationalism'. The contradictions embedded in how Caribbeanists have treated these concepts suggest an inconsistency that can be critiqued as potentially cancelling their analytical use or as confusing the experience they are trying to explain. However, I will argue that the inconsistency arises from thinking of the effects of mobility and insularity as separate constituents instead of mutually informing each other in a positive tension. My intention is to place representations of insularity in relation to markers of mobility and to argue that mobility and insularity create a positive tension through which Caribbean islanders experience continuities and change.

General views of Caribbean insularities and mobilities

A trend in Caribbeanist research is to relate cultural patterns such as language, politics and race relations of specific Caribbean islands to the historical relationship with their respective European metropolis. As a result, the Caribbean region is divided into groups of islands according to their respective European coloniser. In general terms, the islands of the Caribbean are discursively divided into the Anglophone Caribbean, with ties to the United States and England, the Francophone Caribbean which are incorporated into France as overseas departments, the Dutch dependencies, and the Hispanic Caribbean which is discursively linked to Latin America (Burac 1995; Hennessy 2000).

The immobility suggested by colonial continuities—where the islands are seen as un-related to each other—are compounded by understandings of 'island' as an insular space, and presupposed in Caribbeanist research. In the concluding chapter of *Caribbean Contours*, an edited book that presents an overall view of Caribbean history and ethnicity, Gordon Lewis writes:

> Moreover, and perhaps more importantly, these societies have been, and for the most part still are small island societies marked by psychological insularity; an inward-turned communal life in which everybody seems to know everybody else. That is obvious, of course, in small island capital towns such as Bridgetown, Barbados, or Castries, St. Lucia, but surprisingly is also a marked feature even of larger cities such as Havana, or San Juan, Puerto Rico. Whereas North American life is continental, Caribbean life is island oriented. (Lewis 1985: 219)

Insular attitudes or mind sets of Caribbeans are also elicited to account for the failure of political and economic integrationist initiatives, such as the Caribbean Community (CARICOM). In his Ph.D. thesis, Anthony Payne (1978) shows how CARICOM was fraught with difficulties and contradictions on many levels, many of them based on the economic differences between the island units. However, for Payne, the most salient feature in CARICOM's political culture 'is, and always has been, the intensity of insular self regard. (…) the lengths to which this tendency is taken seem to reach absurd proportions' (Payne 1978: 33). Sidney Mintz (1996) attributes political fragmentations to the constellation of circumstances brought about by geology, the region's colonial history, and its current post-colonial condition where the persisting influence of the metropolitan powers are still being felt (Mintz 1996: 43). From these perspectives, the political fragmentation of the Caribbean is written as having an unavoidable or inevitable quality to it that can come across as naturalised. This inherent and unbreachable distance between the islands does not enable islanders to engage in a coherent regional political project.

Caribbean fragmentation is also reproduced by academic institutions and social research agendas. The trend can be appreciated in volumes that organise their discussions according to linguistic expressions of the islands, such as Hispanic, Francophone, Anglo or Dutch Caribbean. Trouillot (1992) and Hennessy (2000) have addressed, in separate essays, the predominance of Anglophone Caribbean studies among British and North American research institutions. These institutional practices have the capacity to leave the Hispanic Caribbean outside the Caribbean research agenda by linking Spanish speaking islands to the historical and discursive space of Latin America. The Spanish speaking Caribbean is then constructed in relation to continental processes rather than to the Caribbean (Hennessy 2000). In the same way, academic research that corresponds to colonial narratives of the region does not address the relationships between other islands of the Caribbean and the site being researched and enhances the distance between the islands.

Puri (2003) argues that a lack of attention to intra-regional migration, which leads to fragmentation, can be understood as the result of 'a configuration of power in which the funding, research, and development priorities of metropolitan universities continue to set the agenda' (Puri 2003: 4). I would add that these types of research projects suggest an understanding of culture, identity and social experience that is spatially and temporally

stable, where culture and the ethnographic object are bound to a specific location and to a specific history (Gupta and Ferguson [eds] 1997). In the case of the Caribbean, the ethnographic subjects are pinned to colonial histories and island-nation-states, or nation-states as in distinctions between Spanish speaking Dominicans and Francophone Haitians who share the same island.

Paradoxically, Caribbeanist literature and research acknowledge the mobile condition of Caribbean society. However, either these movements are relegated to a secondary status and are not followed up as a focus of study or they are treated as a separate domain of Caribbean life, independently from discourses and practices of insularity. The most prominent marker of movement of the Caribbean lies in the foundational narrative of the region. The contemporary Caribbean is the product of oceanic movements and interactions of a global scale that have come together in an unfinished process of becoming (Benítez-Rojo 1989; Glissant 1989; Mintz 1974). It is represented as a place of interaction of histories, narratives and identities from all over the world, eliciting metaphors of networks and flows rather than clusters of islands on the margins of global experiences. It is constructed as a major node in a rhizome-like network that interlaces experiences, desires and imaginaries on a global scale (Benítez-Rojo 1989). The scope of global interlacings that the Caribbean process suggests is capable of eluding explanation or rational containment.

> I start from the belief that 'Caribbeanness' is a system full of noise and opacity, a nonlinear system, an unpredictable system—in short, a chaotic system beyond the total reach of any specific kind of knowledge or interpretation of the world. To my way of thinking, no perspective or human thought—whether premodern, modern, or postmodern—can by itself define the Caribbean's complex socio-cultural interplay. We need all of them at the same time. (Benítez-Rojo 1995: 255)

Movements within the Caribbean are also addressed in Caribbeanist scholarly literature. By placing islanders in relation to a variety of island spaces and colonial histories, these movements support the imagery of the Caribbean as a place of movement and flow rather than a mosaic of clustered islands. They locate Caribbeans outside of colonial movements and categorisations of the region. These movements are written alongside insularist observations, but are nonetheless treated as a separate discourse from insularism. Gordon Lewis, referenced earlier as writing that the Caribbean is composed of 'small island societies marked by psychological insularity; an inward communal life', writes later in the same essay:

> Intraregional migration has been the order of the day, especially in the eastern Caribbean where, for example, labourers go south to work in the oil refineries of Aruba and Trinidad and others go north to seek jobs in the tourist industry of the US Virgin Islands. Whole settlements of contract workers, both bonded and illegal, become parts of their adopted homes: Grenadians in Trinidad, Antiguans in the Virgin Islands, Jamaicans in Panama, and Dominicans in Puerto Rico. (Lewis 1985: 221)

The scope of these movements can be appreciated to such a scale that they can be understood as a characteristic feature of Caribbean life. Describing the twentieth-century Caribbean migrations, Hoetink (1985) writes about Curaçaoans working in Suriname, Barbadians in Peru, tens of thousands of Jamaicans and British Virgin Islanders working in Panama and along the coast of Central America. Even more recently, around 1985,

many Dominicans moved to Puerto Rico, hundreds of British Windward Islanders worked in the refineries of Aruba and Curaçao, some 40,000 Guyanese are in Suriname, there is a significant Haitian presence in St. Marteen, the French Antilles and French Guiana, and Trinidad has absorbed thousands of migrants from the Commonwealth's smaller Caribbean islands. Hoetink concludes:

> Such movements attest to the connections between all parts of the Caribbean that we have so artificially separated; they make the social fabric of the region more complicated and in some ways more unified; and they have in some instances profound influence on power, and hence racial relations. Islands such as those in the Caribbean never have been entirely isolated but have continuously invented migration; their Robinson Crusoes have always had a chance to sight a ship. (Hoetink 1985: 76)

It is as if there were two antagonistic paradigms used to address the Caribbean: one prioritising the open-ended, processual, mobile and the uncontained, and another the colonial, racialised and finite. It reads like a convenient choice between two available discourses that one could rely on to address different aspects of Caribbean life (i.e. poverty as a product of colonialism and neo-colonialism, which suggests insularity vs. tourism and its open-ended, global flow of capital and goods that market the islands as pleasure commodities). Rather than seeing these two paradigms as locked against each other, or as a narrative choice, I would argue that they are not antagonistic but feed into the same process.

Plantation

The plantation is the space that contains the foundation myths and narratives from which the Caribbean emerges. Representations of the plantation characterise it as a confined and insularising place, from which modern Caribbean racial typologies were produced, stabilised and put into practice. At the same time, the plantation is written up as the place of creative encounter; as a location full of crevices and liminal spaces from where creative experiences, suggestive of mobility, question and de-stabilise racial and ethnic continuities.

The historical narrative of the contemporary Caribbean begins with Europe's expansionist project to the Americas in the late fifteenth century. The first Europeans to establish themselves in the Caribbean, initiating the process that would lead to the formation of the contemporary Caribbean, were representatives of the Spanish crown. Spanish colonists successfully transplanted sugar to the Caribbean and initiated plantations as a proto-industrial mode of production that would last over four hundred years. The colonists turned to Dutch and Portuguese slave traders, who acquired their slaves from the Western regions of Africa, for a steady supply of slaves to work their plantations. The success of the plantation system, which included coffee, tobacco and sugar for European consumption, led other European powers to follow suit. Within one hundred years of the Spanish arrival in the Antilles, England, France, and The Netherlands had successfully consolidated their own slave labour based plantation systems on the smaller islands of the Caribbean, Jamaica and the western half of Hispaniola. The constant need for slave labour, made more acute during the nineteenth-century's process of emancipation,

motivated Europeans to import workers from India, China, Java, the Levant and the more impoverished parts of Europe (Mintz 1974).

The plantation, it has been argued, became the primary location for the foundational discourse of the Caribbean's contemporary political economy (Bolland 1998). Nigel Bolland, in his critique of the concept of plantation societies, describes representations of the plantation space as:

> The social organisation and culture associated with plantation production is seen as a microcosm of the whole society. The distinguishing features of the plantation—which include mono-crop production for export, strong monopolistic tendencies, a rigid system of social stratification that includes a high correlation between racial and class hierarchies, a weak community structure, the marginality of peasants who engage in subsistence production as well as periodic work on the plantations—make it the nexus of cultural and political, as well as economical, activities. (Bolland 1998: 5)

Bolland continues to show how contemporary authors argue that the Caribbean's current state of poverty and marginalisation in the global economic and political sphere have a precedent in the plantation mode of production. Among other reasons, the plantation is dependent on the 'inputs and markets of the metropolis, which leads to underdevelopment and so to persistent powerlessness and poverty of the majority of the population' (Bolland 1998: 6). This link to the metropolis is sustained by the isolation and confinement of the plantation in relation to spaces outside of it.

> Jamaican slave society was loosely integrated; so much so, that one hesitates to call it a society since all that it amounted to was an ill-organised system of exploitation (…) Jamaica is best seen more as a collection of autonomous plantations, each a self-contained community with its internal mechanisms of power, than as a total social system. (Patterson 1967: 70 cited in Bolland 1998: 5)

The plantation is also understood as a place that precedes contemporary Caribbean social relations (Bolland 1998; Giovannetti 2006). These representations emphasise the role that the plantation played in the creation of racial types that set the scene for contemporary race relations in the Caribbean (Oostindie 1996; Giovannetti 2006). It is the location where knowledge of Caribbean races was developed as 'a useful, maybe necessary, principle of control' (Thompson 1975: 17 cited in Giovannetti 2006: 16). This system of control was reproduced through a systemic organisational structure that maintained Africans and their descendants in a subordinate position of power in relation to European settlers and their descendants (John 1999 cited in Giovannetti 2006: 16).

The plantation becomes then the historical precedent for the creation of Caribbean racial identities. It constituted a 'total institution' where a new identity is imposed on its inmates (Bolland 1998). Mintz (1990: 39) and Manuel Moreno-Fraginals (2001: 264) have also stressed the plantation's 'semi-military' and 'prison-like character, respectively' (Giovannetti 2006). The internal politics of the plantation required fixing the subject as a moral being (Allen 1998), racialised and in a specific location within Caribbean society (Giovannetti 2006), a fixing that many argue continues to be reproduced in contemporary Caribbean society (Giovannetti 2006; see Bolland 1998 for critique).

> The slave society of the Leeward Islands at the end of the eighteenth century was divided into separate groups, clearly marked off from each other by the differences of local and social status, of political

rights and economic opportunity, and of racial origin and culture. The existence of these separate groups is so striking that it tends to obscure the existence of the community of which they were all part. But this community did exist, and its fundamental principles of inequality and subordination based on race and status were firmly impressed upon the lives of all its members. It was these basic principles, embodying the necessities of the West Indian slave system which determined the ordering of separate groups as part of a community and held them all together within a single social structure. (Goveia 1965 cited in Bolland 1998)

Aside from creating a fixed subject and a fixed social structure, the plantation also functions as the foundation for discussing island differences within the region. Each island is constructed as having its own particular plantation politics, which have led to contemporary differences amongst the islands. Sidney Mintz (1974) points to the fact that the degree of plantation exploitation was not homogenous throughout the region, but subject to the different intentions that each European power had towards the Antilles. Mintz shows how the politics of colonisation and the degree of plantation exploitation varied from one European power to the next and relates these plantation politics to contemporary socio-cultural and ethnic constructions of Caribbean islands. The Spanish crown was actively involved in the process of colonisation, expecting its subjects to establish themselves on the islands on a long-term basis producing an 'early process of "creolisation" or "indigenation", mestizaje' (Mintz 1996: 43). These early processes of creolisation are related to the consolidation of island identities and concomitant national identities (Mintz 1974: 314).

Meanwhile, the British and Dutch are constructed as having a more entrepreneurial approach to their exploitation of the Caribbean. The non-Hispanic colonisation of the Caribbean was represented by individuals who established themselves in the Caribbean for the sole purpose of investing in a plantation scheme that would generate profits, followed by a return to their homeland. The different politics of colonisation by each European power meant that each island experienced different relationships with their respective coloniser. The quality of such a relationship provides for each island to develop a unique ethnic composition and language use (Mintz 1996; Lewis 1983).

This type of research suggests that plantation politics represent the founding paradigm for the creation of the Caribbean subject as being in a marginal location in relation to global economics and politics, racialised and insularised through an island-nation-state that was forged in a colonial relationship. From this gaze, the plantation represents a fixed location, a globally isolated institution that produces knowledge and practices which construct subjects and places as inexorably located under its own discourse. These models, while relevant in addressing historical events that shape the Caribbean, have come under criticism for simplifying the complexities of the Caribbean process. Plantation-society models seem to conflate the predominant institutional and economic feature of the Caribbean with social and cultural systems (Bolland 1998: 6–7). Research that considers the social and cultural aspects of plantation societies suggests that the plantation system, while leaving a distinctive and influential legacy to the region, did not achieve cultural hegemony over the plantation owners or the workers. Following such a premise, then, the binaries and insularisations supposed to have been the result of the plantation are questioned and a more complicated and mobile picture of plantation society emerges.

The most mobile quality of plantation society is the notion of the plantation as a place of encounter, where a variety of histories and narratives converge in a continuous process of relation (Glissant 1989). The Caribbean became a meeting place of peoples that represented regions from all over the world. The assumed continuity between racial and social conditions that are dominant in the insular plantation model are problematised because the dichotomy between European/African gets complicated with the added elements of Chinese, East Indians, Javanese, mainland indigenes and Levantines who also flocked to the Caribbean. This melange of experiences, languages, religions, institutions and histories were forged together in a relationship of violence and slavery to create a distinct and unique Creole culture (Lewis 1983; Glissant 1989).

In her discussion of the notion of the Caribbean Creole, Carolyn Allen (1998) discusses how the category of the Creole, the product of Caribbean processes of relation, was constructed in ways that highlighted the contradictions behind the unitary language, place or race within the Caribbean plantation space. While the term Creole carries wide ranging connotations, it fundamentally refers to the person that emerges from the Caribbean context, within the Caribbean. This emergence is linked to the idea of mixture and difference. It can refer to having blood relations with any of the ethnic groups that converged in the Caribbean, in which case it also carries a reference to a place outside the Caribbean. It can refer to language and to moral attitudes (Allen 1998). In this case, distinctions will be made between the Caribbean-born European and the European-born European or between the African-born and the Caribbean-born African. But differences are complicated when the Creole is the product of mixed race unions or speaks languages that do not correspond exclusively to any from Africa, Europe, China, the Pacific, the East Indies or the Levant, but are the product of contact and interactions with different languages and peoples. These processes of mixtures and relations are constructed as reproducing themselves in perpetuity, in a rhizome-like sequence structured by plantation systems (Benítez-Rojo 1989). Creolisation does not necessarily suggest a process towards reconciliation of Caribbean narratives, because each plantation carries within it discrete elements and qualities that develop its own character (Allen 1998: 45).

Looking at these processes as separate or contradictory results in narratives that tend to prioritise either the insular and oppressive effects of the plantation in Caribbean history and contemporary politics or construct the plantation as a place of creativity, subversiveness and movement where the ironic and the irreverent are expressed through processes of encounters. These narratives emphasise the liminal spaces and crevices within the plantation where Caribbean subjects disrupted or operated on the margins of the structure of power that supposed the plantation a prison (Olwig 1993). Prioritising either perspective, addressing each narrative as separate or attempting to untangle their contradictions has the potential for creating a confusing and inconsistent picture of the Caribbean. In my view, plantation processes that result in island-nation-states have operated in relation to processes of mixtures and hybridities in the constitution of Caribbean island identities. These two approaches create a positive tension from which Caribbean islanders fashion a sense of insular uniqueness in relation to global connections. The Caribbean plantation can be pictured as a prison, a place where knowledges, narratives and subjects are fixed, both discursively and physically. But this insular and disconnected location also generates a crucible, where subjects and identities acquire new forms and meanings and

create a distinct language, cosmology and deconstruct racial uniformities. This double imagery of the plantation does not necessarily constitute a contradiction, but that it is emblematic of the mobile and insular processes that characterise the Caribbean process.

Creole

Perhaps the most prominent marker for movement in the Caribbean narrative of identity is the discourse of creolisation and similar processes of mixture, hybridity, miscegenations and transculturations. Creolisations respond to understandings of processes of continuity and change in a transposed and colonial context. I do not intend to conduct a comprehensive review of creolisation discourse in this section. Instead, I will highlight the ways in which creolisation is deployed to suggest a Caribbean identity characterised by mobility and difference at the same time as it is used to define, delimit and reproduce insular identities.

As I mentioned in the previous section, creolisation is a term that carries wide ranging implications but, in the Caribbeanist context, it is consistently used to refer to the process by which the Caribbean person is constituted. Historically, it has been deployed to address ideas on Caribbean race, blood, moral values, locality and language (Allen 1998). It is also used to suggest the Caribbean process as improvised, creative, democratic and liberated from discourses of empire (Quintero-Rivera 1998; Benítez-Rojo 1989; Guilbault 1994). It is described as a mobile and continuous process (Shepherd and Richards 1998; Burton 1995) that accounts for the multiplicity of narratives and locations that converge in the Caribbean in a constant process of interaction. The Caribbean has been addressed as a global example for creolisation.

> Proclaimed since its colonization as both crucible and epitome of 'creole' culture(s), it apparently follows that the Caribbean region be determined the 'root metaphor' we seek as we try to get a better grasp on the evermore indeterminate yet interconnected terrain around us. (Khan 2001: 271–272)

Caribbean creolisation is constructed as the product of processes that involve different forms of 'rejection, adaptation, accommodation, imitation, invention' of forms, narratives and experiences (Allen 1998: 44). Amongst other things creolisation suggests (a) a distancing from the notion of origins and a complication in reconstructing a type of path to a sense of essence or source; (b) a historical experience of colonialism which gives rise to its use as a 'cross-cultural encounter and the location of creoleness at an intersection, negotiating between identities and forces, and defined by its relocations'; (c) a continuous process with new ingredients being added; and (d) a multiplicity of Creole forms which makes 'context and point of view crucial in its understanding' (Allen 1998: 44).

Creolisation is also located in a tense relationship between the similar and the dissimilar or between difference and sameness (Allen 1998; Burton 1995). In theory, the Creole subject draws from a variety of specific locations and forms, though possibly creolized themselves, and, through a process that negotiates socio-historical circumstances and collective creativity (Bolland 1998), the subject fashions a distinct sense of self. However, this process does not lead to a homogenous state of the collective (Bolland 1998) for

Caribbean societies, and the creolisation process itself is full of internal contradictions and conflicts that reproduce internal divisions based on, amongst other categories, race, class, gender, island identity, ethnicity and language. I would like to read this tension between difference and sameness as analogous to mobility and insularity. In this reading, mobile processes account for the ephemeral, the interactive and change, and insularity suggests the stable, continuous and located.

The idea of a *créolité* identity is associated with the Franco-Caribbean literary movement of the same name. The *créolité* movement revolves around the intentions of engaging creatively and politically with a region characterised by difference. The *créolité* manifesto, *Eloge de la Créolité* (1989), was the joint work of Martinican writers Jean Bernabé, Patrick Chamoiseau and Raphaël Confiant. In it, the authors react against popular and academic discourses of Caribbean culture that locate the elements that constitute Caribbeanness outside the Caribbean, such as Europe or Africa historically and America or India in the present. The *créolité* movement looks for a sense of the Antillean or Antillanité through creoleness. Creoleness is defined as an open specificity, a concept that engages with the global interaction of peoples and histories to shape a unique Caribbean experience, 'united on the same soil by the yoke of history' (Bernabé et al. 1989). *Créolité* insists on the necessary complexity of Caribbean identity and disputes essentializing any character of Caribbean identity with arguments for a more mobile, open and non-racial discourse (Burton 1995: 152). It negates any sense of the universal, static or monolingual category in the constitution of the Caribbean. Instead, it promotes a gathering of histories and cultures that engage in their Caribbeanness through a process of relation (Glissant 1989). In the *créolité* literary discourse, the Caribbean has always been in a state of formation, constantly reshaping itself, nurtured through infinite wanderings across locations and experiences (Dash 1996): a 'brewing of a stew' (Morse 1996: 31); a free-floating idea of multiplicitous growth, unfixed in any primordial position but extending in all directions through a vast network of branches (Burton 1995; Glissant 1989: 67), thereby reacting against totalising histories and providing for a constant negotiation of moving in many directions (Benítez-Rojo 1989: 54).

The *créolité* discourse suggests a rejection of the idea that Caribbean expressions are a readable phenomenon, but rather that they are constituted in vagueness and in truncated messages that are in constant flux and shaping (Benítez-Rojo 1989). Furthermore the history of the Antilles and its contemporary experience are beyond ethnographic and historical knowledge, and the comings and goings of peoples and ideas that have made up and continue to transform the Caribbean can only be grasped through 'poetic knowledge, romantic knowledge, literary and artistic knowledge' (Bernabé et al. 1989 cited in Price and Price 1997:8). The Antilles find their unique identity and uniqueness in the improvised use of multiple histories and spaces (Benítez-Rojo 1989; Quintero-Rivera 1998) and it must be the writer who forges a new discourse that transcends literary genres and traditional notions of time and space, while bringing a new language, representative of the Caribbean experience, into existence (Bernabé et al. 1989).

The *créolité* literary discourse has been successful in accommodating, theoretically, the multitude of voices and histories that shape the Caribbean. In its political discourse, however, *créolité* is less inclusive. The *créolité* manifesto, *Eloge de la Créolité* (1989),

acknowledges a common thread of experience of the Antilles and advocates a Caribbean confederation as the only way to achieve global recognition and confront global hegemonic processes. However, this call for Caribbean unity is based on a common historical and cultural continuity that prioritises the Francophone Caribbean. Its anti-nationalist and non-racialist discourse draws from the Martinican case and its scope focuses on the island's condition as an overseas department of France (Burton 1995).

In other readings, the notion of creolisation has been inextricably linked to the process of nation building in the Caribbean (Bolland 1998). Earlier, I quoted Mintz (1974) where he suggests a direct relationship between the emergence of a Creole identity and the formation of a national identity amongst islands of the Hispanic Caribbean. The connection between a Creole consciousness and national awakening in Jamaica was addressed by Kamau Brathwaite, the renowned Jamaican poet and sociologist. A central question in Brathwaite's work concerned itself with the issue of whether the political power that had been vested in the black majority after independence could successfully articulate an ideal of a 'national culture' (Bollans 1998: 13). Not surprisingly, his reading of Jamaican history pointed to the process of 'creolisation as the source of authentic Jamaican culture, rooted in the descendants of the ex-slaves' (Bolland 1998: 13).

Linked to the idea of the Creole subject is the notion that the Creole person constitutes a unique person or a person who is derived from the Old World but who developed and came to being in the New World (Glissant 1995). This Creole subject does not necessarily respond to the schemes and structures of Europe or Africa, or other locations that congregate in the Caribbean, but constitutes a subject who fashions a new sense of identity. He or she has an intimate knowledge of the land 'being committed to it by experience and/or attachment' (Allen 1998: 40). As an intermediary between two worlds, the empire and the colony, constituting a third person, the Creole distances him or herself from the imperial project and creates a new society with claims to legitimate rule and sovereignty (Mintz 1971; Bolland 1998: 3).

The Creole also creates a new language which is distinct and unique to the elements that initially arrived in the Caribbean. Creole language is associated with novel linguistic variations that emerged in Jamaica (Allen 1998), Haiti, Guadeloupe, Martinique, French Guyana, St. Martin (Glissant 1989) and the Dutch Caribbean—Aruba, Bonaire and Curaçao—as well as elements of the population in Grenada, Dominica, St. Lucia and Trinidad (Mintz and Price 1985). While the term Creole is used to address the predominant languages in these islands, there is an ambiguity as to whether it refers to a distinct language or to the process by which they came to be. On the one hand, it is used to address the process of relation and colonialism that preceded it and continues to inform its development (Glissant 1995). On the other, it is used to address the specific language that is spoken in each island. This is problematic because the language spoken in each island, while undoubtedly responding to a similar process of mixture and colonialism, responds to its own historical circumstances and is, effectively, a different language. Regardless, the term is used to address specific languages and their nationalisation through public education systems, radio, music compositions and press (Glissant 1989; Guilbault 1993).

Contrary to literary constructions of creolisation, these understandings of creolisation ultimately function to stabilise and fix the Caribbean person. Creolisation creates a

subject that is intimately linked to the land, and fosters nationalist sentiments that are island-centred or centred on its colonial past. Language becomes a constant, rather than an open specificity, with calls to standardize Creole and incorporate it into the national curriculum (Burton 1995; Glissant 1989). 'As popularly conceived, then, the image of creole culture and a creole society emphasises social unity: the new nation as a creole community' (Bolland 1998: 2). The political idea of a 'new nation' arising from a 'creole community' rests upon the notion of a common culture that somehow establishes the national limits and 'constitutes the ideology of a particular social segment, namely a middle class intelligentsia that seeks a leading role in an integrated, newly independent society' (Bolland 1998: 4).

With these contradictions, creolisation has the possibility of losing its analytical and creative strength. Its premise is perhaps too generalised. The idea of creolisation as a discourse of mixture does not necessarily carry a Caribbean specificity, for similar comments can be made about identity in general in contemporary research that looks at global transactions and exchanges of people and ideas (Hannerz 1987; Khan 2001).

> Through its being hegemonic, however, 'creole' remains definitive, and thus recapitulates a safe terrain, rather than diverting normative discourses of difference. 'Creole' historically has signalled *familiar* or *recognizable* diversity. It thereby recapitulates the same imaginary and is thus a conforming rather than subversive model of culture and society. (Khan 2001: 289, emphasis in original)

It is as if creolisation carries a unitary understanding of culture. It does not seem to add much to the discussion of cultural continuities and changes because it reproduces the purities which it set out to counteract in the first place. But of more concern is the suggestion that it is a conformist and conservative discourse, lacking the kind of creative subversion that is articulated by the *créolité* movement. It seems to carry a potential to gloss over internal differences, such as in the case of language—many in the Caribbean are called Creole—and internal social divisions. It is criticised for addressing 'culture' as a generalised and all encompassing entity, with a ubiquitous quality that does not contemplate an effective ethnographic insight of the quotidian (Khan 2001). It has the potential of becoming an abstract 'root metaphor' (Hannerz 1987) with a lack of analytical application to the understanding of social relations.

These criticisms do not necessarily argue against the idea of a Caribbean process of interaction, transculturalism, hybridity and other processes of cultural relations. Instead, these concerns argue for historicizing the Caribbean process from perspectives that are sensitive to internal differentiations of Caribbean societies. For example, as Kahn (2001: 292) would argue: 'Perhaps what is globally applicable about creolization is not culture (as a reified abstraction) but class and the cultures of particular class positions.' In a similar vein, Paul Gilroy's project looks into shifting representations of Caribbean processes of modern identity away from categories that correspond to the intellectual heritage of the Enlightenment. Gilroy's project enquires into the relationships and intersections created by Atlantic crossings in the constructions of the modern subject. This enquiry, which includes the Caribbean, the rest of the Americas, Africa and Europe, takes us on a journey that examines the convergences between the notions of nationality, ethnicity, authenticity and continuities as 'characteristically modern phenomena' (Gilroy 1993a: 2) and critiques

the success of such concepts by valuing ideas of the fractal, the hybrid, the restless, the transnational and other mobile discourses and practices.

Paul Gilroy is particularly interested in the Atlantic interactions that originated from the process of enslaving Africans. This particular historical narrative looks at the ways in which black intellectuals have engaged with the typologies and intellectual traditions associated with Western modernity. He calls this system of interactions and communications the 'black Atlantic'. Through discussions of a black Atlantic, Gilroy highlights the ways in which black experiences operate simultaneously within and outside the project of modernity. Gilroy constructs a narrative whereby the black Atlantic experience of modernity is both a contributor and a victim of exemplary modern ideas such as the pursuit of freedom, citizenship and social and political autonomy. His research centres on the ways in which black intellectuals and artists created a sense of the modern at the same time as they were victimised by it.

The process of this double consciousness is enacted through transatlantic crossings. Gilroy makes the sea the centre of his explorations and makes it the location of Western modernity. Historicizing the ocean in this way shifts attention away from stable narratives and values movement as an important characteristic of modernity. It offers an alternative reading of cultural history as processual and non-essentialist, where the ocean functions as a metaphor from which we can grasp the reconfiguration of space and time initiated by the movements that typify modernity. Focusing on the ocean as a location of study pushes aside previous imagery of networks or webs and proposes a system of communication that enmeshes previously distant locations into an amorphous continuity centred on the sea. But, Gilroy's mobile, inspiring and creative ocean is balanced by its capacity to contain and reproduce notions of ethnicity and nationalism. The attraction to this project lies in the creative contrasts and political subversions that spring out of such circumstances.

> By directing attention repeatedly towards crossing experiences and other translocal histories, the idea of the black Atlantic not only deepens our understandings of modern statecraft, commercial power and their relationship to territory and space, it also summons some of the tough conceptual problems that can imprison or ossify the idea of culture. (Gilroy 1993b: 2)

Gilroy's project is more focused on highlighting the mobile conditions and itinerant practices of black intellectuals and artists that were instrumental in constructing political and artistic programmes of modernity. Mobility in this case, does not only relate to the physical travels carried out by the individuals he is considering, but to the intellectual and creative interactions that were produced through these travels. By focusing on the restless temperament of his characters, Gilroy traces a genealogy of ideas and influences that connect the Caribbean, United States, Europe and Africa. The intellectual genealogy of the black Atlantic corresponds in many ways to processes of hybridity and creolisation elicited in discussions of Caribbean ethnicities, particularly on the issue of creating a sense of self by taking nourishment from a variety of resources in such a way as to complicate any idea of the essential or of the source.

> The fractal patterns of cultural and political exchange and transformation that we try and specify through manifestly inadequate theoretical terms like creolisation and syncretism indicate how both ethnicities and political cultures have been made anew in ways that are significant not simply for

the peoples of the Caribbean but for Europe, for Africa, especially Liberia and Sierra Leone, and of course, for black America. (Gilroy 1993a: 15)

One of Gilroy's goals is to propose a research and political agenda that moves away from notions of ethnicity and race and their connection to ideas of culture and identity. He evokes terminology and processes such as creolisation and hybridity, not to elicit the creation of a new modern subject, but to construct a subject that goes beyond national, racial, ethnic and other bounded classifications. Gilroy's proposal is, effectively, a call to move away from discourses that draw on categorisations that respond to racial codes and imperial paradigms. In his view, this line of thinking reproduces an ideology of difference based on raciological thinking, fostering racism and concomitant violence which produces an unsustainable ethical stance and hinders a stable and morally consistent political project. Instead, Gilroy encourages us to examine raciological discourses as the product of morally problematic discourses such as imperialism, slavery and fascism. By recognising the legacy of essentialist discourse, Gilroy invites his readers to develop a rhetoric that displaces essentialisms, accept its violent heritage and strive to develop an inclusive and, more democratic project.

Gilroy's work has encouraged Caribbeanists to think and write about the mobile elements that constitute Caribbean identity and to see these movements as democratising (see Ramnarine 2007). Gilroy's ideas invite us to address the non-terrestrial dimension of Caribbean narratives and he challenges his reader not to focus on the Caribbean as an ethnic construction but as an identity that responds to discourses and practices that are constituted in a restless state of transience.

However, Gilroy's suggested call to challenge insularities in the construction of Caribbean social life is difficult to relate to in ethnographic terms. As has become apparent in the history of CARICOM, for example, island uniqueness and island difference is an important frame of reference in the construction of political strategies and a potent source of island activism. In a previous publication (Cubero 2008), I show how different kinds of insularirites are deployed in political contestations surrounding tourism development in the northeastern Caribbean. Caribbean's insularities are produced through the mobile processes of history that connect the islands to broader spaces. But, at the same time, mobile practices, and the fluid identities that arise from them, function to reproduce an insular rhetoric.

The contradiction that creolisation seems to embody stems from a rationale that separates mobility and insularity in the constitutive process of the Caribbean. While the criticisms directed towards creolists are founded in a consistent logic, they are fuelled by an understanding of mobility and insularity as mutually exclusionary practices in need of separation or reconciliation. A more consistent picture of Caribbean identity politics emerges when the contradictions of creolisation discourse understood as a negative paradox but represent a dialectic relation in the production and reproduction of Caribbean island identity.

Transnationalism

Caribbean transnationalism usually refers to the migration, more intensive after World War II, of Caribbeans to metropolitan locations that maintain links to their island of 'origin'. Caribbean transnationalist research pays special attention to the quality of the relationships that transmigrants sustain between their host society and their island, highlighting the growing interconnectivity between people in the contemporary world.

> We define 'transnationalism' as the processes by which immigrants forge and sustain multi-stranded social relations that link together their societies of origins and settlement. We call these processes transnationalism to emphasize that many immigrants today build social fields that cross geographic, cultural, and political borders. (…) Transmigrants take actions, make decisions, and develop subjectivities and identities embedded in networks of relationships that connect them simultaneously to two or more nation-states (Basch, Glick-Schiller and Szanton-Blanc 1994: 7).

Transmigrants are represented as confronting a variety of identity politics in relation to the location in which they find themselves and negotiating these politics accordingly. The quality of interconnections between various nation-states is significant because, through these multi-national relationships, notions of citizenship, community and ethnicity are re-examined as subjects negotiate social relations according to the social context in which they find themselves. As transmigrants foster intimate relationships with the societies which they are moving to and from, they participate in processes that redefine the boundaries as well as reconfigure the limits of the nation in which they live and work. This type of research rests on the fluidity of identity politics. It relates anthropological constructions of identity to historical processes of power and capital, which vary from one location to the next. It examines the ways in which transmigrants shape, and are affected by, hegemonic constructions of identity. Transnationalist research necessarily suggests a reconfiguration of social spaces and a re-evaluation of social categories that spring from a practice of movement through different national spaces. The Caribbean is consistently represented as a transnational society. Throughout the twentieth century Caribbeans have been travelling extensively to metropolitan centres either in North America or to Europe. Caribbean transnational research looks into the ways in which the politics of socio-cultural categories of identity vary from the island to the host society and focuses on how Caribbeans negotiate fluctuating identity politics.

All Caribbean islands have a transnational relationship with some metropolitan location (Negrón-Muntaner et al. 1997; Sánchez-Korrol 1983; Anselin 1995; Basch et al. 1994). This trend is significant because it opens the island space beyond its landed confines and recognises movement as an integral part of contemporary Caribbean life (Olwig 1993). Concomitantly, it adds a further mobile dimension to the already fluid ethnic categories that typify the Caribbean process. It also problematises notions of global political and economic structurings such as centre-periphery because the scope of interconnections that transmigrants reproduce between the two societies blur the boundaries that separate the presumed centre and periphery (Basch et al.1994).

Caribbean transnational research points to the fluidity of categories of identity and emphasises the contradictions and ironies that emerge out of these fluidities. In the case of Puerto Rican transmigrants to the United States, research underlines the inconsistency

of state politics in reinforcing imagery of ethnic difference with regards Puerto Ricans in the US despite the fact that they travel to the US as citizens (Ramos-Zayas 2003). The scope of these movements has prompted comments about Puerto Rico performing as a commuter nation, rather than a fixed territorialized ethnicity, with the planes that carry Puerto Ricans to and from the US resembling aerial buses more than commercial aircraft (Torre et al. 1994). In a similar way, Haitians living in the US confront different racial typologies than those in their native Haiti and deploy different rhetoric and strategies to achieve social mobility in the US (Basch et al. 1994). At the same time, Haitian transmigrants continue to leave their mark on Haitian politics as politicians from Haiti draw on their support for the promotion of their policies on the island (Basch et al. 1994). These cases can be seen as a continuation of practices of movement that have historically been an important feature of Caribbean life.

However, one could argue that transnationalist research functions to reinforce Caribbean insularities while adding a mobile dimension to Caribbean identity. Transnationalist research tends to focus on binary movements from an island to a metropolitan location abroad: France for the Francophone Caribbean (Anselin 1995), the UK for the Anglophone Caribbean, or to nations such as the US, which is the focus of economic and political power in the region. In this way, one could argue that transnationalist research reproduces Caribbean colonial movements and goes over the familiar terrain of Caribbeans confronting colonialist structures of power and knowledge.

Another way in which Caribbean transnationalism reproduces insularities is through the reification of island ethnic identities. Transnationalist narratives represent Caribbeans as enforcing categories and practices of islandness in their new settings. In her ethnography of Puerto Ricans living in Chicago, for example, Ramos-Zayas (2003) shows how her Puerto Rican informants construct themselves as the bearers of authentic Puerto Rican culture in opposition to Puerto Ricans living on the island. In Ramos-Zayas' narrative Puerto Rican transmigrants reproduce a sense of uniqueness in relation to other Hispanic populations of Chicago and in relation to their fellow US citizens by adhering to a rhetoric of being Puerto Rican and by establishing community programmes and activities to foster Puerto Rican values and traditions in the community. For Ramos-Zayas' informants, these programmes reproduce cultural continuities that are being diluted or lost in Puerto Rico itself due to the acceptance of US cultural and political values. For Ramos-Zayas the performance of cultural nationalisms on the part of Puerto Rican transmigrants responds to the subordinate position of Puerto Ricans within Chicago society. Puerto Rican national identity in this case responds to strategic positioning in relation to social contexts and the state (Ramos-Zayas 2003: 9–10).

An issue that transnationalist research is trying to grapple with is the contradictions created by subjects that are engaged in processes of travel and interactions while maintaining a sense of their specificity. Transnationalist research focuses on the structures of power and production that locate transmigrants in specific locations and on the ways in which transmigrants relate to these contexts of power and knowledge.

> The paradox of current world conjuncture is the increased production of cultural and political boundaries at the very time when the world has become tightly bound together in a single economic system with instantaneous communication between different sectors of the globe. In order to disentangle these contradictory trends, it is necessary to place the construction of cultural

demarcations and political boundaries being erected between groupings of people within the context of contention for political power and control of productive recourses, including labour power. (Basch et al. 1994: 34)

Such an approach, while invaluable in understanding the ethnographic conditions in which transmigrants live and work as they traverse through different social contexts, arises from an academic position that perceives movement and stability as two opposing forces that need to be reconciled or untangled. Untangling these two notions creates a narrative whereby stable categories such as nationality and ethnicity are described in opposition to fluid practices and discourses. Representing these discourses and practices as opposing each other creates a confusing picture of the transmigrant, in which he or she is depicted as mobile and creative on one instance and reactionary and victimised on the other. This inconsistency stems from the conceptual separation of mobile and insular discourses and practices instead of relating them as mutually constitutive processes. A slightly different picture, a more consistent picture, would emerge if contemporary Caribbean movements were written about from a perspective where island specificities are not in contradiction with mobilities but represent a continuity of Caribbean practices of travel and relation.

Conclusion

In this article I have reviewed basic Caribbeanist concepts and contextualised them within discourses of mobility. The intended result is to show how discrepant processes are represented in Caribbeanist discourse. On the one hand, Caribbean islands are constructed as insular, marginal and peripheral—a result of colonial history founded on the extraction of resources. This historical alienation is compounded by an understanding of islands as geographically insular, limited on all sides by the socially sterile ocean—a prison. In both cases, the sea functions as a non-social space, an isolator of relations. On the other hand, another strand of research prioritises the region's open-ended quality, its perpetual state of becoming that eludes classification, and a global example for creolisation. Movement between the islands and on to continental locations elicit images of the archipelago as an eternal liminal space with no centre or periphery perpetually unfolding itself in a rhizome like character. From this perspective, the island's social space spills out to the sea, expanding and contracting its referents to its neighbours and beyond.

   Rather than looking at these discourses as antagonistic, I have proposed that these discourses speak to processes that feed off each other in reproducing island life. I have drawn from three historically specific themes of the Caribbean in order to engage with islands as simultaneously open and closed, alienated and liberating, creolised and racialised, transnational and national. Concomitantly, the sea exhibits a simultaneous isolator and connector of social experiences and histories. Accepting the multiple simultaneities that characterise Caribbean life can serve as a model for examining other complexities that are emblematic of Caribbean life, such as tourism and musical practice (see Sheller 2004 and Manuel 1995 respectively), for example. In both cases, islanders draw from connections outside of their social space to produce a sense of what it means to be an islander.

This approach also resonates with broader discussions of globalisation in the sense that it encourages a discourse where the local is created through the global rather than the local and global representing competing discourses. In the Caribbean case, practices associated with globalisation represent a continuation of island life rather than a rupture with the insular or with tradition. In this sense, neologisms such as 'glocal' or notions of hybridity have the curious consequence of attempting to resolve a contradiction that remains open in the constitution of island life. As a tentative conclusion, I would suggest that leaving the paradox open allows for metaphors that speak to the montage, juxtapositions and bricolages of social relationships. These kinds of allegories may suggest a separation between insularity and movement, but they allow for a narrative that succeeds in bringing together these seemingly discordant practices and placing them in conversation with each other in the process of understanding island societies.

REFERENCES

Allen, Carolyn 1998. Creole Then and Now: The Problem of Definition. *Caribbean Quarterly* 44 (1–2): 33–49.

Anselin, Alain 1995. West Indians in France. In Richard D. E. Burton and Fred Reno (eds), *French and West Indian: Martinique, Guadeloupe, and French Guiana Today*. Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press.

Basch, Linda, Nina Glick-Schiller and Cristina Szanton-Blanc 1994. *Nations Unbound: Transnational Projects, Postcolonial Predicaments and Deterritorialized Nation-States.* Newark: Gordon and Breach.

Benítez-Rojo, Antonio 1989. *La Isla que se Repite: El Caribe y la Perspectiva Posmoderna*. Hanover: Ediciones del Norte.

Benítez-Rojo, Antonio 1995. The Polyrhythmic Paradigm: The Caribbean and the Postmodern Era. In Vera Lawrence-Hyatt and Rex Nettleford (eds), *Race, Discourse, and the Origin of the Americas: A New World View*. Washington, DC: Smithsonian Institution Press.

Bernabé, Jean, Patrick Chamoiseau and Raphael Confiant 1989. *Eloge de la créolité*. Paris: Gallimard.

Bolland, Nigel O. 1998. Creolisation and Creole Societies: A Cultural Nationalist View of Caribbean Social History. *Caribbean Quarterly* 44 (1–2): 1–21.

Burac, Maurice 1995. The French Antilles and the Wider Caribbean. In Richard D. E. Burton and Fred Reno (eds), *French and West Indian: Martinique, Guadeloupe, and French Guiana Today*. Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press.

Burton, Richard D. E. 1995. The Idea of Difference in Contemporary French West Indian Thought: Négritude, Antillanité, Creolité. In Richard D. E. Burton and Fred Reno (eds), *French and West Indian: Martinique, Guadeloupe, and French Guiana Today*. Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press.

Clifford, James 1997. *Routes: Travel and Translation in the Late Twentieth Century*. Cambridge, Massachusetts and London, England: Harvard University Press.

Cubero, Carlo A. 2008. Contesting Visions of Caribbean Landscapes. *Tourism, Culture and Communication*. 8 (2): 77–83.

Dash, Michael J. 1996. Introduction. In Edouard Glissant, *Caribbean Discourse: Selected Essays*. Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press.

Gilroy, Paul 1993a. *The Black Atlantic: Modernity and Double Consciousness.* London: Verso.

Gilroy, Paul 1993b. Black Atlantic (excerpt). Available online at: <http://www.blackatlantic.com/general/gilroy_essay.pdf>.

Giovannetti, Jorge L. 2006. Grounds of Race: Slavery, Racism and the Plantation in the Caribbean. *Latin American and Caribbean Ethnic Studies* 1 (1): 5–36.

Glissant, Edouard 1989. *Caribbean Discourse: Selected Essays*. Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press.

Glissant, Edouard 1995. Creolization in the Making of the Americas. In Vera Lawrence Hyatt and Rex Nettleford (eds), *Race, Discourse, and the Origin of the Americas*. Washington, DC: Smithsonian Institution Press.

Goveia, Elsa V. 1965. *Slave Society in the British Leeward Islands at the End of the Eighteenth Century.* New Haven and London: Yale University Press.

Guilbault, Jocelyn 1993. *Zouk: World Music in the West Indies*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Guilbault, Jocelyne 1994. Créolité and the New Cultural Politics of Difference in Popular Music of the French West Indies. *Black Music Research Journal* 14 (2): 161–178.

Gupta, Akhil and James Ferguson (eds) 1997. *Culture, Power, Place: Explorations in Critical Anthropology.* North Carolina and London: Duke University Press.

Hannerz, Ulf 1987. The World in Creolization. *Africa* 57 (4): 546–559.

Henessy, Alistair 2000. Preface. In Conrad James and John Perivolaris (eds), *The Cultures of the Hispanic Caribbean*. Gainsville: University of Florida Press.

Hoetink, Harry 1985. Race and Color in the Caribbean. In Sidney Mintz and Sally Price (eds), *Caribbean Contours*. Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press.

John, B. M. 1999. The Construction of Racial Meaning by Blacks and Whites in Plantation Society. In T. J. Durant and J.D. Knottnerus (eds), *Plantation Society and Race Relations: The Origins of Inequality*. Connecticut: Praeger Publishers.

Khan, Aisha 2001. Journey to the Center of the Earth: The Caribbean as Master Symbol. *Cultural Anthropology* 16 (3): 271–302.

Knight, Franklyn W. 1990. *The Caribbean: Genesis of a Fragmented Nationalism.* 2nd Edition. New York: Oxford University Press.

Lewis, Gordon K. 1983. *Main Currents in Caribbean Thought: The Historical Evolution of Caribbean Societies in its Ideological Aspects, 1492–1900*. Baltimore and London: The John Hopkins University Press.

Lewis, Gordon K. 1985. The Contemporary Caribbean: A General Overview. In Sidney Mintz and Sally Price (eds), *Caribbean Contours*. Baltimore and London: The John Hopkins University Press.

Lowenthal, David 2007. Islands, Lovers, and Others. *Geographical Review* 97 (2): 202–229.

Manuel, Peter 1995. *Caribbean Currents: Caribbean Music from Rumba to Reggae*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Mintz, Sidney 1974. *Caribbean Transformations.* Chicago: Aldine Publishing Company.

Mintz, Sidney 1990. Labor Needs and Ethnic Ripening in the Caribbean Region. *Anales del Caribe* 10: 31–52.

Mintz, Sidney 1996. Ethnic Difference, Plantation Sameness. In Gert Oostindie (ed.), *Ethnicity in the Caribbean: Essays in Honor of Harry Hoetink*. London: MacMillan Education.

Mintz, Sidney and Sally Price (eds) 1985. *Caribbean Contours*. Baltimore and London: The John Hopkins University Press.

Moreno Fraginals, Manuel 2001 [1974]. *El ingenio: complejo económico social cubano del azúcar*. Barcelona: Editorial Crítica.

Morse, Richard M. 1996. Race, Culture, and Identity in the New World: Five National Versions. In Gert Oostindie (ed.), *Ethnicity in the Caribbean: Essays in Honour of harry Hoetink*. London: MacMillan Education.

Negrón-Muntaner, Frances and Ramón Grosfoguel (eds) 1997. *Puerto Rican Jam: Rethinking Colonialism and Nationalism*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Olwig, Karen Fog 1993. *Global Culture, Island Identity: Continuity and Change in the Afro-Caribbean Community of Nevis.* Reading: Harwood Academic Publishers.

Oostindie, Gert 1996. Introduction: Ethnicity as Ever? In Gert Oostindie (ed.), *Ethnicity in the Caribbean: Essays in Honor of Harry Hoetink*. London: MacMillan Education.

Patterson, Orlando 1967. *The Sociology of Slavery: An Analysis of the Origins, Development and Structure of the Negro Slave Society in Jamaica.* London: MacGibbon & Kee.

Payne, Anthony J. 1978. The Politics of the Caribbean Community 1961–1976: Regional Integration in the Third World. Manchester: University of Manchester, Faculty of Economic and Social Studies.

Price, Richard and Sally Price 1997. Shadow Boxing in the Mangrove. *Cultural Anthropology* 12 (1): 3–36.

Puri, Shalini 2003. Introduction. Theorizing Diasporic Cultrues: The Quiet Migrations. In Puri, Shalini (ed.), *Marginal Migrations: Circulation of Cultures within the Caribbean.* Oxford: MacMillan Caribbean and Warwick University.

Quintero-Rivera, Angel 1998. *Salsa, Sabor y Control: Sociología de la Música Tropical.* Colombia: Siglo XXI Editores de Colombia.

Ramnarine, Tina K. 2007. *Beautiful Cosmos: Performing and Belonging in the Caribbean Diaspora.* London: Pluto Press.

Ramos-Zayas, Ana Y. 2003. *National Performances: The Politics of Class, Race, and Space in Puerto Rican Chicago.* London: University of Chicago Press.

Sánchez-Korrol, Virginia E. 1983. *From Colonia to Community: The History of Puerto Ricans in New York City.* Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.

Sheller, Mimi 2003. *Consuming the Caribbean: From Arawaks to Zombies.* London: Routledge.

Sheller, Mimi 2004. Demobilizing and Remobilizing Caribbean Paradise. In Mimi Sheller and John Urry (eds), *Tourism Mobilities: Places to Play, Places in Play.* London: Routledge.

Shepherd, Verene and Glen Richards 1998. Introduction. *Caribbean Quarterly* 44 (1–2): vi–xiv.

Thompson, Edgar T. 1975. *Plantation Societies, Race Relations, and the South: The Regimentation of Population. Selected Papers of Edgar T. Thompson.* Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Torre, Carlos Antonio, Hugo Rodríguez-Vecchini and William Burgos 1994. *The Commuter Nation: Perspectives on Puerto Rican Migration.* Río Piedras: Editorial Universidad de Puerto Rico.

Trouillont, Michel-Rolph 1992. The Caribbean Region: An Open Frontier in Anthropological Theory. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 21: 19–42.

CARLO A. CUBERO, Ph.D.
DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL AND CULTURAL ANTHROPOLOGY
ESTONIAN INSTITUTE OF HUMANITIES
TALLINN UNIVERSITY
carlo.cubero@gmail.com