Journal of Literature and Art Studies, September 2025, Vol. 15, No. 9, 707-712
doi: 10.17265/2159-5836/2025.09.005

The Black Atlantic as Heuristic: Rethinking Modernity through Diaspora and Transnationalism

ZHOU Meng-jie
University of Chinese Academy of Social Science, Beijing, China

Since the publication of *The Black Atlantic: Modernity and Double Consciousness* (1993), the concept of the "Black Atlantic" has become a key paradigm in diaspora studies and cultural criticism. The "Black Atlantic" challenges the historical dominance of Western-centered Atlantic history by situating slavery, forced migration, and diasporic intellectual production as central components of modernity itself. This essay re-examines the meaning of the "Black Atlantic" by situating it against Eurocentric Atlantic history, exploring its philosophical dialogue with modernity, interrogating its relationship with Marxism, and reassessing its significance in the context of globalization. In doing so, it seeks to clarify both the transformative power and the limitations of Gilroy's paradigm while also suggesting directions for future scholarship that reconnect the "Black Atlantic" to Africa, Marxism, and anti-capitalist critique.

Keywords: "the Black Atlantic", Marxism, anti-capitalism

Introduction

The concept of the "Black Atlantic" marked a turning point in the study of diaspora, modernity, and global history. First introduced by Paul Gilroy in his influential book *The Black Atlantic: Modernity and Double Consciousness* (1993), the term describes not only a geographic space encompassing Europe, Africa, the Americas, and the Caribbean, but also a cultural and intellectual framework that transcends the boundaries of the nation-state. Gilroy's intervention sought to reframe the history of modernity by centering the experiences of enslaved Africans and their descendants, thereby destabilizing the Eurocentric narrative that had dominated both Atlantic history and theories of modernity. In his words, the Black Atlantic represents a "counterculture of modernity", a term that encapsulates both the resistance to and entanglement with European colonial power, capitalist expansion, and Enlightenment philosophy. Yet, to define the Black Atlantic is not a simple task. The intellectual genealogy of the Black Atlantic can be traced to both African American thought and postcolonial theory. W.E.B. Du Bois's concept of double consciousness, articulated in *The Souls of Black Folk* (1903), provided an early theoretical framework for understanding the fractured identity of African Americans as both insiders and outsiders of Western modernity. Later, cultural critics and historians such as Robert Farris Thompson, in *Flash of the Spirit: African and Afro-American Art and Philosophy* (1983), highlighted the

ZHOU Meng-jie, Doctoral candidate, Department of Foreign Language, University of Chinese Academy of Social Science, Beijing, China.

endurance of African cultural forms in the Americas, foreshadowing Gilroy's emphasis on diasporic hybridity. When Gilroy coined the term "Black Atlantic," he brought together these strands of thought while also responding to the limitations of Atlantic history, which until the late twentieth century remained primarily a story of European exploration, conquest, and power struggles. This essay therefore seeks to re-examine the meaning of the Black Atlantic by situating it within three overlapping debates: the critique of Eurocentrism in Atlantic history; the philosophical engagement with modernity, including its relationship to Hegelian and Marxist thought; and its role in the discourses of globalization.

Defining the Black Atlantic

The term "Black Atlantic" first gained prominence with Gilroy's *The Black Atlantic: Modernity and Double Consciousness* (1993), but its intellectual roots stretch back much further. First, the emergence of Atlantic history as a field in the mid-twentieth century provided the backdrop against which Gilroy formulated his critique. Scholars such as Trevor Burnard have noted that early works in Atlantic history during the 1940s and 1950s primarily portrayed the Atlantic as a theater of Western civilization, largely written by European scholars for whom the Atlantic symbolized imperial expansion and cultural exchange among European nations (伯纳德, 2023, p. 24). Bernard Bailyn, one of the most influential historians of the Atlantic, characterized it as a "developmental narrative" tracing successive stages of European conquest, rivalry, and colonization (Bailyn, 2005, p. 63). In these accounts, Africa and Africans figured primarily as labor resources, not as agents of historical transformation. Second, cultural historians such as Robert Farris Thompson had already begun to articulate an alternative vision of the Atlantic as a space of African survivals and transformations. In *Flash of the Spirit: African and Afro-American Art and Philosophy* (1983), Thompson analyzed Yoruba, Kongo, and Mande influences in the art, religion, and architecture of the Americas, demonstrating that African cultural patterns persisted and evolved in diasporic settings (Thompson, 1983, p, 115). His insistence on the centrality of African aesthetics and cosmologies inspired Gilroy, who acknowledged Thompson as an important influence on his thinking (Gilroy, 1993, p. 15). Third, the philosophical groundwork for the Black Atlantic was laid by W.E.B. Du Bois, whose concept of "double consciousness" in *The Souls of Black Folk* (1903) captured the divided identity of African Americans as both participants in and outsiders to Western modernity. Du Bois's formulation highlighted the psychic and cultural dissonance of racialized subjects caught between competing worlds—a theme Gilroy would later expand to describe the broader dynamics of diaspora.

Gilroy's innovation was to synthesize these threads into a coherent framework that reconceptualized the Atlantic not merely as a geographic basin but as a cultural and political unit. The Black Atlantic, in his view, encompasses the flows of people, ideas, and practices across the Atlantic Ocean, particularly those generated by the transatlantic slave trade and its aftermath. It includes the Middle Passage, slavery, abolition, emancipation, and subsequent struggles for civil rights and cultural recognition. Crucially, it is not confined to one nation, ethnicity, or continent but instead designates a hybrid, interstitial space that resists nationalist boundaries. This perspective also entails a methodological shift. Rather than studying cultures within national boundaries, the Black Atlantic proposes analyzing flows, circulations, and networks that cross those boundaries. It demands a transnational approach that is attentive to mobility, hybridity, and exchange. As such, the Black Atlantic is not only a description of past phenomena but also a call for new ways of doing history and cultural criticism.

The methodological radicalism of the Black Atlantic lies in its rejection of two dominant frameworks: Eurocentric modernity and ethnonationalist essentialism. On the one hand, Gilroy challenges the Enlightenment-derived narrative of modernity as a European achievement disseminated outward through conquest and colonization. By situating slavery and the African diaspora at the core of modernity, he exposes the racial terror that undergirded the rise of modern Europe. On the other hand, he also resists nationalist narratives within the African diaspora that posit Africa as an untouched origin or that equate diasporic identity with singular national cultures. Instead, he emphasizes the ongoing processes of cultural mixing, negotiation, and translation that define diasporic life. Benedict Anderson's remark that "comparison is a discursive strategy rather than a method" (安德森, 2018, p. 41) resonates with Gilroy's insistence that diaspora studies must move beyond comparative frameworks to embrace relational and processual approaches. Likewise, Zygmunt Bauman's notion of fluid modernity underscores Gilroy's preference for mobility and change over fixity and tradition. Taken together, these perspectives suggest that the Black Atlantic offers not a fixed object of study but a heuristic for analyzing cultural production in conditions of displacement, hybridity, and transnational circulation.

Despite its theoretical appeal, defining the Black Atlantic has proven contentious. Critics argue that Gilroy's refusal to privilege Africa as a central site risks erasing the specificity of African histories and perspectives. Laura Chrisman, for example, has observed that by focusing on diasporic intellectuals in Europe and the Americas, Gilroy reproduces a hierarchy that privileges diasporic over continental African voices. Similarly, Neil Lazarus contends that Gilroy neglects the Marxist critique of capitalism and world-systems theory, thereby depoliticizing the structural underpinnings of racialized exploitation (Lazarus, 1995, p. 62). Others note the ambiguities of Gilroy's stance on nationalism. While he critiques the homogenizing tendencies of nationalist ideology, he underestimates the emancipatory role that anti-colonial nationalism played in the struggles of the global South. As a result, his embrace of transnationalism may inadvertently downplay the revolutionary achievements of postcolonial states.

the "Black Atlantic" and the Critique of Eurocentrism

One of the central claims of Paul Gilroy's *The Black Atlantic: Modernity and Double Consciousness* is that the history of modernity cannot be told solely as the achievement of Europe. Instead, it must include the enslaved Africans and their descendants whose forced labor and cultural contributions were indispensable to the rise of modern Western societies. This claim directly confronts the Eurocentrism that has long shaped both historical and philosophical accounts of modernity. In order to appreciate the significance of Gilroy's intervention, it is necessary to examine the contours of Eurocentrism in Atlantic historiography, the Hegelian philosophy of history, and the ways in which the Black Atlantic offers an alternative narrative.

The historiography of the Atlantic world provides a prime example of how Eurocentrism structured historical narratives. When the field of Atlantic history emerged in the mid-twentieth century, it primarily focused on the political, economic, and cultural interactions among European empires. Bernard Bailyn's interpretation of the Atlantic as a vast but patterned historical process exemplifies this orientation. According to Bailyn, while the Atlantic encompassed diverse geographies and peoples, its history could nonetheless be traced through successive "phases of development," from Spanish conquest to British, Dutch, and French

competition for imperial supremacy (Bailyn, 2005, p. 45). Similarly, early Atlantic historians emphasized the creation of a transatlantic "Western civilization." Trevor Burnard has noted that the first generation of Atlantic historians in the 1940s and 1950s often portrayed the Atlantic world as an extension of Europe, highlighting the spread of European institutions, ideas, and values (伯纳德, 2023, p. 31). This perspective aligned with the broader Eurocentric tendency to treat Europe as the origin of modernity and other regions as passive recipients of its diffusion. Gilroy explicitly challenged this orientation. For him, the Atlantic is not merely a theater of European expansion but a space where African diaspora communities forged new forms of culture, politics, and thought. By centering the experiences of enslaved Africans, the Black Atlantic decenters Europe and reveals the interconnectedness of modernity, slavery, and racial struggle. In doing so, Gilroy reoriented Atlantic history from a Eurocentric to a polycentric framework, emphasizing the contributions of non-European actors.

Beyond historiography, Eurocentrism is also deeply embedded in the philosophical tradition of modernity. Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel's *Philosophy of History* (1837) famously relegated Africa to the status of a "non-historical" continent, claiming that it was enveloped in "the dark mantle of night" and lacked the consciousness necessary for historical development. By excluding Africa from the narrative of universal history, Hegel provided philosophical justification for colonialism and slavery, which could be rationalized as bringing "history" and "civilization" to a supposedly ahistorical continent. Eurocentrism in philosophy thus reinforced Eurocentrism in history, legitimating Europe's dominance as both natural and progressive. Gilroy's Black Atlantic directly confronts this legacy. By emphasizing the centrality of the slave trade and the Middle Passage to the making of modernity, he reverses Hegel's logic: rather than being outside history, Africans were at the very core of its most transformative processes. The exploitation of African labor in plantations, the cultural creativity of enslaved communities, and the political thought of diasporic intellectuals were not peripheral to modernity but constitutive of it. In this sense, the Black Atlantic represents a counter-history that exposes the violence, exploitation, and racial terror that underpinned Europe's self-congratulatory narrative of progress.

Gilroy characterizes the Black Atlantic as a "counterculture of modernity" (Gilroy, 1993, p. 37). By this he means that the African diaspora not only participated in modernity but also developed cultural and political forms that resisted and critiqued it. The music of the African diaspora—spirituals, blues, jazz, reggae—exemplifies this countercultural dimension. Similarly, the writings of diasporic intellectuals such as Olaudah Equiano, Frederick Douglass, and W.E.B. Du Bois articulated perspectives that challenged dominant European ideologies. Equiano's *Interesting Narrative* (1789) exposed the brutality of slavery while asserting the humanity and agency of Africans. Douglass's speeches and autobiographies combined Enlightenment ideals of liberty with firsthand accounts of enslavement, thereby indicting American and European hypocrisies. Du Bois's concept of double consciousness captured the fractured identity of African Americans as both part of and excluded from Western modernity. Together, these cultural and intellectual productions form what Gilroy calls the counterculture of modernity. They reveal that modernity was not a unilinear European achievement but a contested process shaped by the struggles and contributions of the African diaspora.

Another key dimension of Gilroy's critique of Eurocentrism is methodological. Rather than engaging in comparative studies that juxtapose African, European, and American histories, Gilroy advocates for a relational approach that emphasizes flows and connections. Benedict Anderson has argued that comparison is not a method but a discursive strategy, and Gilroy builds on this insight by showing how diasporic cultures emerged

through interaction rather than isolation. This relational method challenges the territorial logic of both Eurocentrism and nationalism. By treating the Atlantic as a space of mobility, hybridity, and exchange, the Black Atlantic undermines narratives that privilege rootedness, purity, and boundedness. Instead, it foregrounds processes of translation, adaptation, and transformation that defy Eurocentric teleologies. Despite its radical challenge to Eurocentrism, Gilroy's framework is not without limitations. As discussed earlier, Hegel's philosophy of history excluded Africa from universal history, casting it as "non-historical" and outside the trajectory of progress. For Gilroy, this exclusion is emblematic of the Eurocentric logic that has long dominated modern thought. His project is to confront this philosophical discourse by demonstrating that slavery, diaspora, and racial terror are not anomalies but central to the constitution of modernity.

Despite the power of this philosophical critique, many scholars argue that Gilroy's framework insufficiently addresses the economic dimensions of modernity. From a Marxist perspective, this omission is problematic. Slavery was not simply a cultural trauma or philosophical contradiction; it was a fundamental economic institution that fueled the rise of capitalism. As Eric Williams famously argued in *Capitalism and Slavery* (1944), profits from the slave trade and plantation economy were central to the development of European industrial capitalism. To discuss slavery without analyzing its economic functions risks reducing it to a moral or cultural problem, thereby obscuring its structural role in shaping global capitalism. Marxist theory has long emphasized the centrality of capitalism to modernity. For Karl Marx, modernity was defined by the rise of capitalist relations of production, characterized by the commodification of labor, the global expansion of markets, and the constant revolutionizing of the means of production. The famous line from *The Communist Manifesto*—"all that is solid melts into air"—captures the dynamism and destructiveness of capitalist modernity. In this framework, slavery is not an aberration but an integral part of capitalism's global expansion. World-systems theorists such as Immanuel Wallerstein have further developed this idea, showing how the transatlantic slave trade and plantation economy were essential components of the capitalist world-system that emerged in the sixteenth century. Samir Amin and André Gunder Frank similarly emphasized the centrality of colonial exploitation and racialized labor to the development of global capitalism. From this perspective, Gilroy's focus on cultural hybridity and philosophical critique appears incomplete. By neglecting the Marxist analysis of capitalism, he risks presenting the Black Atlantic as primarily a cultural or intellectual phenomenon rather than as a structural condition of capitalist modernity. By downplaying the role of capitalism, Gilroy's framework risks obscuring the class dimensions of diasporic struggles. The plantation system, for instance, was not only a site of racial oppression but also of class exploitation. Enslaved Africans were workers whose labor generated surplus value for European capitalists. The struggles of the African diaspora were therefore not only struggles for recognition and cultural survival but also struggles over labor, production, and class relations. Ignoring this dimension risks depoliticizing the Black Atlantic and reducing it to a matter of cultural identity.

If Gilroy's framework is limited by its neglect of capitalism and Marxist critique, how might it be revised or supplemented? One possibility is to reconnect the Black Atlantic with world-systems theory and Marxist analyses of global capitalism. By situating the slave trade, plantation economies, and diasporic labor struggles within the larger dynamics of capitalist expansion, scholars can highlight the material as well as the cultural dimensions of the Black Atlantic. For instance, examining the ways in which plantation economies linked the Caribbean, Africa, and Europe reveals the structural interdependencies of the capitalist world-system. Similarly,

analyzing the role of enslaved and free black labor in the development of industrial economies underscores the centrality of African-descended peoples to global capitalism. Such approaches would complement Gilroy's cultural analysis by grounding it in economic structures.

Conclusion

The Black Atlantic, as conceptualized by Paul Gilroy, has transformed the study of diaspora, modernity, and cultural history. By foregrounding the experiences of enslaved Africans and their descendants, Gilroy destabilized Eurocentric narratives of modernity and Atlantic history, insisting that slavery and diaspora were not peripheral anomalies but constitutive forces of the modern world. His emphasis on hybridity, mobility, and transnationalism challenged both Eurocentric historiography and nationalist essentialisms, offering a polycentric and relational model of culture and history. Yet, as this essay has argued, the framework of the Black Atlantic is not without its limitations. Gilroy's focus on cultural and philosophical critique often downplays the structural role of capitalism in shaping modernity. His neglect of Marxist analyses of labor, class, and world-systems theory leaves the economic dimensions of diaspora underexplored. Moreover, while Gilroy decenters Europe, he sometimes recenters the West by privileging diasporic intellectuals in Europe and the Americas, leaving Africa and the broader global South marginalized. Finally, the resonance of his rhetoric of routes, flows, and hybridity with the language of globalization raises concerns about its alignment with neoliberal ideologies that celebrate mobility while masking structural inequalities. To address these limitations, the Black Atlantic must be reimagined in ways that reconnect it to Marxist critiques of capitalism, integrate Africa and South-South dynamics more fully, and remain attentive to the politics of borders and the coercive dimensions of global mobility. Doing so will strengthen its capacity to serve as both a historical framework and a contemporary critique. The legacies of slavery and diaspora continue to shape global inequalities, and the Black Atlantic remains a vital tool for analyzing these dynamics. Ultimately, the question "What is the Black Atlantic?" does not admit a single, fixed answer. It is best understood as a heuristic: a way of seeing the world that foregrounds hybridity, relationality, and resistance, while also demanding constant revision and expansion. In this sense, the Black Atlantic is less a closed concept than an open invitation to rethink modernity, diaspora, and globalization in more inclusive, critical, and transformative ways.

References

Bailyn, B. (2005). *Atlantic history: Concept and contours*. USA: Harvard University Press.

Bruneau, M. (2010). Diasporas, transnational spaces and communities. In R. Baubock and T. Faist (Eds.): *Diaspora and transnationalism concepts, theories and methods.* Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.

Gilroy, P. (1993). *The Black Atlantic: Modernity and double consciousness*. London and New York: Verso.

Lazarus, N. (1995). Is a counterculture of modernity a theory of modernity? *Diaspora: A Journal of Transnational Studies*.

Thompson, R. F. (1983). *Flash of the spirit: African and Afro-American art and philosophy*. New York: Random House.

本尼迪克特·安德森. (2018). 《椰壳碗外的人生》. 徐德林译. 上海: 上海人民出版社.

特雷弗 伯纳德. (2023).《大西洋史》. 张恒杰, 桂芳芳译. 北京: 中国友谊出版公司.